



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 2017

No. 58

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 4, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GARRET GRAVES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot going on around here lately. We have been conducting investigations, holding hearings, and some of us have even tried and failed to fundamentally change the way we provide health care in this country.

It has been easy to get distracted by the dozens of different headlines and breaking news stories we see each week. But no matter what else is going on here in Washington, one thing con-

tinues unabated: each day, the United States, like every other country on Earth, continues to release tons and tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, and now we are starting to see the effects.

Over the last couple of years, the U.S. has joined 20 other countries from around the world in growing its economy while reducing its annual emissions into the atmosphere. This is not a small feat, and decoupling emissions from growth is the first step toward the substantive action needed to address the growing climate crisis. But I find this concept of reducing emissions can sometimes be a little misleading.

In the last few years, the U.S. has reduced the rate that it emits greenhouse gases. But even if we are doing it more slowly, we are still emitting harmful pollution into our air.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, standing at the edge of an empty swimming pool with a garden hose. For a while, water was spewing out of that hose at a torrent; and each year, the volume got greater and greater. Now, the water is still running, but we have begun to turn the speed down. However, even if we manage to slow the rate of water going in, the pool still has more water than when we started and is still filling up.

Our atmosphere is that pool. For nearly 100 years, it has been filling up with greenhouse gases. And they don't just go away when the calendar flips. Reducing the annual emissions is vital, but we can't lose track of all the gases that have been accumulated year after year.

If we are going to hit the international goal of limiting climate warming to 2 degrees Celsius, we need to start acting now. Yet, this august body has been behind the curve on this issue for years.

Our colleagues seem content to ignore the climate crisis, to hold hearings with discredited, crank

pseudoscientists bought and paid for by corporate interests, or to deny the value of scientific thinking altogether, an approach that is all too familiar given the post-research, post-intelligence, post-truth mindset that we have seen from this administration. They have adopted a "hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil" approach to climate change, hoping they can ignore it until it goes away. Sadly, that is not the way the world works.

We can't unfill the pool by pretending there is no such thing as water. This form of denial has been evolving over time. First, we heard that there was no way that climate is changing at all.

Now that the changes in the atmosphere are beyond doubt, we are starting to hear that climate is changing but there is nothing we can do about it. In addition to being flat out false, that type of thinking is unbecoming of a nation that put the first man on the Moon, pioneered instantaneous communication, and has led the world in the fight against countless deadly diseases.

Last month, we heard the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency question the very fundamentals of atmospheric science, a particularly dismaying thing from the man charged with leading the fight against climate change. This type of willful scientific ignorance has serious consequences. It will cost lives.

Children will be exposed to harmful, asthma-inducing pollution because we didn't act fast enough to clean our air. They will die because crops that could be counted on for generations will no longer grow. They will be forced from their homes because melting polar ice is driving sea levels higher and higher.

We cannot deny these impacts. We cannot continue to hear no evil and see no evil when these changes are happening all around us, resulting in devastating consequences that affect every aspect of our life.

□ 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.

H2633

Instead, the time has come to speak up and speak loudly like our lives and the world depend on it, as it truly does.

RECOGNIZING VICTORIA RIOS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize an outstanding young lady from our south Florida community, Victoria Rios.

Vicki is the winner of the 2016 Congressional App Challenge from my congressional district, and she is a remarkable senior high student at Gulliver Preparatory.

Her app, Simple Sign, was created out of the most noble and sincere desire to help those with hearing impairment, and her app was inspired by her special needs younger sister, Zoe.

Simple Sign is an easy-to-use app that includes photos and videos that helps individuals easily and quickly learn sign language through a cell phone or tablet.

The future of our great Nation relies on innovators from all backgrounds and walks of life in STEM careers, and I could not be more proud of Vicki choosing this extraordinary calling. I hope that this accomplishment will inspire her classmates, friends, and other young women across south Florida to pursue a career in STEM fields.

Congratulations, Victoria, and I cannot wait to see all of the amazing designs that you will create in the future.

2017 AIDS WALK MIAMI

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage all of south Florida to participate in the 2017 AIDS Walk Miami on Sunday, April 23, at Soundscape Park located in my congressional district of Miami Beach.

This 5K walk through the streets of beautiful South Beach seeks to cultivate a culture of awareness and prevention, as well as help provide services for the more than 15,000 individuals who have been impacted by HIV/AIDS in our south Florida community.

Since 1989, this AIDS walk has been one of Miami's largest HIV/AIDS awareness charity event and continues to attract thousands of participants from all over the Nation who walk together to raise funds to prevent new infections, maximize the health outcomes and quality of life of those infected, and ultimately end the HIV/AIDS epidemic in south Florida.

Unfortunately, last year, south Florida led our Nation in AIDS-related deaths, and Miami was one of the Nation's top HIV hotspots.

This walk lends vital support to local groups and organizations, such as Care Resource and the Food for Life Network, that are working to transform the lives of patients and caregivers throughout our south Florida community.

The Food for Life Network food bank provides and delivers groceries, meals,

and nutritional education to men, women, and children living with HIV/AIDS in Miami-Dade County. Since 1987, its staff and volunteers have provided over 1.5 million meals and groceries as well as other crucial services, such as free screening for sexually transmitted diseases, free medical and dental care, access to health and nutrition specialists, and so much more, Mr. Speaker.

Care Resource is improving the health and quality of life of our diverse south Florida community, especially those impacted by HIV/AIDS, by providing essential health services, such as pediatric and dental care, immunizations, HIV primary care, and more.

It is because of the work and commitment of organizations like these that AIDS is no longer a death sentence and patients can live long and fulfilling lives.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, I invite everyone in south Florida to come out to the 2017 AIDS Walk Miami and help celebrate our great success against this disease and the great progress that we have achieved for the thousands living with HIV/AIDS in south Florida and to reaffirm our strong commitment to the work that is yet to be done.

Together we can achieve the goal of an AIDS-free generation in the near future.

COMMEMORATING THE WORK OF THE HUMANE SOCIETY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate one of the Nation's largest animal protection organizations, The Humane Society of the United States.

Each year, The Humane Society and its affiliates provide sanctuaries, veterinary programs, emergency shelters, and rescues to over 100,000 animals, leading in efforts to confront animal cruelty and providing care and services to many animals in need.

In addition, The Humane Society works tirelessly to educate and advocate by providing essential training and services to local shelters and animal groups lacking resources and through policy initiatives on both the State and national level.

Animal welfare and wildlife conservation are vital to our south Florida community. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to pay tribute to the outstanding commitment of all the volunteers of The Humane Society of the United States and wish all of them great success as we continue working together to combat animal cruelty and negligence to create a better world for all animals.

MILITARISM, MATERIALISM, AND RACISM

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the 49th anniversary of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Dr. King, Jr., was, sadly, struck down in Memphis, Tennessee, by an aberrant

individual who wanted to kill him and chased him all over the country. It so happened that Memphis was the spot that he had that final opportunity.

In Memphis, there will be activities today celebrating the life of Dr. King and commitments to community service in his spirit.

Ironically, today, while it is the 49th anniversary of his assassination, it is also the 50th anniversary of his greatest speech, in my opinion. Not the "I've Been to the Mountaintop" speech that he made the night before in Memphis, the great speech where he said: I have been to the mountaintop, and I may not get there with you; but I want you to know tonight, that we, as a people, will get to the promised land.

His greatest speech, in my opinion, was the speech at the Riverside Church in New York, in Manhattan, on April 4 of 1967, when he spoke of the three isms that bother this country and are the enemies of this country: militarism, materialism, and racism.

The speech was called "Beyond Vietnam." A prescient Dr. King saw the need to get out of Vietnam, to make a unilateral step, cease the bombing, save lives. He was indeed right about that. We should have gotten out of Vietnam then, but we didn't.

It was months later that Richard Nixon interfered with the peace process for political reasons and got word to Vietnam not to participate; that they might get a better deal from Nixon; and that stopped President Johnson from possibly concluding the war in 1968.

The racism, the militarism, and the materialism are still pervasive. Dr. King wouldn't like what he sees today. We have a budget giving 56 or \$57 billion extra to the military and cutting away from diplomacy efforts, foreign aid efforts that militate against war. And it takes away from funding for people, African Americans and poor people in America, who need government assistance.

That is part of what Dr. King was concerned about in this "Beyond Vietnam" speech. And here it is 50 years later and we still suffer with the same tight budget and the same misguided priorities.

We have an Attorney General who is looking at ending consent decrees on police violence against African Americans in Baltimore, Maryland, and also in Ferguson, a suburb of St. Louis, Missouri.

We are going the wrong direction, and it is sad that one of our greatest prophets and one of our greatest leaders told us about it 50 years ago.

Have we learned.

The disparity in wealth is greater than ever in this country. The rich are getting richer and richer and richer. It is incomprehensible that there are billionaires—and there are lots of them out there—and that the tax breaks that we offer in the Tax Code are going to give millionaires and billionaires hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars of tax breaks at the expense of

government programs for people who don't have enough.

There is no consideration of a minimum wage. And Dr. King was strong on believing that if people worked a full-time job, they shouldn't be paid a part-time wage.

□ 1015

We need to go a lot further. We need to reflect on Dr. King's Riverside speech and understand that it is still a guide for us, and we need to look at a more understanding budget that cares about people first and not the military industrial complex that President Eisenhower warned us about; that we try to avoid wars through diplomacy and foreign aid and goodwill; and that we support our people with WIC programs and LIHEAP programs and Meals on Wheels and health care and public education; and that we try to give tax breaks to the middle class—large tax breaks, and not tax breaks to those who already have enough.

Thank you, Dr. King. You served us well. We mourn your loss. We remember your words.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF WIC

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children—or WIC—is a short-term intervention program designed to help ensure pregnant women and their children are able to meet healthy nutritional needs.

WIC began in 1972 as a supplemental food pilot program aimed at improving the health of pregnant mothers, infants, and children in response to a growing concern of malnutrition among low-income families. By 1974, WIC was operating in 45 States and became a permanent program in 1975.

WIC provides participants with monthly benefits redeemable for specific foods to supplement their diets, as well as related nutrition and health services. WIC provides quality nutrition education and services; breastfeeding promotion and education; a monthly food package; and access to maternal, prenatal, and pediatric healthcare services. WIC has served 8.3 million participants each month through 10,000 clinics nationwide in 2014; 806,000 pregnant women; 592,000 breastfeeding women; 575,000 postpartum women; 2 million infants; and 4.3 million children.

Mr. Speaker, numerous studies have shown that pregnant women who participate in WIC have longer pregnancies, leading to fewer premature births. They have fewer low and very low birth weight babies. They experience fewer fetal and infant deaths, and they seek prenatal care earlier in pregnancy and consume more of key nutri-

ents, such as iron, protein, calcium, vitamins A and C.

WIC has been addressing the nutrition and health needs of low-income families for more than 40 years. I rise today as chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition but also as someone who knows firsthand how important WIC is for many Americans.

In the early 1980s, when my wife, Penny, and I were just starting out, we were eligible for WIC based on our income. We used WIC to supplement our personal resources at the time to ensure that Penny, who was expecting our first son, was healthy. Back then, WIC truly helped us supplement what we needed after our personal resources and the family assistance and support came into play.

Nutrition influences health at every stage of life. Good nutrition during pregnancy is especially important to support fetal development and protect mothers from pregnancy-related risks of gestational diabetes, excessive weight gain, hypertension, and iron deficiency anemia. Good nutrition in early childhood can promote development and foster healthy behaviors that may carry over into adulthood.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are clear: WIC works. Let's ensure this program remains viable for generations to come. WIC truly provides a competitive edge that will give everyone a fair shot at life—a fair start in life, and the American people deserve no less.

TRUMP'S GROWING LIST OF PERSONAL AND BUSINESS ENTANGLEMENTS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to President Trump's ever-growing risk of personal and business entanglements. They call into question his ability to serve impartially in the interests of the American people. Both he and his administration remain closely linked to private companies and foreign entities whose interests are often in direct opposition to those of the United States.

For example, we are well aware of the increasing boldness of the Chinese regime and its efforts to extend their economic and military influence. Despite portraying China publicly as a threat to economic growth of the United States, the President has selected Goldman Sachs' executive, Gary Cohn, to be his director of the National Economic Council. That is about one of seven individuals from Goldman Sachs who have been brought into this administration. Mr. Cohn has just sold his \$16 million holding in a Chinese bank. This same state-owned Chinese bank also happens to be the largest tenant in Trump Tower in Manhattan. Isn't that a coincidence?

Wilbur Ross, President Trump's choice for Commerce Secretary, pre-

sents similar conflicts of interest. As a man who will play a major role in shaping U.S. trade policy, Mr. Ross continues to hold a stake worth tens of millions of dollars in the international shipping company, Diamond S Shipping Group, a company that not only operates ships that fly the Chinese flag, but those ships also call on ports in countries, such as Iran and Sudan, that are under U.S. sanctions for being state sponsors of terrorism.

We also know that The Trump Organization was recently awarded sole rights to the President's name for products sold in China. He had waited 10 years to get those rights. The case was settled just mere days after President Trump's phone call with Chinese President Xi Jinping, when the President reversed his prior stance on Chinese unification and gave a full-throated endorsement to what he termed "One China" policy. That was a reversal from what he had done just after the election.

Meanwhile, according to The New York Times, President Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner, was recently negotiating a real estate deal worth hundreds of millions of dollars with a Chinese company closely tied to its government. And while it has been reported that the deal was called off, the fact that Mr. Kushner is continuing to negotiate private real estate deals while serving as a White House employee is deeply troubling.

It was announced last week that Ivanka Trump will now be joining her husband in the White House as an adviser to the President with top secret security clearance. While she has stepped down from her former role at her fashion licensing company that uses the Trump name, her decision to transfer her brand's assets into a trust run by her own brother-in-law—and her arrangement to continue to receive fixed payments from the company—is a matter of serious concern given her role in the administration.

The ever-growing list of valid concerns about the Trump administration's conflicting entanglements are taking place at the same time that the President is proposing \$18 billion in reductions for the 2017 appropriations process—while he himself, his daughter, son-in-law, and his Cabinet members continue to benefit off the American taxpayer.

While the President spends millions of tax dollars on securing his residences in New York and in Florida and flying to his so-called southern White House almost every weekend, he is slashing to zero the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative—an absolutely critical program that directly impacts my district and many others responsible for preserving the world's largest body of fresh water from serious and growing environmental threats. What is right about that?

President Trump also wants to eliminate TIGER grants, a highly successful transportation program that provides

funding for communities across America with backlogged infrastructure projects that create jobs and produce robust economic benefits. Everyone agrees on that.

He has also called for a nearly \$3 billion draconian reduction to foreign operations endangering our national security. We are the leader of the free world the last time I looked, and, meanwhile, he and his family spend millions of American taxpayer dollars on travel and security costs for themselves.

With an investigation into President Trump's possible entanglements with Putin's Russia already underway, and members of the President's family and administration engaging in increasingly brazen conflicts of interest, this Congress should pass legislation to prevent these increasingly apparent conflicts of interest from endangering our Nation and the American people. It is only a matter of time before his conflicts of interest harm our country.

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

PLANNED PARENTHOOD V. WOMEN'S HEALTH CLINICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of life and in respect for the conscience rights of all citizens of this free Nation.

I was proud to preside over the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives a few short weeks ago as we voted in favor of No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act to strike down an Obama administration policy that forces Americans to fund abortion providers.

We also passed H.J. Res. 43, which is another step closer to restoring the rights of States to decide how to distribute title X funding for women's health care. The measures ensure that States are not forced to fund abortion providers like Planned Parenthood.

Based on its own annual report, Planned Parenthood performs the most abortions in the United States. It commits more than 320,000 abortions every year, 887 each day. Mr. Speaker, that is one abortion every 97 seconds. Three unborn children's lives will be taken by Planned Parenthood as I stand here this morning.

Recently, Planned Parenthood has begun attacking me as a supposed enemy of women's health care. Nothing could be further from the truth. All Missourians deserve quality health care, which is one reason I oppose taxpayer funding of Planned Parenthood. This organization does not provide general women's health or mammogram screenings. That is a fallacy.

In the State of Missouri, there are 12 Planned Parenthood facilities scattered across our 114 counties. However, Mr. Speaker, we are grateful to have

588 healthcare clinics that prioritize women's health and wellness. That is 49 healthcare clinics for every 1 Planned Parenthood health center. So instead of driving 100 miles or more to a Planned Parenthood in Missouri, women can receive the quality care they need within their own communities.

Last Congress, I voted to increase funding to those very clinics by hundreds of millions of dollars. Congress has a sincere duty to not only defund big abortion but to radically change the conversation around life issues.

Members of Congress and this administration understand that life is beautiful, that children are a blessing, that abortion is not healthcare. It kills children, and it hurts women.

Rest assured that our work to protect life, all life, has only just begun.

HONORING SACRIFICES OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN WOMEN DURING WORLD WAR II

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, each year during Women's History Month, we pause to commemorate the contributions women have made to this country, but we should really commemorate women every day. So I am here today in April to amplify the contributions of women of color, particularly African-American women. Far too often, the blood, sweat, and tears sown by women of color goes unrecognized. So many are truly hidden figures.

Mr. Speaker, this morning, I want to honor the sacrifices African-American women made for this country during World War II. Sadly, to this day, their sacrifices have gone unacknowledged, and as the daughter of a World War II veteran and a Korean veteran, I am honored to shed light on a few of the tremendous contributions of African-American women during World War II. I want to rise to highlight the courageous efforts of more than 800 African-American women from the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, which was the first all-women, all-Black unit deployed in World War II.

The 6888th, its nickname "Six Triple Eight", was an all-women, all-Black unit that helped boost morale among Allied troops by working through major mail backlogs in Europe during World War II.

□ 1030

To sort through the major backlog of mail in Europe, the women were divided into three subunits that allowed them to run the postal service 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, processing 65,000 pieces of mail per 8-hour shift.

The battalion endured the harsh winter of Europe, dimly lit rooms, and rat-infested headquarters to carry out their mission. Adding insult to injury, these courageous women also faced segregation and discrimination from the

very country they were working to defend. The women were forced to run their own mess halls, hair salon, refreshment bar, and other facilities because of segregationist Department of Defense policies.

Yet despite the harsh conditions of war and unequal treatment, the women of the 6888th Battalion cleared a 6-month backlog of mail in just 3 months while posted in Britain. In France, they cleared a 3-year mail backlog in just 6 months. Thanks to their tireless efforts, United States soldiers were finally able to receive lost letters from loved ones during the war.

The courage exhibited by the 6888th proved once again that senseless acts of cruelty are no match for the will and determination of African-American women.

But in July 1945, tragedy struck Private First Class Mary J. Barlow, Private First Class Mary H. Bankston, and Sergeant Dolores M. Browne, who lost their lives in a Jeep accident. Recognizing their fellow comrades' sacrifices, the women of the 6888th pooled their personal resources to properly bury these women. These women who tragically lost their lives while serving in Europe are buried at the Normandy American Cemetery, which I was privileged to visit a couple of years ago.

Their contributions and sacrifices deserve to be celebrated. These Black women proudly sacrificed their lives for a country that did not value them due to racial discrimination and bigotry. So it is with great pride that I speak their names today, hoping that more people will come to acknowledge their sacrifice and the sacrifices of their fellow sisters during World War II.

I want to thank our Military Construction, Veteran Affairs Appropriations Chair Congressman CHARLIE DENT, then-Ranking Member SANFORD BISHOP, as well as our full committee Chair ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for their support in the Appropriations Committee to help us uncover this great history, and also the American Battle Monuments Commission.

These great sheroes need to be brought to the attention of the American people so that they can properly be recognized for their sacrifices and their legacies.

It is my hope that the United States will no longer be shy about recognizing the value, accomplishments, and sacrifices of Black women in history. I am hopeful that we will come to know the many nameless sheroes of the Black community. These hidden figures have fought many battles, have sacrificed so much, and have paved the way for Black women to move forward in spite of the barriers which we are still trying to break.

On today, Equal Pay Day, I am reminded that African-American women earn 63 cents on the dollar. We are still at the bottom of the economic ladder. I urge my colleagues to fight for pay

equality and gender equality as we continue to honor the lives and legacies of so many African-American women who truly are hidden figures but who have done so much to make this a better country.

A TRIBUTE FOR ROBERT "BOB"
RAWLINGS

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Robert "Bob" Rawlings of Pueblo, Colorado. Bob passed away at the age of 92, on March 24, 2017.

Born in 1924, Bob graduated from Bent High School in 1942. He immediately pursued a college education at Colorado College in Colorado Springs, but, ultimately, he decided to enlist in the Navy that same year.

Bob received a commission from the University of Colorado Boulder in 1943 and served honorably as the executive officer of subchaser 648 in the Pacific campaign of World War II. Bob was part of an effort to liberate over 100 British and Dutch prisoners of war during his time in service.

After receiving an honorable discharge from the Navy in 1946, Bob returned to school at Colorado College and earned his bachelor's degree in economics in 1947. Bob took a job as a reporter at the Pueblo Chieftain, the place he would work for the next seven decades, ultimately climbing the ladder to serve as chairman and as editor of the paper.

Bob always championed his hometown and used his career with the Chieftain as a platform to advocate his passion for Pueblo and for the surrounding region. A vocal supporter of protecting Pueblo's resources, Bob spent 70 years delivering news to the people of southern Colorado. His character and his life's work represent the very best of Pueblo and the entire State of Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Rawlings served his community as a philanthropist, a journalist, a sailor, and as a family man. Although Bob referred to himself as the world's worst golfer, Bob will be remembered by so many in his hometown as one of its best citizens.

While I am saddened by his death, I am honored to have known Bob. His presence will be missed by so many, but his impact in the community, however, will be remembered forever.

SPEAKING FOR EQUAL PAY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of women and men of New York's Ninth Congressional District on this, the anniversary of the signing of the Equal Pay Act by President John F. Kennedy.

It has been 54 years since the Equal Pay Act was signed into law, yet

women in the United States who work full-time, year-round, on average still only earn 80 cents for every dollar earned by men. This amounts to a yearly gap of \$10,470 between full-time working men and women.

For African-American women like myself, the pay gap is even larger. African-American women working full-time, year-round, on average still only earn 63 cents for every dollar earned by White, non-Hispanic men.

In my own district, in Brooklyn, men earn \$49,691, while women earn only \$42,487. Mr. Speaker, that is just not acceptable.

On Equal Pay Day 2017, we are calling upon Congressional Republicans to work with Democrats in getting the long overdue Paycheck Fairness Act enacted into law.

Pay inequity not only affects women, it affects children and families and our national economy as a whole. That is because so many women in our country are the sole or co-bread winner in two-thirds of families with children. Families increasingly rely on women's wages to help make ends meet, and with less take-home pay, women have less for the everyday needs of their families: groceries, mortgages, rent, child care, and doctor visits.

President Barack Obama signed several orders to address gaps in Federal equal pay protections, protecting segments of the civilian workforce from pay discrimination, despite congressional gridlock. Rather than working with Democrats to promote equal pay, House Republicans have voted nine times since 2013 to block the Paycheck Fairness Act from being considered on the House floor.

So let's see whether Donald Trump, who claims he respects women more than anyone else, demonstrates through his deeds in real and substantive plans to do more to help working women and their families.

Mr. Trump, it is time to put the money where your mouth is.

THE REMARKABLE LIFE OF EDNA
YODER

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life and legacy of a Kansas pioneer woman. Last week I joined my family in Yoder, Kansas, to celebrate the life and legacy of my grandma, Edna Yoder, who recently passed at the age of 105 years old.

I was very close to my grandma, as many of us are to our grandparents. She was a sweet and kind woman who could tell a good story, never met a stranger, and had an infectious laugh. I spent much of my childhood listening to her hum church hymns while cooking a country meal or quilting another masterpiece.

As one of 14 children, born in 1911, she grew up in another era, attending

school in a one-room schoolhouse, a time without cell phones or television or even electricity and the other modern conveniences we take for granted today. Yet somehow she survived and had a remarkable life. She saw hard times from the Dust Bowl to the Great Depression to countless world events over the past century.

When she was born, women didn't have the right to vote in America; but even well past turning 100 years old, she was voting in local elections, even for President of the United States. She saw a lot of Presidents come and go—19, as a matter of fact.

She saw America progress from a country really still recovering from the deep wounds of our Civil War to the world's most indispensable, vital, and vibrant nation. She saw us defeat Hitler in Nazi Germany. She saw us bring freedom and peace around the globe to men, women, and children who had never experienced it before.

She was born less than 10 years after Orville and Wilbur Wright took off on their first flight at Kitty Hawk, and yet she would watch Neil Armstrong set foot on the Moon while she was just in her fifties. But as the world changed around her, she quietly lived her entire life near Yoder, Kansas, where she raised her children on the same farm that I grew up on.

She worked tirelessly on that farm, milking cows at dawn and bringing in the Kansas wheat harvest in the hot sun. She didn't ask for much: food on the table, a roof over her head, and a better life for her children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, we like to call them the Greatest Generation. She was a living embodiment of the values that help make America the greatest country in the world. She was guided every day by her faith in God, and she was truly blessed with more than a century of good health and good spirits in return. She loved her family and deeply believed in hard work and self-determination.

She and her husband, Orie, were married for 49 years, and together they raised their four children and nine grandchildren, and they even watched one of them make it all the way from that farm in Yoder, Kansas, to the United States House of Representatives here in Washington, D.C. Family always came first for her.

In her later years, she passed the time reading her Bible, playing in the bell choir, and, of course, quilting and playing lots of games. In fact, the last time I saw her recently, we played bingo together, and we wiped out the competition at her retirement home one last time. She was sharp into her final hours.

She was born into a home that did not have a telephone, but in her final days, we were also able to communicate from Kansas to Washington via FaceTime so I would have a chance to speak with her.

We recently had her services at the Yoder Mennonite Church, built just

after she born. This was the church she was raised in, was baptized in, was married in, and the church in which we laid her to eternal rest.

From 1911 to 2017, what a ride, what a remarkable life and unforgettable woman. Through it all, she stayed true to what was important to her and what makes America such a strong nation: her faith, her family, and her Kansas prairie values.

Grandma, we were so blessed to have so many years with you. You lived an amazing 105 years. I think if we look closely and we listen closely, you gave us a roadmap for a long and happy life. As you pass on to eternal life, please know that you are an inspiration to all of us every day. May you rest in peace, Grandma.

Mr. Speaker, may you and my colleagues in this body join me in keeping her in your prayers.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless abundantly the Members of this people's House. During this season of new growth, may Your redemptive power help them to see new ways to productive service, fresh approaches to understanding each other, especially those across the aisle, and renewed commitment to solving the problems facing our Nation.

The disagreements on the Hill are profound. Send Your spirit of hope and goodwill upon those who are struggling through current, contentious issues.

May all Members, and may we all, be transformed by Your grace and better reflect the sense of wonder, even joy at the opportunities to serve that are ever before us.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ADAMS 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DENY TERRORISTS THE RECRUITS OF THE NEXT GENERATION

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

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, we woke up this morning to yet more horrific images of dozens of people killed by another chemical weapons attack in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, this included children who were gasping for their last breath as they perished because of the brutal, murderous dictator Bashar al-Assad, who decided that chemical weapons would be used to extinguish their life.

Mr. Speaker, for 6 years, we have failed in the Western world to address this horrific act. In fact, for the first time since World War II, we are accepting the use of chemical weapons as just a normal part of everyday life.

Mr. Speaker, the Western world, the free world, needs to stand up, needs to make clear that Assad needs to go, and needs to stand up for humanity, lest we see these images again.

We wonder how to defeat terrorism. Mr. Speaker, you do it by denying terrorists the recruits of the next generation, of which Bashar al-Assad is creating many.

HAWAII'S PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCHERS AND RADIO TECHNICIANS

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend a warm mahalo to Hawaii's public safety dispatchers and radio technicians who provide an essential service to our community.

These hardworking men and women process more than 1.4 million 911 calls each year in Hawaii and are literally the first line of response in an emergency situation. Their ability to relay accurate and up-to-date information is essential to the success of our police officers, firefighters, paramedics, and to the safety of those in desperate need of help.

Last year, Hawaii's public safety telecommunicators helped our State

become one of the very first in the Nation to implement a text-to-911 program that is helping to close the gap in emergency response. This program addresses a very real need for situations where you may have a home invasion or domestic violence scenario where making a phone call to 911 safely is simply not possible.

Mahalo to our telecommunicators for leading the way on this initiative and for your work every single day on behalf of Hawaii's people.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING DONALD BURGETT

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of World War II veteran, noted author, and longtime Eighth Congressional District resident Donald Burgett, who recently passed away at the age of 81.

Don was an Army paratrooper, and he participated in the opening operations of the Normandy invasion with A Company, 506th Parachute Infantry of the 101st Airborne Division.

After his service, Mr. Burgett published four books, including "Currahee!" published in 1967 and endorsed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Mr. Burgett used his photographic memory to paint vivid scenes during the chaos of war.

In addition to his writing, he also was an active member of several veterans organizations, including the VFW, American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, and the Military Order of the Cooties. He was a local builder and loved spending time outdoors.

Don is survived by his wife, Twyla, his 5 children, 12 grandchildren, and 28 great-grandchildren. A memorial is being held for him this week in his honor in his hometown of Howell, Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence for this great American patriot.

May God bless Don and his family.

OUR DEMOCRACY UNDER ATTACK

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it pains me to come to this Chamber this morning to say that nothing was done as our democracy came under attack.

We know Russia intervened in our Presidential election. This was not done in the interest of the people, by the people, or for the people of America. It was done to make America a vehicle for Russian interests.

You know that, in 2016, President Trump said he hoped Russia would hack our former Secretary of State's emails. You know General Michael Flynn was forced to resign due to his

unreported contact with Russian agents, who he also had business ties to.

Yesterday, you learned that the President had a contractor meet with Russian officials on his behalf to have a back channel to the Kremlin.

Where is the transparency from the White House? How is it that Meals on Wheels is the enemy, but you turn a blind eye to an attack on democracy by Vladimir Putin?

Russian spies have long attacked American businesses. Now they are attacking our freedom. You must investigate the Russian grip on our government. We must investigate swiftly and seriously.

Mr. Speaker, this is on your watch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

CELEBRATING THE MASTERS

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have the honor of representing the 12th Congressional District of Georgia and the good people who live and work there.

This week, thousands will gather in Augusta to take part in a tradition unlike any other.

Beginning in 1934, the Masters, hosted by the Augusta National Golf Club, has become the most prestigious golf tournament in the world. Known for its lightning-fast greens and gorgeous azaleas, this tournament captivates the world for both the talent of those playing and its beauty. Since its inception, many legends have conquered the greens to prove their skill and earn the coveted green jacket.

This year will be a little somber, as we will deeply miss another of the great legends, four-time Masters champion Arnold Palmer. His presence will certainly be missed on that first tee as an honorary starter and throughout this great week.

I wish the best to all those competing in this truly remarkable event and invite those who are traveling from far and wide to experience and enjoy the wonderful hospitality of the 12th Congressional District of Georgia and my home, Augusta.

REJECT THE NEW HEALTHCARE BILL

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, word coming out of the White House and House Republicans is that there is a new healthcare bill, and this bill would obliterate the patient protections for preexisting conditions and eviscerate essential benefits and cost controls.

Under the new healthcare scam, insurance companies could opt out of all

consumer protections. In other words, insurance companies could write fake policies with big premiums and little or no coverage.

Mr. Speaker, under this plan, a parent of a kid who is struck with childhood cancer could still buy a policy, but the policy is worthless because the policy would not have to cover their children's cancer treatment.

This is how House Republicans and the insurance lobby plan to get out from under their obligation to cover preexisting conditions.

This means more power for the insurance companies and less protection for good people, the American people, who play by the rules. This plan should be rejected again. It is deceitful, cold, cruel, and wrong.

GORDIAN KNOT

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight legislation I recently introduced, the VA GORDIAN KNOT Act, which would help improve and reform the Department of Veterans Affairs.

In Greek mythology, the Gordian knot represents a complex problem that needs out-of-the-box thinking to solve, and that is exactly what we need.

The VA's Gordian knot is its repeated manipulation of key data and overall lack of accountability. The VA has been known to yield less-than-truthful information when it comes to collecting and reporting data about patient care, appointment wait times, and employee hiring and firing practices.

This behavior is an erosion of public trust and a disservice to our Nation's veterans, our true heroes. It also makes it difficult to properly address the VA's shortcomings and enhance its successes because there are successes as well.

The VA GORDIAN KNOT Act requires the VA to standardize its data collecting and reporting mechanisms and increases oversight of the integrity and accuracy of the information.

I believe this bill is absolutely necessary to reform the VA and assist in its mission to care for our true American heroes.

EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is Equal Pay Day. I rise to support not only women but the American family and the economy.

Women drive our economy. We buy more goods. We own more small businesses, and we earn more degrees. Despite this, we still earn less than men. This should embarrass every lawmaker

in this Chamber and every person listening.

In 2017, Mr. Speaker, how can we justify underpaying women across this Nation? Women still earn 20 percent less than their male counterparts, and it is even worse for Black and Hispanic women.

Shortchanging women shortchanges our children and our economy. When women succeed, we all succeed. Women and our families demand paycheck fairness. We stand boldly united today embracing the words of Florynce Kennedy who said: We won't agonize. We will organize. We will show up and cut up until Molly earns the same pay as Billy.

As Susan B. Anthony said: "Men, their rights and nothing more. Women, their rights and nothing less."

I urge you to call your Representatives, demand that we support you by supporting the Paycheck Fairness Act.

RECOGNIZING SERVICE ACADEMY APPOINTEES

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three outstanding young people from Florida's Second Congressional District who will be continuing their education serving our country next year at the Naval Academy and at West Point.

Sean Moriarty and Zachary Moser will be attending the United States Naval Academy. Sean plays football at Arnold High School, and Zac is on the swim team at Rutherford High School.

Shane Ferry will be attending the United States Military Academy, West Point. He attends Mosley High School and is a member of the wrestling team.

The bar is high and the competition is stiff to earn entry into our service academies, and it should be. I am confident that each of these young men possess the character, ability, and determination to excel at Annapolis and West Point and to earn the privilege to do extraordinary things for our Nation and for those who they will one day command.

As they join their Federal fellow cadets and midshipmen, they also have our support and our gratitude for choosing this life of service.

Thank you and good luck.

□ 1215

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION NEEDED TO INVESTIGATE TRUMP'S TIES WITH RUSSIA

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are now joining Democrats in calling for Chairman NUNES to recuse himself from the House Intelligence Committee's current investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 election.

By working hand in glove with the White House around an investigation that centers on the President and his administration, the chairman has blown the integrity of this investigation. Through his actions, he has shown he cannot lead an impartial investigation. His actions demonstrate why Congress must establish a bipartisan, independent commission to investigate President Trump's political and personal business ties to Russia.

The majority of the American people favor an independent commission, outside of Congress, according to polling done by the Associated Press. This is a serious matter. Our democracy is at stake. Our national security is at stake.

Congress must call a bipartisan, independent commission to investigate these troubling connections between President Trump and Russia.

HONORING STEPHEN P. COUNIHAN

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of Stephen P. Counihan, and I rise with my colleagues all around the greater Boston area, as we seek to raise the spirits of Stephen, who is currently battling cancer. "Coughni," as he is affectionately known, is currently the tennis coach at Suffolk University, where he has led four championship teams to great renown in the greater Boston area. But it was in the 1970s, as a standout defenseman at Bowdoin College where Counihan got the name "Coughni-Orr" because of his remarkable presence on the ice and his cool capacity under pressure.

Now, Stephen is facing one of the great challenges of his life, as he deals not only with the chemotherapy, but the potential surgery that we are looking at in the month of April ahead.

Coughni, I want you to know that all of your colleagues from Beta Theta Pi, from Bowdoin College hockey team, from the greater Bowdoin community, in fact, the entire Boston area, stand with you today. Win one more championship for us, Coughni, so we can all celebrate together when we have you back collectively.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA: NCAA CHAMPIONS

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's men's basketball team for winning the 2017 NCAA Division I National Championship, in the face of a spirited challenge from Gonzaga University.

As a proud alumnus of UNC-Chapel Hill, the Nation's first public university, I was delighted to cheer on the en-

tire team—players, coaches, and staff—during their outstanding performance yesterday in the Nation's most competitive and most popular collegiate athletic tournament.

The Tar Heels have now played in a record 20 NCAA Final Four games, the most of all time, and last night marked their sixth NCAA National Championship and seventh overall National Championship. The years 1957, 1982, 1993, 2005, and 2009 are seared in the minds of North Carolina basketball fans, and I know I speak for our entire State when I say how delighted we are to add 2017 to that list!

The teamwork, camaraderie, and determination of this year's team were evident throughout the entire season as they struggled to overcome their heartbreaking defeat in the last seconds of the 2016 National Championship game. While their tournament finishes may have been a little closer than we wished, the team managed six wins against a formidable slate of opponents. These 15 young men played hard, played smart, and played together.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the names of the players, coaches, and staff.

UNC MEN'S BASKETBALL ROSTER

Nate Britt, Upper Marlboro, Md.; Theo Pinson, Greensboro, N.C.; Joel Berry, II, Apopka, Fla.; Kennedy Meeke, Charlotte, N.C.; Isaiah Hicks, Oxford, N.C.; Tony Bradley, Bartow, Fla.; Shea Rush, Fairway, Kan.; Kanler Coker, Gainesville, Ga.; Brandon Robinson, Douglasville, Ga.; Seventh Woods, Columbia, S.C.; Aaron Rohlman, Gastonia, N.C.; Stilman White, Wilmington, N.C.; Luke Maye, Huntersville, N.C.; Justin Jackson, Tomball, Texas; Roy Williams, Head Coach; Steve Robinson, Assistant Coach; Hubert Davis, Assistant Coach; C.B. McGrath, Assistant Coach; Brad Frederick, Director of Basketball Operations; Sean May, Director of Player Personnel; Jonas Sahratian, Strength & Conditioning Coordinator; Eric Hoots, Director of Player Development.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we could not be prouder of our team's victory last night.

To paraphrase the greatest basketball player of all time and a fellow UNC alumnus, Michael Jordan, who was perhaps channeling Yogi Berra, "The ceiling truly is the roof."

Hark the sound, and Go Heels!

THANKING SNAPa

(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, this afternoon I will meet with leaders from the School Nutrition Association of Pennsylvania, commonly called SNAPa, which is a state-wide organization of school nutrition professionals.

SNAPa works to advance quality child nutrition programs through education and advocacy. Organized in 1955, SNAPa is an all-volunteer board of directors elected by its member, which currently stands at more than 2,300 individuals.

As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition and a senior member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, I know the essential services that SNAPa works to provide. Students throughout the Commonwealth receive high-quality, low-cost meals thanks to SNAPa.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that, for some students, the only meal that they receive is at school. This organization works to keep our children healthy and ensure that they have healthy food options through school meal programs. SNAPa is recognized as the authority on school nutrition in Pennsylvania.

I sincerely thank SNAPa for advancing the availability, quality, and acceptance of school nutrition programs as an essential part of education in Pennsylvania for more than 60 years.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF HENRY HALGREN

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to recognize the achievement of Henry Halgren from Fort Collins, Colorado. Henry is a sixth grader at Liberty Common School, a middle school, a public charter school that is very high-performing in my district. He is the victor from all of Colorado in the National Geographic Bee this last week.

He competed against over 100 kids at the University of Denver, and he was able to answer as a sixth grader the following question: Altamira Cave, known for its prehistoric paintings, is found in the province of Cantabria in the north part of what European country?

Henry knew that the answer was Spain. He got it right. He won a \$30,000 scholarship to CU, some prize money, and an atlas.

I am proud to say he will be coming here to Washington, D.C., to represent the Second Congressional District of Colorado in May. And if he is able to win against the competitors from other States, the prize for that is a \$50,000 scholarship and a family tour to the Galapagos Islands.

Congratulations not only to Henry, but to all the participants who showed such a keen interest in learning about the world around them and about our planet.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Henry and his family and everybody who participates in furthering the knowledge about geography.

RECOGNIZING MONTH OF THE MILITARY CHILD

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of April as the Month of the Military Child. I have the

utmost respect for the families of the military's men and women; specifically, the children of our Nation's military, who are the bedrock of military families. These children make sacrifices—relocations, new schools, and the absence of a parent on deployment—and they deserve our gratitude.

Due to the unique circumstances the children are put under, I stand before you today to commend the children of those currently serving in my district at Fort Riley in Kansas, and the children of those serving around the Nation. I call on my colleagues to provide continued support of our military children and families whose sacrifice is not always recognized, but certainly is revered.

CONGRATULATIONS TO READING RED KNIGHTS' VICTORY

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Reading High School men's basketball team on their first State championship in school history. The Red Knights finished their historic season with a 30-3 record, and beat Pine-Richland 64-60 in the Class 6A Boys Final to bring a championship to the city of Reading.

This is a group of outstanding young men led by senior guard and McDonald's All-American Lonnie Walker. This team is a staple in the Berks County community.

Lonnie may have said it best himself after the championship victory: "What we did wasn't even about Reading High basketball. It was about the city of Reading. It was about the community, all the schools, the young kids we inspired. This is for them."

I couldn't be more proud today to represent these young men. I look forward to the continued success of this team, and I look forward to watching Lonnie continue his basketball career at the University of Miami.

Congratulations to the Reading Red Knights team, the coaches, their families, the faculty, staff, and students that made this championship possible.

REMEMBERING MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(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, I rise today to recognize that on this day, April 4, 49 years ago, Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated on a hotel balcony in Memphis, Tennessee.

We all know the story: the most prominent civil rights activist in the sixties, if not of our entire Nation's history, was shot dead in cold blood at the still very young age of 39 years old. It is a tragic tale of a man who had accomplished much and still had more to

accomplish, but we should note this day as remembrance to honor the sacrifice he risked and he made during a very difficult time in our Nation's history.

He demonstrated to the world that it was not the color of a person's skin that we should be judged, but by the nature of their character. He led by example in an era of violence that violence was not the answer.

The peaceful protests he organized were an illustration of how to go about achieving social change in America, building bridges of understanding. The image of the Selma bridge comes to mind.

His strong Christian beliefs helped him to see what many others could not, and opened the doors for millions to follow in his path.

Mr. King's work is not done. It is very saddening to still see so many in racial strife in these days in our Nation, but he showed the right way to lead, the right way to peacefully protest, and the right way to inspire to fulfill his famous dream.

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, April 4, 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 April 4, 2017, at 9:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 89.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1343, ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 240 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 240

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1343) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise its rules so as to increase the threshold amount for requiring issuers to provide certain disclosures relating to compensatory benefit plans. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-11 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amend-

ment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. Americans have always been a people known for taking ownership. We take ownership of our lives and livelihoods, working hard to provide for our families. We take ownership in our communities, setting standards of conduct. We take ownership in all our political process, voting for the right candidates. We have even taken ownership in our world, fighting evil actors and regimes to maintain peace.

□ 1230

H.R. 1343, the bill we are discussing today, allows employees to take ownership in their companies. This is the American way.

Under SEC rule 701, private companies can offer their own securities to employees, enabling those employees to take a stake in the company. This is a great deal for both businessowners and employees. I doubt either side of the aisle would disagree.

Rule 701 allows employers to better recruit talented employees and pay them without having to borrow money or sell securities. For some companies, especially younger ones, compensating employees through equity is vital for survival.

These younger companies need the top talent but often can't pay the top salaries. Rule 701 allows them to offer potential recruits a tradeoff: accept a lower salary now for more equity in the company later.

By giving the employees a stake in the company, businessowners reward the employees for their continued hard

work and innovation. Workers have an opportunity to buy into the mission and future of the company. They have the opportunity to reap what they sow, making their work more meaningful and fulfilling.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1343 simply raises the reporting threshold for companies who issue securities to their employees as compensatory benefits. Right now, any company that issues more than \$5 million of securities in a yearlong period faces significant reporting requirements, including financial statements and disclosure of risk factors. These requirements cost small businesses time and money, making them less likely to issue stock as compensation for their employees. That is why this legislation moves the threshold up to \$10 million.

The original \$5 million threshold was added to rule 701 in 1999 and hasn't been updated since. By easing the threshold and indexing it to inflation every 5 years, we allow companies to increase the amount of stock they offer to employees. Additionally, raising the threshold will prevent private companies from having to disclose confidential financial information.

America is known for taking ownership, but we are also known for innovation. Our technology industry, especially, has propelled our economy and quality of life forward. But so many great tech companies started as small startups, struggling along from month to month before the financial rewards of their hard work could be achieved.

Thinking about the young companies right now that have grand innovative visions for improving our quality of life, this legislation will help them thrive. The employees already pour so much of their livelihoods into the venture. This bill will reward those workers with equity so that their perseverance and investment will pay off.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I would like to discuss the broad support for this bill. I indicated earlier that both sides of the aisle can support this legislation, and I want to highlight that bipartisan support for the bill.

H.R. 1343 has equal numbers of Republican and Democratic sponsors. Further, the bill passed out of the Financial Services Committee 48-11. A majority of the Democrats on the committee supported the bill. A similar bill passed with a bipartisan vote last Congress, with more than two dozen Democrats joining Republicans to pass the bill. And in the Senate, this same basic proposal passed the Senate Banking Committee by a voice vote just a few weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to see why this proposal is generating so much bipartisan support. With a higher threshold, companies can focus their time on innovating and creating jobs instead of filling out paperwork. Employees, meanwhile, can take a stake in their company and their own future. I urge my colleagues to vote for this important rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, one that provides for consideration of H.R. 1343, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act.

I strongly support the underlying legislation. I wish it had been brought forward to the floor under an open rule that allowed Democrats and Republicans to freely offer amendments that could be adopted by a simple majority vote.

Before we get to the specifics of the bill, I want to talk about the importance of employee ownership. I join my friend and colleague from my neighboring district in Colorado in extolling the virtues of employee stock ownership, of ensuring that employees in the company are stakeholders and able to benefit from the value that is being created.

You know, we have different stakeholders in our economy, and when you look at a company, you have different stakeholders that that company is responsible to and caters to: You have the shareholders, you have the employees, and you have the customers. In running a company, as I have done, it is always a constant balancing act to make sure that you are able to satisfy the legitimate demands of all those various stakeholders.

Now, one of the things that has been out of whack in our economy the last few decades is that a disproportionate share of the value creation has gone to the shareholders and the customers, often to the detriment of the employees.

Now, everybody has benefited as consumers and as customers with revolutions in prices and consumer technology. It is so exciting to see people, you know, where a flat screen television used to be out of reach, you now see them in nearly every home; and, in many cases, they cost less than a television would have cost that was significantly smaller 10 years ago—not to mention the remarkable mobile computing devices that middle class families and working families carry in their pockets with them that contains more processing power than a \$3,000 computer did just a decade ago.

Consumers have benefited and shareholders have benefited. There has been an unprecedented increase in private equity markets, in stocks, a huge amount of value creation in the American economy, both on the balance sheet as well as in the market valuation of companies.

Now, the issue is that, while all of this has happened, wages have largely stagnated. A lot of the increases in efficiency and economic growth have gone to benefit consumers and shareholders. Employees and workers have felt, legitimately so, that they haven't seen their share of value creation.

Now, there are a number of reasons for that. One of those has been the weakening of the union movement that gave workers a collective voice. But if you look at what some of the remedies are, really none can make a bigger impact than employee stock ownership. This bill doesn't change the ball on that. It is a positive step.

There are a lot of other ideas that I hope we can talk about in a bipartisan way. Fundamentally, we need to create an economy that works for everyone, one in which employees and workers can directly benefit from the increase in value of the firm that they helped create. And what better way to do that than employee stock ownership in a variety of models and options for that. This bill deals with one; but we have ESOPs, we have co-ops, we have employee stock option plans, to name a few.

Companies find that it is in their interest to help improve morale and maintain a stable employee base to align the incentives of employees with shareholders and, of course, to help align the success of our economy with the success of all the stakeholders in our economy.

H.R. 1343 is a bipartisan bill. It was passed last year; it will pass again overwhelmingly this year. It sends a strong statement that Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives want to make employee stock ownership easier. Hopefully, this is a starting point rather than an ending point.

The two other bills the Chamber is considering are also bipartisan, and I am hopeful that they can move forward expeditiously.

Now, that stands in stark contrast to some of the other actions of this Chamber, for instance, the 15 Congressional Review Act resolutions which simply sought to undo some of the positive steps that President Obama took rather than put forward a proactive agenda of where Republicans actually want to lead the Nation.

We also spent countless hours debating healthcare legislation that, thankfully, didn't go anywhere because it would have left 24 million Americans without health insurance and increased premiums by 15 to 20 percent for those who were lucky enough not to lose their insurance altogether.

I am glad that we have been able to move past that towards a more bipartisan discussion here that will fundamentally help American innovators and entrepreneurs and help lead to a fair economy that works better for everybody, that shows that Democrats and Republicans can work together to create a real solution that addresses a real problem and takes a first step towards creating an economy that works for workers, consumers, and shareholders.

I am hopeful that we can continue this trend after the district work period and move forward on bipartisan legislation that will simplify our complex Tax Code and realign incentives in

a positive way, fix our broken immigration system, and make sure that we have the infrastructure we need for our country to succeed in the 21st century. I hope that my colleagues are encouraged by the strong bipartisan show of support for H.R. 1343 and we can work together to bring more bipartisan legislation to the floor instead of divisive bills that make problems even larger.

This bill, very simply, updates an SEC rule from 1999 that will allow private companies to offer employees a greater stake in the place they work without requiring additional paperwork or regulation—a simple and good idea.

Currently, a private company that offers over \$5 million in securities through compensation for employees is required to provide additional disclosures which can, A, often serve as a detriment to going over the \$5 million in compensatory stock for their employees, and, B, take up costs, administrative overhead, should they choose to proceed. H.R. 1343 simply raises that threshold from \$5 million to \$10 million, and this legislation gives a private company more flexibility to reward and retain employees of all levels.

Employee ownership of various structures has benefits to both the company, the employees, and the overall economy. It helps align the interests. It results in more productivity, higher employee retention. It can help make a business more profitable and more sustainable. It helps make the American economy and the amazing value that is created work for everybody rather than just one of the stakeholder groups.

For many startups and small businesses, giving employees a stake in the business is a great way to provide an additional benefit, an incentive. It gives companies flexibility to attract new employees when they are starting up, to retain talent as a company grows and matures.

Providing workers stakes in their company helps strengthen their retirement savings. Employee stock ownership plans, or ESOPs, are a type of retirement plan that offers employees an ownership stake without upfront costs. In Colorado, there are 118 businesses that use employee-owned ESOPs as a way to promote employee ownership.

A good example of an ESOP is Fire Safety Services. The owner, Jeff, wanted to offer his employees a stake in the business. He converted his business to an ESOP, an employee-owned company, that allowed him to create a succession plan so the business can stay locally owned by the people who worked to create the value. Jeff noted that, after the conversion, employee morale was up and sales were up.

One of our most famous examples of employee-owned companies is in my district in Fort Collins, Colorado: New Belgium Brewing. From the perspective of the employees, New Belgium has a very strong corporate culture of personal and collective growth. The employee owners are concerned about

their own professional development and that of their colleagues. They have a vested stake in the management, economic health, and stability of the company.

This bill is a commonsense approach and makes it easier for companies to give their employees ownership opportunities. It is a small first step towards encouraging an economy that works for everybody.

Now, I want to make sure that this legislation helps employees at all income levels have access to ownership opportunities and that workers' retirement savings are not put in jeopardy by an overconcentration in company stock. That is why I offered an amendment requiring GAO to do a study on the impact of this legislation on employee participation and ownership and the effect this legislation has on securities held by retirement plans that are governed by ERISA.

I very much look forward and am grateful that the rule has made in order my amendment. This study will give us important information on how these changes impacting employee ownership also affect retirement. It will give this body information that we need to move forward.

The example of my amendment is an example of the many great ideas that Democrats and Republicans could have brought forward had this been brought forward under an open rule. What better bill to bring forward under an open rule than this kind of bipartisan bill where there is nobody in this body who is trying to undermine or sabotage this bill?

There may be some Members who vote against it on both sides, I don't know, but the overwhelming majority are for it. I think there are Democrats and Republicans with great ideas who would love the opportunity to take 10 or 15 minutes—10 minutes as I am afforded under this rule. How many other Republicans and Democrats would love that same opportunity to offer amendments to improve this bill to make it even better?

The good news is employee ownership is not a partisan issue. Employee ownership strengthens our economy, helps small and medium-sized and large businesses across our entire economic spectrum create and retain jobs, and promotes an increased retirement savings for the middle class. These companies are often anchor businesses in our communities that go beyond offering jobs but are involved with sponsoring Little League or being involved with community nonprofits by giving back, by helping local charities and helping support an ecosystem of entrepreneurship by helping other entrepreneurs get off the ground through mentorship networks and angel funding networks.

I am a strong supporter of this bill and, of course, want to point out that it is simply a starting place. We have a long way to go with encouraging employee ownership in all of its forms—ESOPs, co-ops, stock options, outright

stock grants—and any other ways that we can come up with or that the private sector can come up with that allow a stake in the company and in the value being created to reside with the employees, aligning their incentive, making our economy work for everybody, and ensuring that stakeholders have balanced benefits from our overall growth.

I support this bill. I wish it had been brought to the floor under an open rule. I oppose the rule.

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

□ 1245

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond briefly to my friend from Colorado's comments about the nature of the rule. The Rules Committee did make in order every single germane rule that was offered to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends, colleagues from Colorado for their work on this, for their support of this important legislation.

I rise today to speak in support of the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1343, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act of 2017. I am proud to be a sponsor of this legislation, and I am grateful for the consideration it has been given by the House, and I am encouraged by its strong record of bipartisan support. The bill has passed the House in prior Congresses as part of larger capital markets packages, but this is the first time the legislation will be considered on its own.

We have had very constructive debate on the bill in the Financial Services Committee over the last few years. This debate has allowed us to build a strong consensus around this uniting principle: What is good for the company should also be good for the employee, and vice versa.

We want it to be easy for companies to offer stock compensation to their employees. This is a company issue, and this is a jobs issue, but this is also a workforce issue. The title of this legislation does not betray its intent. We believe encouraging employee ownership is important.

Agreement on the benefits of employee ownership has contributed to the strong bipartisan support enjoyed by this legislation. It has three Republican and three Democratic original co-sponsors. Furthermore, the majority of Republicans and Democrats voted in favor of the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act when it was considered in the House Financial Services Committee just last month. We are simply expanding on something that is working.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, the investor protection regulator, has never raised issue with reduced disclosures available under rule 701, so we are simply saying this tool

should be made available to more companies and to their employees. We do this by adjusting for inflation the threshold for the amount of securities that can be issued each year under rule 701.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues from Colorado. I want to thank all for the work in the Financial Services Committee, and I look forward to the House's consideration and, hopefully, passage of this important legislation.

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

You know, the beauty of an open rule, which we did see when the Democrats had the majority and we have not seen since the Republicans took the majority, is it allows the floor debate to inspire good ideas. It allows Democrats and Republicans to bring forward amendments, subject to germaneness, that can be considered and voted upon.

Frankly, it seems like the Republicans didn't have much for us to do this week. This would have been a perfect week to try an open rule; and I know that Democrats and Republicans would have, consistent with the spirit of an open rule, brought forth good ideas and offered them. Good ideas would have been included in the bill.

But most importantly, we could have set a precedent that open rules work and an open process that values our contributions as legislators and as representatives of 750,000 Americans who would be able to work to improve legislation. So I think that we need to move in that direction. Let the debate on the floor and the back-and-forth inspire new collaboration between Democrats and Republicans, new ideas, new ways of working together.

Here you have a concept that Democrats and Republicans join together in support of. How can we reduce the costs or the red tape around administering employee ownership? We would love to remove barriers to employee ownership that exist across all forms of employee ownership.

We would love to see an economy that works for everybody, one that values employees and workers as stakeholders that share in the economic growth that they helped create. That is a big part of the answer to the discrepancies in our economy and the simple fact—yes, fact—that the majority of the benefit of our economic growth has resided with a few and, generally, with shareholders and executives rather than workers.

So at the same time we can continue to move forward with conveying value to consumers, I think we can also find a way to make sure that workers are able to participate in the value that is created in our economy. But to be able to do so, we should have an open process that allows Democrats and Republicans to bring forward germane amendments that improve the bill, to create an even better and more comprehensive effort to encourage employee ownership.

Employee ownership ultimately touches a number of different commit-

tees. There are issues around employee ownership that affect government procurement. There are issues that would reside in the Ways and Means Committee under taxes. There are issues that reside in the Judiciary Committee, and, yes, Financial Services and regulator issues as well.

I am hopeful that Democrats and Republicans can work together to create a comprehensive omnibus approach to improving access to employee ownership for firms across our country.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, small businesses and entrepreneurs are what drive the American economy. I meet with these folks all the time when I am back home in the Second District, as I know my colleagues do when they are back in their districts, and we see firsthand the benefits that these people's dreams, their innovations, their hard work, and as they provide to our communities that inspiration.

These innovators, entrepreneurs, and risk-takers are critical to our country's economic growth and prosperity. In fact, small businesses are responsible for more than 60 percent of all of the net new jobs. Let me repeat that. Small businesses are responsible for more than 60 percent of all the net new jobs over the past two decades. This isn't just a one-time blip. This is over the last two decades.

So if our Nation is going to have an economy that provides opportunities for every American, then we must promote and encourage success and growth for our small businesses, our startups, and our entrepreneurs. It is this notion that I think brings us to this legislation we are discussing here today.

H.R. 1343, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act, would simply level the playing field for small companies by updating Federal rules that allow small businesses to better compensate their employees with ownership in those businesses.

Currently, the SEC rule 701 permits private companies to offer their own securities as part of written compensation agreements with employees, directors, general partners, trustees, officers, or other certain consultants without having to comply with rigid Federal securities registration requirements. The SEC rule 701, therefore, allows small companies to reward their employees.

Despite the SEC having the authority to increase the \$5 million threshold via a rulemaking, the SEC has once again chosen to prioritize what, I would argue, are highly politicized regulatory undertakings instead of focusing on its core mission, which includes the facilitation of capital formation. That is one of the key core jobs of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Well, if the SEC isn't going to focus its

priorities, then Congress will help them do that. So that is why we are here today on this bill.

I believe it is imperative that small businesses not only in West Michigan, but across America, have the ability to compete. A critical element of competition and success is, first, that small businesses be able to offer compensation packages that attract and retain top-tier talent in their fields. In today's world, that includes rewarding employees with stock options. To me, this is common sense. Small-business employees have a clear and vested interest in the success of their employers, and oftentimes they are attracted to it.

I know, having some younger children myself that are coming into adulthood, they are looking for that excitement. They are looking for that opportunity. They are looking to be builders themselves.

Well, by increasing the rule 701 threshold to \$10 million, it will give these private companies more flexibility to attract, reward, and retain those employees. This simple change would allow companies to offer twice as much stock to their employees annually without having to trigger additional disclosure information to investors about those compensation packages that include securities offerings.

By reforming this regulatory burden, Mr. Speaker, startups, small businesses, and emerging growth companies will be better equipped to attract highly talented individuals from companies that are better capitalized and able to provide cash compensation. By incentivizing employees with stock options, small businesses will now be able to compete on a more level playing field in order to retain those valuable employees rather than seeing them flee to cash, frankly.

This bill is an example, I believe, of positive, bipartisan results that can be achieved when Republicans and Democrats reach across the aisle. I commend our sponsors of the bills, Representative HULTGREN, who spoke a little earlier; Representatives DELANEY, HIGGINS, MACARTHUR, SINEMA, and STIVERS, for their leadership on this issue; and my friend from Colorado, as well, and what he is doing.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to convene several roundtables in my district featuring employee-owned businesses, and it has been great to hear their stories, whether it is New Belgium Brewing, talking to employee owners who are excited to spend their time building value for themselves and creating stability in their own job and bringing a wonderful craft brew product to people in all the States in which they distribute, or medical care companies and so many others that have different variations of employee ownership.

As a private sector entrepreneur before I came to Congress, I founded several companies in the technology sector. My companies used stock options for every employee, ranging from entry-level front desk and telephone all the way to executive positions; and, frankly, Mr. Speaker, that has become the standard in the tech industry.

So many venture-backed companies and technology companies provide stock options across the board such that people who participate in building that value are able to also participate in sharing the value that is created. That is one of the great aspects of the technology sector, in particular, and the startup sector that I hope can export to other sectors.

On the margins, this bill will make it a little bit easier for small and mid-sized companies to provide equity compensation to employees. But again, we need to do a lot more. We need to do a lot more culturally to make this the norm. We need to do a lot more from a tax perspective and from a regulatory perspective to make it easier for companies to share ownership with employees so that employees can benefit from the value that is being created.

It is considered the cultural norm and the best practice within the technology entrepreneurship sector, and I hope that that can carry across to other sectors as well. It is very important to have an economy that works for everybody, and employee ownership is a critical linchpin of that effort.

Mr. Speaker, we are debating on a rule and a bill that makes it easier for companies to offer employee stock as part of their compensation; but, unfortunately, the backdrop to this discussion is that there continues to be an enduring wage gap in which women are simply not paid the same as men for doing the same job. Any efforts by us to strengthen compensation packages continue to remain hollow for 51 percent of the country—women.

Today is Equal Pay Day. I wish you, Mr. Speaker, a happy Equal Pay Day, and it is time that we do something to address pay and equity in our country.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative DELAURO's Paycheck Fairness Act in addition to the legislation we have been debating, H.R. 1343. So what that means is I will still bring forward this legislation. I will just also bring forward the Paycheck Fairness Act, which I am a proud cosponsor of.

Sometimes when we move the previous question, we bring forward a piece of legislation in lieu of the legislation that we bring to the floor under the rule. In this case, once we defeat the previous question, I will offer both of those bills: this employee stock ownership bill and the bill to address paycheck inequity, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extra-

neous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) may be joining us on the floor in a few minutes to talk about her proposal.

I have an article written by Ms. DELAURO that I include in the RECORD.

[From Cosmopolitan, Apr. 4, 2017]

WE WILL WIN THE FIGHT FOR EQUAL PAY

(By Rosa DeLauro)

Think about 20 cents. It doesn't feel very significant—there isn't much you could buy with it. But over a lifetime, those 20 cents add up in a major way.

Today, we have reached yet another Equal Pay Day—the day on which the average woman's earnings finally catch up to what the average man made last year. This year's Equal Pay Day falls 94 days into 2017—94 days too late.

Women are nearly half the workforce—yet they still only earn about 80 cents on average, to a man's dollar. The gap widens even further when you consider women of color—African-American women make 63 cents on the dollar, while Latinas make only 54 cents on average, compared with what white men earn. This is unacceptable.

The National Women's Law Center found that based on today's wage gap, a woman starting her career now will lose \$418,800 over a 40-year career. For African-Americans, the losses are \$840,040. And for Latinas, the lifetime gap is over \$1 million.

These disparities exist at all levels of education and occupation—even at the very top. The world champion U.S. women's soccer team is fighting for pay equality, as are Academy-Award winning actresses from Emma Stone to Viola Davis and Patricia Arquette, who have used their platforms to call for equal pay in Hollywood.

Men and women in the same job should have the same pay. Period. Wage discrimination takes place not just on the soccer field or the silver screen, but in the board room, on the factory floor, and in countless other workplaces across the country. That is why I am fighting for equal pay—for all women.

I am fighting for AnnMarie in Massachusetts, who found out, years into her job, that the university she worked for was paying men more for the same work. I am fighting for Terri in Tennessee, who only discovered she was making less than she deserved because her husband held the exact same job and was paid more! And I am fighting for ReShonda in Iowa, who discovered that her own father was paying women less when she went to work in the family business. Pay discrimination in the workplace is real—and it is happening everywhere.

Pay inequity does not just affect women—it affects children, families, and our economy as a whole. That is because women in this country are the sole or co-breadwinner in half of families with children. The biggest problem facing our country today is that families are not making enough to live on—and closing the wage gap would help address that problem.

Over 50 years ago, Congress came together—in a bipartisan fashion—to pass the Equal Pay Act and end what President John F. Kennedy called “the serious and endemic problem” of unequal wages. The Equal Pay Act made it illegal for employers to pay men and women differently for substantially equal work. Yet we still have so far to go to close the wage gap.

In 2009, we took a critical step forward with the passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which kept the courthouse door open to sue for pay discrimination. But we must continue the fight and finish the job by passing into law the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I first introduced the Paycheck Fairness Act on June 24, 1997—almost 20 years ago. The Paycheck Fairness Act will mean real progress in the fight to eliminate the gender wage gap and help families. The act ensures that employers who try to justify paying a man more than a woman for the same job must show the disparity is not sex-based, but job-related and necessary. It prohibits employers from retaliating against employees who discuss or disclose salary information with their coworkers. The bill would also allow women to join together in class-action lawsuits where there are allegations of sex-based pay discrimination.

The bill actually passed the House twice, with bipartisan support. Yet it has never made it to the president's desk—despite the fact that this is an issue that affects every single state in this country. In the last session of Congress, I was proud to have every single Democratic member of Congress signed onto the Paycheck Fairness Act—and even one Republican!

But we need to keep fighting. When women raise their voices, we get results. Take the recent victory for the U.S. women's national hockey team who were able to negotiate a historic new contract to address pay inequality. They spoke up—even threatening to boycott the International Ice Hockey Federation World Championship games—and their voices were heard.

In January, I attended the Women's March in Washington. The organic energy—the real, tangible power of the people—was unlike anything I have ever seen. It was a stark reminder of what we can achieve together, when we speak with one voice and demand what we deserve.

When I looked out at the sea of pink hats and powerful, handmade signs, I thought of my mother. When she was born, women could not even vote. Yet today, her daughter is a congresswoman. When we fight for equal pay for equal work, we carry on the legacy of all the women who have fought before us. And when we finally succeed, we will create a better future for all the women who will follow us.

Equal pay is an idea whose time has come—in fact, it is long overdue. But we have the power. We have the momentum. And I believe that we will win.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman DELAURO's article from Cosmopolitan magazine, dated April 4, 2017, today, talks about how, over a lifetime, the 20 cents that women are missing every paycheck on a dollar earned by men adds up. In fact, the National Women's Law Center found that a woman starting her career now will lose over \$400,000 over a 40-year career. That could be a house. That could be college for two kids or three kids. That could be a family vacation every year. That means a lot, which is why we need to defeat the previous question and move forward on both of these worthy bills.

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

□ 1300

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

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

say to the gentleman that I do have one other speaker on the way.

Mr. Speaker, this bill under consideration is a small but significant step to help companies increase worker ownership to help improve the overall equity of our economy. I hope that this bill, along with the other two coming to the floor later this week, are the start of something. I hope they are a sign that this body will actually consider meaningful, bipartisan, practical, and commonsense legislation to address the issues the American people sent us to Washington to fix: creating jobs, growing our economy, reforming our Tax Code, and fixing our broken immigration system.

I hope my colleagues support the underlying legislation, H.R. 1343, oppose the rule, and defeat the previous question so I can bring forward not only the employee stock ownership rule, but also the Paycheck Fairness Act here on Equal Pay Day across America so that we can make sure as we are talking about making sure that women receive the same cash and ownership in recognition of their efforts as employees across the country.

This bill will hopefully pass overwhelmingly. I just wish it could be an example of how we could work under an open rule and give Democrats and Republicans a chance to build upon and improve legislation. There have been zero open rules under Speaker RYAN since he has taken over the Speaker's gavel promising, ironically, a more open process. It is about time.

If not this bill, what bill, Mr. Speaker? If not a bill with strong bipartisan support that Democratic and Republican leaders are committed to bringing across the finish line, when can we have an open process that allows us as legislators to bring forward our amendments in response to debate on the floor in realtime?

I wish that this would have been that bill. And I hope that by defeating this rule, we can send a message back to the Rules Committee that we should consider open rules for these kinds of bipartisan legislation.

Promoting employee stock ownership is incredibly important. To have a multistakeholder economy that works for everybody will help address a lot of the legitimate concerns that Americans have, that workers and employees have not shared, and the great amount of value that has been created.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) to further discuss our proposal on the previous question on Equal Pay Day and the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the previous question and to the rule. If we defeat this rule, we can enable the House of Representatives to vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Today is Equal Pay Day. This is the day that the average woman's earnings finally catch up to what the average

man made last year—and we are 94 days into 2017.

Women are nearly half the workforce, yet they still only earn about 80 cents, on average, to a man's dollar. The gap widens even further when you consider women of color. African-American women make 63 cents on the dollar, while Latinas make only 54 cents, on average, compared with White men.

This is unacceptable. The National Women's Law Center found that, based on today's wage gap, a woman starting her career will lose \$418,800 over a 40-year career. For African-American women, the losses are \$840,000. For Latinas, the lifetime gap is over \$1 million.

This disparity, by the way, exists at all levels of education and occupation—even at the very top. The world champion U.S. women's soccer team is fighting for pay equity, as are Academy Award-winning actresses like Emma Stone and Viola Davis, who have used their platforms to call for equal pay in Hollywood. The fact that women at the top of their field feel the repercussions of this issue speaks to its pervasiveness. Women from the boardroom to the factory floor and in every industry in every State are hurt by the wage gap.

The biggest issue of our time is that people are not making enough to live on, and their jobs just don't pay them enough money. Pay inequity does not just affect women; it affects children, families, and our economy as a whole, and that is because women in this country are the sole or co-breadwinner in half of families with children today.

I first introduced the Paycheck Fairness Act on June 24, 1997, almost 20 years ago. The Paycheck Fairness Act will mean real progress in the fight to eliminate the gender wage gap and help families. The act ensures that employers who try to justify paying a man more than a woman for the same job must show the disparity is not sex-based but job-related and necessary. It prohibits employers from retaliating against employees who discuss or disclose salary information with their coworkers. The bill would allow women to join together in class action lawsuits where there are allegations of sex-based pay discrimination.

This bill, by the way, has passed the House of Representatives twice in a bipartisan way. Today we have 198 cosponsors of that bill, and, yes, it is bipartisan. We can pass this piece of legislation in this body. We have not been able to get it to the President's desk despite the fact that this is an issue that affects every single State in this country.

Every year I hope we never have to recognize this day again because equal pay will be the law of the land. Men and women in the same job deserve the same pay. It is true in the House of Representatives; it should be true all over this country. We are men and women in this body who come from dif-

ferent parts of the country with different skill sets, different educational backgrounds, and different philosophies, and, yes, we get paid the same amount of money. Let's make sure that the Paycheck Fairness Act is the law of the land. The time has come for equal pay.

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

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

I want to thank Ms. DELAURO for her tireless advocacy on behalf of equal pay. I would also encourage my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. It is about time. Today, on Equal Pay Day, let's enshrine equality between men and women into the U.S. Constitution.

If we can defeat the previous question, we will bring forward H.R. 1343, the employee stock ownership bill, but we will also bring forward the Paycheck Fairness Act so that we can do a little more work of the people's work here in the House of Representatives and help make sure that we can look ourselves in the mirror knowing that men and women will both benefit equally from a hard day's work.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule to defeat the previous question and to vote "yes" on H.R. 1343 as a first step to encouraging an economy that works for everybody and employee stock ownership.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we often talk about coming together in support of good policy. We all have friends on both sides of the aisle, and we routinely promise to work together on issues upon which we agree. Most of us speak in front of our constituents about our desire to work with the other party. However, we all know that Americans perceive us to be constantly engaged in partisan conflict.

It is unfortunate that we are not able to work together on good legislation more often. It is understandable that Americans feel disappointed by Washington's partisan sniping. But here before us today is a bill with wide bipartisan support. Not only has it already received numerous bipartisan votes, there were only two amendments offered to the bill. One amendment was withdrawn because it was not germane. The other amendment from my good friend from Colorado and the Rules Committee, Mr. POLIS, is simply requiring a report.

Why is this bill so noncontroversial?

I believe it has to do with the process by which we received this legislation. The Committee on Financial Services held hearings as far back as 2015 in which problems with the SEC rule were raised by small-business owners.

The sponsor of this bill, Mr. HULTGREN, worked with his Democratic

colleagues on the committee and introduced a proposal to reform the SEC rule. Chairman HENSARLING held a full committee markup last month which allowed for full debate and amendment, and now we have the bill on the floor this week. Good process produces good policy. But perhaps equally as important, good process helps instill faith in this institution. When Americans see us take up an issue, hear their concerns, and work together to find a commonsense solution, they will trust us to tackle even bigger problems.

This may not be the largest legislative product that Chairman HENSARLING and the Financial Services Committee produce in this Congress, but, nevertheless, it is an important work that is helping us solve problems faced by American small businesses. This legislation ensures that the employees of America's small businesses can take ownership in their companies and their jobs. It reduces regulatory encroachment on America's job creators and helps our small businesses expand and grow.

I thank Representative HULTGREN for bringing this bill before us. I commend Chairman HENSARLING for working with both sides of the aisle and for following a good process on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and vote "yes" on the bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 240 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1869) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1869.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1304, SELF-INSURANCE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 241 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 241

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1304) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the definition of health insurance coverage certain medical stop-loss insurance obtained by certain plan sponsors of group health plans. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, then-President Obama said: "If you like your health insurance plan, you can keep it."

Unfortunately, at least 4.7 million Americans now know that was simply not true. ObamaCare was a takeover of the American healthcare system. The law's mandates have been burdensome, destroying 300,000 small-business jobs and forcing an estimated 10,000 small businesses to close. Premiums are skyrocketing, and choices are dwindling.

House Resolution 241 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1304, the Self-Insurance Protection Act, an important part of the Republican effort to repair the damage ObamaCare has done to insurance markets. More than 150 million Americans—62 percent of workers—receive their health insurance from their employer. In fact, almost all firms with at least 200 or more employees offer health benefits, and just over half of smaller firms with 3 to 199 employees offer health insurance.

Overwhelmingly, Americans and their employers like this system of employer-sponsored health care; and for many years, employer health plans have been successfully regulated by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, or ERISA.

□ 1315

Typically, small and large employers offer healthcare coverage to employees either in self-funded arrangements or purchase fully insured plans from an insurer.

Under self-insurance plans, employers cover the costs of their employees' medical expenses. Employers can either process claims in-house or work with a third-party administrator to oversee and implement the plans.

ERISA regulates both fully insured and self-insured plans, but only self-insured plans are exempt from the patchwork of mandates imposed under State insurance law. Furthermore, employer-sponsored self-insured plans are not subject to the same requirements under ObamaCare, as are fully insured plans.

Thus, self-insurance plans are desirable and successful because they are free from many government restrictions and regulations and allow employers to tailor their plans to meet the unique needs of their employees and to innovate.

For example, these plans do not require employees to purchase government-mandated coverage options that their employees do not want or need. This helps lower costs for working families while ensuring access to high-quality health care.

In hearings before the Education and the Workforce Committee, on which I sit, we heard testimony that today self-insurance is often the only way employers can afford coverage, thanks to the burdens of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, in Alabama, we like to say: if it ain't broke, don't fix it. Prior to ObamaCare, there were problems in our Nation's healthcare system, but the successful model of employer self-insurance wasn't one of them. Today, self-insurance remains perhaps the best way for employers to provide health care to their workers.

Unfortunately, the prior administration seemed intent on disrupting this successful healthcare model. Rather than leave self-insurance plans alone, they repeatedly explored ways to impose new regulations that would negatively impact self-insurance. Specifi-

cally, the Obama administration wanted to disrupt the model by regulating stop-loss insurance and treating it as if it were health insurance.

Employers who self-insure often purchase stop-loss insurance to cover large medical claims and to protect against the financial risks such claims can pose. Despite decades of Federal regulation on employer health plans under ERISA, stop-loss insurance has never been regulated by the Federal Government. That is because stop-loss insurance is actually a financial risk management tool designed to protect employers from catastrophic claim expenses. Remarkably, in a regulatory grab, the Obama administration tried to reclassify it as "group health insurance."

Mr. Speaker, if the last 7 years have taught us anything, it is that more Federal control over health insurance does not make health care more affordable for the American people. Stop-loss insurance is not health insurance, and it should not be regulated like it is.

The Self-Insurance Protection Act simply updates the law to make clear that Federal bureaucrats cannot redefine stop-loss insurance as group health insurance. This is about reaffirming longstanding policies and ensuring workers continue to have access to a health insurance model that is proven to lower costs and provide flexibility to consumers.

This bill will provide workers and employers alike with the regulatory certainty that they have desperately wanted and needed. They shouldn't have to worry about unelected Federal bureaucrats stepping in and destroying their healthcare system.

To put it simply, this bill is necessary in order to prevent future bureaucratic overreach that would destroy the self-insurance model that has been so successful for so many working families.

I also think this bill is an area where we should have some bipartisan cooperation. It passed out of the Education and the Workforce Committee earlier this year on a voice vote, and I hope it earns bipartisan support here in the full House.

As we continue our efforts to increase choices, lower costs, and provide better healthcare options for working families, let us not forget to shore up and protect the health insurance programs that are actually working and getting the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 241 and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate a rule for a piece of legislation that many on this side of the aisle do not necessarily have a serious issue with.

The attempt here today is to ensure that a thing that is already happening continues to happen.

I suppose that, the next time we meet, we will take up a bill that declares that the Moon is not the Sun. Doing so is a complete waste of time, but that does not seem to necessarily be dispositive when deciding whether we should legislate on an issue these days.

Look, I get it. My friends across the aisle took one on the chin the other week when their Affordable Care Act repeal bill—a bill they spent 17 days working on, even though they had 7 long years to prepare for it—went down in flames in a most public and spectacular fashion, and now they need some time to dust themselves off and become reoriented.

The problem is, while they are doing that, while they are recovering from the miserable failure that was their attempt to strip 24 million Americans of their health care, they are burning valuable time—time that should be used to tackle more pressing issues like addressing the debt ceiling and fixing our crumbling infrastructure.

Let me also take this opportunity to remind my Republican colleagues that, while we spend our time here today debating these filler bills, there are only 7 legislative days, including today, remaining before the government runs out of funding. But are we tackling any of these importance issues or ensuring the government remains open? No.

Instead, we have before us a bill that addresses an issue that is not an issue. On top of that, this legislation was actually supposed to be the third bucket of their three-bucket strategy to end health care for millions of Americans.

We saw how sturdy the first bucket was a couple of weeks ago. In fact, the bucket we are talking about today was actually referred to as the "sucker's bucket" by Senator CRUZ. That is not exactly a glowing endorsement.

Indeed, some, like Senator COTTON, have referred to all this bucket talk as simply a bunch of political spin. Whatever it is, it is certainly a bucket that has a hole in it.

In all of the uncertainty facing my Republican friends, one thing becomes crystal clear: they have no plan whatsoever to help working Americans achieve the American Dream. They are adrift, in general, and most particularly when it comes to health care.

What do they really want? At first, it was repeal, then it was repeal and replace, then it was repeal and delay, followed finally by access to coverage, and would you believe another one: patient-centered.

That is repeal, repeal and replace, repeal and delay, access to coverage, and patient-centered. We still don't have a plan. Then it turned toward a three-bucket strategy that makes little to any sense, let alone to the American people but even to powerful elected leaders in the Republican Party.

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, do you know what all this talk was?

Exactly what Senator COTTON said: nothing but political spin.

My fear is that it will all come down to whatever it takes to win in the eyes of the other side of the aisle, regardless of the consequences to the American people.

While we were told there was no plan B, we now hear there is a plan B. Donald John Trump “doesn’t lose,” and doesn’t like to lose. So I guess they are going to pass something, even if it is just this bill that does absolutely nothing, just so our Republican friends can say they did something. I am sure Donald John Trump will tweet about this great victory.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans must end their secretive plan B option and embrace the opportunity to do what is right, which is to pursue a path that strengthens and builds upon the strong foundation that has been set by the Affordable Care Act.

Democrats stand ready to work with my friends in the Republican Party on this task to continue to provide affordable coverage to millions of American citizens.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Florida said that the Moon is not the Sun. Well, stop-loss insurance is not health insurance, but the Obama administration tried to make it so. Because they tried to make it so, we need to put into statutory law what I think we all agree on both sides of the aisle not only is the law but should be the law so that there is no question about it in the future. It is unfortunate we have to do that, but, because of some of the actions of the prior administration, it is necessary.

He talked about the strong foundation of the ACA, ObamaCare. That foundation is crumbling beneath the program. We now have more insurers jumping out of exchanges. My home State of Alabama is down to one carrier on the exchange. Soon enough, we may find that, in Alabama, like some other States, there are no carriers. This isn’t a foundation. It is a foundation made of sand—and the sand is leaking out. Something has to be done.

Today’s bill is a step—not the only step—in that direction. I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with what we are doing here in substance, and I wish we would just come together and get this bill done so that we can assure that the self-insured smaller employers and larger employers have the protection that they need for the working families that participate in their programs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Donald John Trump signed into law a measure that eliminates Americans’ internet privacy. With Trump’s signature, internet

service providers will now be able to sell your personal information to the highest bidder.

Mr. Speaker, we stand here ready to fight for the privacy of the American people.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation which would reinstate the Federal Communications Commission’s internet privacy rule.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), a member of the Armed Services and Science, Space, and Technology Committees to discuss our proposal.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, if today’s vote on the previous question fails, we will have the opportunity to vote on my bill, H.R. 1868, Restoring American Privacy Act of 2017, which will reverse last night’s disastrous action by President Trump when he signed a partisan congressional resolution allowing internet providers to sell their customers’ personal information without their knowledge or consent.

Before my time in Congress, I started my career as a systems analyst. I have firsthand experience writing code, and I can tell you that the first thing to protect vulnerable and sensitive data is to make sure it is kept private.

S.J. Res. 34, which the House passed last Tuesday, unraveled those vital protections for sensitive information belonging to millions of Americans nationwide.

□ 1330

The resolution negating essential protections for private citizens was signed by President Trump last night. The October 2016 FCC rule was the only rule that required internet service providers to obtain consumers’ permission before selling their private internet browsing history and other sensitive information.

I am simply shocked that my colleagues across the aisle would vote for a measure that violates American privacy by selling your most personal and intimate information, including your email content and your app usage, all without your consent. Not only is this wrong and a blatant violation of policy, but it jeopardizes Americans’ personal data and puts them at risk of hacking.

Repealing the FCC rule with S.J. Res. 34 allows broadband providers to turn over your info to the highest bidder or anyone else they want, including the government, without a warrant, without ever telling you. That is right. I will repeat it. Repealing the FCC rule

with S.J. Res. 34 allows broadband providers to turn over your private information to the highest bidder or anyone else they want, including the government, without a warrant, without ever telling you.

Even worse, S.J. Res. 34 also tells providers they no longer have to use reasonable measures to protect consumers’ personal information. This is absolutely unacceptable. We are living in a time where identity theft and internet hacking has become the new norm. We must provide consumers with these protections. No American wants their most personal information to be up for grabs.

Eliminating this rule prevents the FCC from publishing rules that are substantially the same absent additional legislation, establishing a very dangerous precedent for private citizens. Americans should have the right to decide how their internet providers use their personal information.

What this bill does, Mr. Speaker, is simple. This bill makes clear that the American people’s browser histories are not for sale. The American people’s health information: not for sale. The American people’s financial information: not for sale. And the American people’s location data: not for sale.

It is a simple concept and one I hope my colleagues across the aisle will recognize and support. The American people don’t want the legislation that was signed last night. In overwhelming numbers, they are calling Congress and letting it be known that they want to keep their private information private.

I am proud to stand up for the American people by introducing the Restoring American Privacy Act of 2017, which reverses this misguided resolution and says, once and for all, that ISPs cannot sell customers’ personal information without their knowledge, without their permission. This bill says that your privacy is not for sale, period.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

It is time for my friends on the other side of the aisle to end their self-proclaimed political spin designed to bewilder and confuse average Americans, making them believe that their Republican representatives are fighting for the future of their health care and the health care of their families, when what they are really doing is fighting for powerful corporate interests.

Now is the time for us to face facts and accept truths.

Fact: House Republicans made an attempt to replace the Affordable Care Act with a bill that caused such an outcry from their own constituents that they were forced to pull it.

Truth: There are serious issues in health care that need to be addressed for the betterment of all Americans, and it is going to take the effort of both parties in both the House and the Senate working together to strengthen our healthcare system.

No more smokescreens, no more political rhetoric, only collaborative discourse using only the well-being of the American people as our compass. It is this approach that will steer us back onto course for the betterment of this and future generations. Unfortunately, this bill does not further that effort.

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

Mr. BYRNE. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for his remarks. I completely agree with him. Both parties should be working together to make sure that we provide what we can reasonably for the health care of the people of America, and we should be collaborating, not just in this House across the aisle but in the Senate as well. I think it is a good place to start right here with this bill because we really don't have a substantive disagreement about this bill.

Both sides understand that stop-loss insurance is not health insurance. It is just the Obama administration tried to turn it into that. This bill would stop that and bring the certainty we need back to these self-insured plans that mainly small employers have and make sure that we have in place for working families across America a system that is working for them and maintain that.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join with us, will collaborate with us, and that our colleagues in the other House, in the Senate, will do as well and pass this legislation because it truly is bipartisan in substance and, I hope today, in the vote.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 241 and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 241 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1868) to provide that providers of broadband Internet access service shall be subject to the privacy rules adopted by the Federal Communications Commission on October 27, 2016. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without inter-

vening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1868.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

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

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy impli-

cations. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 240; and adoption of House Resolution 240, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 188, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—232

Abraham	Duffy	Knight
Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	Kustoff (TN)
Allen	Duncan (TN)	Labrador
Amash	Dunn	LaHood
Amodei	Emmer	LaMalfa
Arrington	Farenthold	Lamborn
Babin	Faso	Lance
Bacon	Ferguson	Latta
Banks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Lewis (MN)
Barletta	Fleischmann	LoBiondo
Barr	Flores	Long
Barton	Fortenberry	Loudermilk
Bergman	Fox	Love
Biggs	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (MI)	Gaetz	MacArthur
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Marchant
Black	Gibbs	Marino
Blackburn	Gohmert	Marshall
Blum	Goodlatte	Masie
Bost	Gosar	Mast
Brady (TX)	Gowdy	McCarthy
Brat	Granger	McCaul
Brooks (AL)	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Brooks (IN)	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Buck	Griffith	McMorris
Bucshon	Guthrie	Rodgers
Budd	Harper	McSally
Burgess	Harris	Meadows
Byrne	Hartzler	Meehan
Calvert	Hensarling	Messer
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Mitchell
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar
Chabot	Higgins (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Chaffetz	Hill	Mullin
Cheney	Holding	Murphy (PA)
Coffman	Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Cole	Hudson	Noem
Collins (GA)	Huizenga	Nunes
Collins (NY)	Hultgren	Olson
Comer	Hunter	Palazzo
Comstock	Hurd	Palmer
Conaway	Issa	Paulsen
Cook	Jenkins (KS)	Pearce
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (WV)	Perry
Cramer	Johnson (LA)	Pittenger
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Poliquin
Curbelo (FL)	Jones	Posey
Davidson	Jordan	Ratcliffe
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (OH)	Reed
Denham	Katko	Reichert
Dent	Kelly (MS)	Renacci
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Roby
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Donovan	Kinzinger	Rogers (KY)

Rohrabacher Shuster
Rokita Simpson
Rooney, Francis Smith (MO)
Rooney, Thomas Smith (NE)
J. Smith (NJ)
Ros-Lehtinen Smith (TX)
Roskam Smucker
Ross Stefanik
Rothfus Stewart
Rouzer Stivers
Royce (CA) Taylor
Russell Tenney
Rutherford Thompson (PA)
Sanford Thornberry
Scalise Tiberi
Schweikert Tipton
Scott, Austin Trott
Sensenbrenner Turner
Sessions Upton
Shimkus Valadao

NAYS—188

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

NOT VOTING—9

Bridenstine Grothman
Davis, Danny McEachin
Gallagher Murphy (FL)

□ 1403

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Messrs. RUSH, JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms.

Wagner Walberg
Walberg Walden
Walker Walorski
Walters, Mimi Weber (TX)
Webster (FL) Wenstrup
Westerman Westerman
Williams Williams (SC)
Wittman Wittman
Womack Womack
Woodall Woodall
Yoder Yoder
Yoho Yoho
Young (AK) Young (AK)
Young (IA) Young (IA)
Zeldin Zeldin

Norcross O'Halleran
O'Rourke O'Rourke
Pallone Pallone
Panetta Panetta
Pascarell Pascarell
Payne Payne
Pelosi Pelosi
Perlmutter Perlmutter
Peters Peters
Peterson Peterson
Pingree Pingree
Pocan Pocan
Polis Polis
Price (NC) Price (NC)
Quigley Quigley
Raskin Raskin
Rice (NY) Rice (NY)
Richmond Richmond
Rosen Rosen
Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard
Ruiz Ruiz
Ruppersberger Ruppersberger
Rush Rush
Ryan (OH) Ryan (OH)
Sanchez Sanchez
Sarbanes Sarbanes
Schakowsky Schakowsky
Schiff Schiff
Schneider Schneider
Schrader Schrader
Scott (VA) Scott (VA)
Scott, David Scott, David
Serrano Serrano
Sewell (AL) Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter Shea-Porter
Sherman Sherman
Sinema Sinema
Sires Sires
Smith (WA) Smith (WA)
Soto Soto
Speier Speier
Suozi Suozi
Swalwell (CA) Swalwell (CA)
Takano Takano
Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)
Titus Titus
Tonko Tonko
Collins (GA) Collins (GA)
Collins (NY) Collins (NY)
Comer Comer
Comstock Comstock
Conaway Conaway
Cook Cook
Costello (PA) Costello (PA)
Cramer Cramer
Crawford Crawford
Culberson Culberson
Curbelo (FL) Curbelo (FL)
Davidson Davidson
Davis, Rodney Davis, Rodney
Denham Denham
Dent Dent
DeSantis DeSantis
DesJarlais DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart
Donovan Donovan
Duffy Duffy
Duncan (SC) Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN) Duncan (TN)
Dunn Dunn
Emmer Emmer
Farenthold Farenthold
Faso Faso
Ferguson Ferguson
Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick

CLARKE of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 184, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

AYES—234

Abraham Fleischmann
Aderholt Flores
Allen Portenberry
Amash Amash
Amodei Franks (AZ)
Arrington Frelinghuysen
Babin Gaetz
Bacon Garrett
Banks (IN) Gibbs
Barletta Gohmert
Barr Goodlatte
Barton Gosar
Bergman Gottheimer
Biggs Gowdy
Bilirakis Granger
Bishop (MI) Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT) Graves (LA)
Black Graves (MO)
Blackburn Griffith
Blum Guthrie
Bost Harper
Brady (TX) Harris
Brat Hartzler
Brooks (AL) Hensarling
Brooks (IN) Herrera Beutler
Buchanan Hice, Jody B.
Buck Higgins (LA)
Bucshon Hill
Budd Holding
Burgess Hollingsworth
Byrne Hudson
Calvert Huizenga
Carter (GA) Hultgren
Carter (TX) Hunter
Chabot Hurd
Chaffetz Issa
Cheney Jenkins (KS)
Coffman Jenkins (WV)
Cole Johnson (LA)
Collins (GA) Johnson (OH)
Collins (NY) Johnson, Sam
Jones Jones
Jordan Jordan
Joyce (OH) Joyce (OH)
Katko Katko
Kelly (MS) Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA) Kelly (PA)
King (IA) King (IA)
King (NY) King (NY)
Kinzinger Kinzinger
Knight Knight
Kustoff (TN) Kustoff (TN)
Labrador Labrador
LaHood LaHood
LaMalfa LaMalfa
Lamborn Lamborn
Lance Lance
Latta Latta
Lewis (MN) Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo LoBiondo
Long Long
Loudermilk Loudermilk
Love Love
Lucas Lucas
Luetkemeyer Luetkemeyer
MacArthur MacArthur
Marchant Marchant
Marino Marshall
Massie Massie
Mast Mast
McCarthy McCarthy
McCaul McCaul
McClintock McClintock
McHenry McHenry
McKinley McKinley
McMorris McMorris
Rodgers Rodgers
McSally McSally
Meadows Meadows
Meehan Meehan
Messer Messer
Mitchell Mitchell
Moolenaar Moolenaar
Mooney (WV) Mooney (WV)
Mullin Mullin
Murphy (PA) Murphy (PA)
Newhouse Newhouse
Noem Noem
Nunes Nunes
Olson Olson
Palazzo Palazzo
Palmer Palmer
Paulsen Paulsen
Pearce Pearce
Perry Perry
Pittenger Pittenger
Poe (TX) Poe (TX)
Poliquin Poliquin
Posey Posey
Ratcliffe Ratcliffe
Reed Reed
Reichert Reichert
Renacci Renacci
Rice (SC) Rice (SC)
Roby Roby
Roe (TN) Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY) Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher Rohrabacher
Rokita Rokita
Rooney, Francis Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas Rooney, Thomas
J. J.
Ros-Lehtinen Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam Roskam
Ross Ross
Rothfus Rothfus
Rouzer Rouzer
Royce (CA) Royce (CA)
Russell Russell
Rutherford Rutherford
Sanford Sanford
Scalise Scalise
Schweikert Schweikert
Scott, Austin Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner
Sessions Sessions
Shimkus Shimkus
Shuster Shuster
Simpson Simpson
Sinema Sinema
Smith (MO) Smith (MO)
Smith (NE) Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott

Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

NOES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty
Evans
Foster

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano

Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Bridenstine
Davis, Danny
Gallagher
Grothman

Hoyer
McEachin
Murphy (FL)
Pelosi

Rogers (AL)
Slaughter
Visclosky

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1413

Mr. PETERS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1343, ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 240) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1343) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise its rules so as to increase the threshold amount for requiring issuers to provide certain disclosures relating to compensatory benefit plans, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—229

- Abraham, Aderholt, Allen, Amash, Amodei, Arrington, Babin, Bacon, Banks (IN), Barletta, Barr, Barton, Bergman, Biggs, Bilirakis, Bishop (MI), Bishop (UT), Blackburn, Blum, Bost, Brady (TX), Brat, Brooks (AL), Brooks (IN), Buchanan, Buck, Bueshon, Budd, Burgess, Byrne, Calvert, Carter (GA), Carter (TX), Chabot, Chaffetz, Cheney, Coffman, Cole, Collins (GA), Collins (NY), Comer, Comstock, Conaway, Cook, Costello (PA), Cramer, Crawford, Culberson, Curbelo (FL), Davidson, Davis, Rodney, Denham, Dent, DeSantis, DesJarlais, Diaz-Balart, Donovan, Duffy, Duncan (SC), Duncan (TN), Dunn, Emmer, Farenthold, Faso, Ferguson, Fitzpatrick, Fleischmann, Flores, Fortenberry, Foxx, Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Galt, Garamendi, Garrett, Gohmert, Gosar, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (GA), Graves (LA), Graves (MO), Griffith, Guthrie, Harper, Hartzler, Hensarling, Herrera Beutler, Hice, Jody B., Higgins (LA), Hill, Holding, Hollingsworth, Hudson, Huizenga, Hultgren, Hunter, Issa, Jenkins (KS), Jenkins (WV), Johnson (LA), Johnson (OH), Johnson (NY), Jordan, Joyce (OH), Katko, Kelly (MS), Kelly (PA), King (IA), King (NY), Kinzinger, Knight, Kustoff (TN), Labrador, LaHood, LaMalfa, Lamborn, Lance, Latta, Lewis (MN), LoBiondo, Long, Loudermilk, Love, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, MacArthur, Marchant, Marino, Marshall, Massie, Mast, McCaul, McClintock, McHenry, McKinley, McMorris, Rodgers, McSally, Meadows, Meehan, Messer, Mitchell, Moolenaar, Mooney (WV), Mullin, Murphy (PA), Newhouse, Noem, Nunes, Olson, Palazzo, Palmer, Paulsen, Pearce, Perry, Pittenger, Poe (TX), Poliquin, Posey, Ratcliffe, Reed, Reichert, Renacci, Rice (SC), Roby, Rogers (KY), Rohrabacher, Rokita, Rooney, Francis, Rooney, Thomas, J., Ros-Lehtinen, Roskam, Ross, Rothfus, Rouzer, Royce (CA), Russell, Rutherford, Sanford, Scalise, Schweikert, Scott, Austin, Sensenbrenner, Sessions, Shimkus, Shuster, Simpson, Smith (MO), Smith (NE)

- Smith (NJ), Smith (TX), Smucker, Stefanik, Stewart, Stivers, Taylor, Tenney, Thompson (PA), Thornberry, Tiberi, Tipton, Trott, Turner, Upton, Valadao, Wagner, Walberg, Walden, Walker, Walorski, Walters, Mimi, Weber (TX), Webster (FL)

- Wenstrup, Westerman, Williams, Wilson (SC), Wittman, Womack, Woodall, Yoder, Yoho, Young (AK), Young (IA), Zeldin

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, noes 177, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

AYES—238

- Adams, Aguilard, Barragan, Bass, Beatty, Bera, Beyer, Bishop (GA), Blumenauer, Blunt, Rochester, Bonamici, Boyle, Brendan, F., Brady (PA), Brown (MD), Brownley (CA), Bustos, Butterfield, Capuano, Carbajal, Cardenas, Carson (IN), Cartwright, Castor (FL), Castro (TX), Chu, Judy, Cicilline, Clark (MA), Clarke (NY), Clay, Cleaver, Clyburn, Cohen, Connolly, Conyers, Cooper, Correa, Costa, Courtney, Crist, Crowley, Cuellar, Cummings, Davis (CA), DeFazio, DeGette, Delaney, DeLauro, DeBene, Demings, DeSaulnier, Deutch, Dingell, Doggett, Doyle, Michael, F., Ellison, Engel, Eshoo, Espaillat, Esty, Evans, Foster, Frankel (FL), Fudge, Gabbard, Gallego, Garamendi, Gonzalez (TX), Gottheimer, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Grijalva, Gutierrez, Hanabusa, Hastings, Heck, Higgins (NY), Himes, Huffman, Jackson Lee, Jayapal, Jeffries, Johnson (GA), Johnson, E. B., Jones, Kaptur, Keating, Kelly (IL), Kennedy, Khanna, Kilhuen, Kildee, Kilmer, Kind, Krishnamoorthi, Kuster (NH), Langevin, Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), Lawrence, Lawson (FL), Lee, Levin, Lewis (GA), Lieu, Ted, Lipinski, Loebsack, Lofgren, Lowenthal, Lowey, Lujan Grisham, M., Lujan, Ben Ray, Lynch, Maloney, Maloney B., Maloney, Sean, Matsui, McCollum, McGovern, McNeerney, Meeks, Meng, Moore, Moulton, Nadler, Napolitano, Neal, Nolan, Norcross, O'Halleran, O'Rourke, Pallone, Panetta, Pascrell, Payne, Perlmutter, Peters, Peterson, Pingree, Pocan, Polis, Price (NC), Quigley, Raskin, Rice (NY), Richmond, Rosen, Roybal-Allard, Ruiz, Ruppertsberger, Rush, Ryan (OH), Sanchez, Sarbanes, Schakowsky, Schiff, Schneider, Schrader, Scott (VA), Scott, David, Serrano, Sewell (AL), Shea-Porter, Sherman, Sinema, Sires, Smith (WA), Soto, Speier, Suozzi, Swalwell (CA), Takano, Thompson (CA), Thompson (MS), Titus, Tonko, Torres, Tsongas, Vargas, Veasey, Vela, Velazquez, Walz, Wasserman, Schultz, Waters, Maxine, Watson Coleman, Welch, Wilson (FL), Yarmuth

- Abraham, Aderholt, Allen, Amash, Amodei, Arrington, Babin, Bacon, Banks (IN), Barletta, Barr, Barton, Bergman, Biggs, Bilirakis, Bishop (MI), Bishop (UT), Black, Blackburn, Blum, Bost, Brady (TX), Brat, Brooks (AL), Brooks (IN), Buchanan, Buck, Bueshon, Budd, Burgess, Byrne, Calvert, Carter (GA), Carter (TX), Chabot, Chaffetz, Cheney, Coffman, Cole, Collins (GA), Collins (NY), Comer, Comstock, Conaway, Cook, Costello (PA), Cramer, Crawford, Culberson, Curbelo (FL), Davidson, Davis, Rodney, Denham, Dent, DeSantis, DesJarlais, Diaz-Balart, Donovan, Duffy, Duncan (SC), Duncan (TN), Dunn, Emmer, Farenthold, Faso, Ferguson, Fitzpatrick, Fleischmann, Flores, Fortenberry, Foxx, Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Galt, Garamendi, Garrett, Gohmert, Gosar, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (GA), Graves (LA), Graves (MO), Griffith, Guthrie, Harper, Harris, Hartzler, Hensarling, Herrera Beutler, Hice, Jody B., Higgins (LA), Hill, Holding, Hollingsworth, Hudson, Huizenga, Hultgren, Hunter, Issa, Jenkins (KS), Jenkins (WV), Johnson (LA), Johnson (OH), Johnson, Sam, Jones, Jordan, Joyce (OH), Katko, Kelly (MS), Kelly (PA), King (IA), King (NY), Kinzinger, Knight, Kustoff (TN), Labrador, LaHood, LaMalfa, Lamborn, Lance, Latta, Lewis (MN), LoBiondo, Long, Loudermilk, Love, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, MacArthur, Marchant, Marino, Marshall, Massie, Mast, McCaul, McClintock, McHenry, McKinley, McMorris, Rodgers, McSally, Meadows, Meehan, Messer, Mitchell, Moolenaar, Mooney (WV), Mullin, Murphy (PA), Newhouse, Noem, Nunes, O'Halleran, Olson, Palazzo, Palmer, Paulsen, Pearce, Perry, Peters, Pittenger, Poe (TX), Poliquin, Posey, Ratcliffe, Reed, Reichert, Hensarling, Rice (SC), Roby, Roe (TN), Rogers (KY), Rohrabacher, Rokita, Rooney, Francis, Rooney, Thomas, J., Ros-Lehtinen, Roskam, Ross, Rothfus, Rouzer, Royce (CA), Russell, Rutherford, Sanford, Scalise, Schweikert, Scott, Austin, Sensenbrenner, Sessions, Shimkus, Shuster, Simpson, Smith (MO), Smith (NE)

- Gosar, Gottheimer, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (GA), Graves (LA), Graves (MO), Griffith, Guthrie, Harper, Harris, Hartzler, Hensarling, Herrera Beutler, Hice, Jody B., Higgins (LA), Hill, Holding, Hollingsworth, Hudson, Huizenga, Hultgren, Hunter, Issa, Jenkins (KS), Jenkins (WV), Johnson (LA), Johnson (OH), Johnson, Sam, Jones, Jordan, Joyce (OH), Katko, Kelly (MS), Kelly (PA), King (IA), King (NY), Kinzinger, Knight, Kustoff (TN), Labrador, LaHood, LaMalfa, Lamborn, Lance, Latta, Lewis (MN), LoBiondo, Long, Loudermilk, Love, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, MacArthur, Marchant, Marino, Marshall, Massie, Mast, McCaul, McClintock, McHenry, McKinley, McMorris, Rodgers, McSally, Meadows, Meehan, Messer, Mitchell, Moolenaar, Mooney (WV), Mullin, Murphy (PA), Newhouse, Noem, Nunes, O'Halleran, Olson, Palazzo, Palmer, Paulsen, Pearce, Perry, Peters, Pittenger, Poe (TX), Poliquin, Posey, Ratcliffe, Reed, Reichert, Renacci, Rice (SC), Roby, Roe (TN), Rogers (KY), Rohrabacher, Rokita, Rooney, Francis, Rooney, Thomas, J., Ros-Lehtinen, Roskam, Ross, Rothfus, Rouzer, Royce (CA), Russell, Rutherford, Sanford, Scalise, Schweikert, Scott, Austin, Sensenbrenner, Sessions, Shimkus, Shuster, Simpson, Smith (MO), Smith (NE)

NOT VOTING—13

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1421

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

NOES—177

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Napolitano
Aguilar	Fudge	Neal
Barragán	Gabbard	Nolan
Bass	Gallego	Norcross
Beatty	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Beyer	Green, Al	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Heck	Pocan
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Bustos	Huffman	Quigley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Capuano	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Jeffries	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rosen
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Rush
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connelly	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cooper	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lee	Sherman
Crist	Levin	Sires
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Cummings	Lipinski	Speier
Davis (CA)	Loebsock	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Takano
DeGette	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lujan Grisham, M.	Titus
Demings	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Torres
Deutch	Maloney,	Tsongas
Dingell	Carolyn B.	Vargas
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doyle, Michael F.	Matsui	Vela
Ellison	McCollum	Velázquez
Engel	McGovern	Walz
Eshoo	McNerney	Wasserman
Espallat	Meeks	Schultz
Esty	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Moore	Watson Coleman
Foster	Moulton	Welch
	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Bridenstine	Hurd	Pelosi
Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Gallagher	McCarthy	Slaughter
Grothman	McEachin	Visclosky
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1430

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 214.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 211, "yea" on rollcall No. 212, "yea" on rollcall No. 213, and "yea" on rollcall No. 214.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 353) to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017".

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING IMPROVEMENT

- Sec. 101. Public safety priority.
- Sec. 102. Weather research and forecasting innovation.

- Sec. 103. Tornado warning improvement and extension program.

- Sec. 104. Hurricane forecast improvement program.

- Sec. 105. Weather research and development planning.

- Sec. 106. Observing system planning.
- Sec. 107. Observing system simulation experiments.

- Sec. 108. Annual report on computing resources prioritization.

- Sec. 109. United States Weather Research program.

- Sec. 110. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—SUBSEASONAL AND SEASONAL FORECASTING INNOVATION

- Sec. 201. Improving subseasonal and seasonal forecasts.

TITLE III—WEATHER SATELLITE AND DATA INNOVATION

- Sec. 301. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration satellite and data management.

- Sec. 302. Commercial weather data.

- Sec. 303. Unnecessary duplication.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL WEATHER COORDINATION

- Sec. 401. Environmental Information Services Working Group.

- Sec. 402. Interagency weather research and forecast innovation coordination.

- Sec. 403. Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and National Weather Service exchange program.

- Sec. 404. Visiting fellows at National Weather Service.

- Sec. 405. Warning coordination meteorologists at weather forecast offices of National Weather Service.

- Sec. 406. Improving National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration communication of hazardous weather and water events.

- Sec. 407. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Ready All Hazards Award Program.

- Sec. 408. Department of Defense weather forecasting activities.

- Sec. 409. National Weather Service; operations and workforce analysis.

- Sec. 410. Report on contract positions at National Weather Service.

- Sec. 411. Weather impacts to communities and infrastructure.

- Sec. 412. Weather enterprise outreach.

- Sec. 413. Hurricane hunter aircraft.

- Sec. 414. Study on gaps in NEXRAD coverage and recommendations to address such gaps.

TITLE V—TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2017

- Sec. 501. Short title.

- Sec. 502. References to the Tsunami Warning and Education Act.

- Sec. 503. Expansion of purposes of Tsunami Warning and Education Act.

- Sec. 504. Modification of tsunami forecasting and warning program.

- Sec. 505. Modification of national tsunami hazard mitigation program.

- Sec. 506. Modification of tsunami research program.

- Sec. 507. Global tsunami warning and mitigation network.

- Sec. 508. Tsunami science and technology advisory panel.

- Sec. 509. Reports.

- Sec. 510. Authorization of appropriations.

- Sec. 511. Outreach responsibilities.

- Sec. 512. Repeal of duplicate provisions of law.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SEASONAL.—The term "seasonal" means the time range between 3 months and 2 years.

(2) STATE.—The term "State" means a State, a territory, or possession of the United States, including a Commonwealth, or the District of Columbia.

(3) SUBSEASONAL.—The term "subseasonal" means the time range between 2 weeks and 3 months.

(4) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term "Under Secretary" means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

(5) WEATHER INDUSTRY AND WEATHER ENTERPRISE.—The terms "weather industry" and "weather enterprise" are interchangeable in this Act, and include individuals and organizations from public, private, and academic sectors that contribute to the research, development, and production of weather forecast products, and primary consumers of these weather forecast products.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 101. PUBLIC SAFETY PRIORITY.

In conducting research, the Under Secretary shall prioritize improving weather data, modeling, computing, forecasting, and warnings for the protection of life and property and for the enhancement of the national economy.

SEC. 102. WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION.

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Assistant Administrator for the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research shall conduct a program to develop improved understanding of and forecast capabilities for atmospheric events and their impacts, placing priority on developing more accurate, timely, and effective warnings and forecasts of high impact weather events that endanger life and property.

(b) **PROGRAM ELEMENTS.**—The program described in subsection (a) shall focus on the following activities:

(1) Improving the fundamental understanding of weather consistent with section 101, including the boundary layer and other processes affecting high impact weather events.

(2) Improving the understanding of how the public receives, interprets, and responds to warnings and forecasts of high impact weather events that endanger life and property.

(3) Research and development, and transfer of knowledge, technologies, and applications to the National Weather Service and other appropriate agencies and entities, including the United States weather industry and academic partners, related to—

(A) advanced radar, radar networking technologies, and other ground-based technologies, including those emphasizing rapid, fine-scale sensing of the boundary layer and lower troposphere, and the use of innovative, dual-polarization, phased-array technologies;

(B) aerial weather observing systems;

(C) high performance computing and information technology and wireless communication networks;

(D) advanced numerical weather prediction systems and forecasting tools and techniques that improve the forecasting of timing, track, intensity, and severity of high impact weather, including through—

(i) the development of more effective mesoscale models;

(ii) more effective use of existing, and the development of new, regional and national cloud-resolving models;

(iii) enhanced global weather models; and

(iv) integrated assessment models;

(E) quantitative assessment tools for measuring the impact and value of data and observing systems, including Observing System Simulation Experiments (as described in section 107), Observing System Experiments, and Analyses of Alternatives;

(F) atmospheric chemistry and interactions essential to accurately characterizing atmospheric composition and predicting meteorological processes, including cloud microphysical, precipitation, and atmospheric electrification processes, to more effectively understand their role in severe weather; and

(G) additional sources of weather data and information, including commercial observing systems.

(4) A technology transfer initiative, carried out jointly and in coordination with the Director of the National Weather Service, and in cooperation with the United States weather industry and academic partners, to ensure continuous development and transition of the latest scientific and technological advances into operations of the National Weather Service and to establish a process to sunset outdated and expensive operational methods and tools to enable cost-effective transfer of new methods and tools into operations.

(c) **EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the program under this section, the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research shall collaborate with and support the non-Federal weather research community, which includes institutions of higher education, private entities, and nongovernmental organizations, by making funds available through competitive grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that not less than 30 percent of the funds for weather research and development at the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research should be made available for the purpose described in paragraph (1).

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Each year, concurrent with the annual budget request submitted by the President to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Under Secretary shall submit to Congress a description of current and planned activities under this section.

SEC. 103. TORNADO WARNING IMPROVEMENT AND EXTENSION PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Under Secretary, in collaboration with the United States weather industry and academic partners, shall establish a tornado warning improvement and extension program.

(b) **GOAL.**—The goal of such program shall be to reduce the loss of life and economic losses from tornadoes through the development and extension of accurate, effective, and timely tornado forecasts, predictions, and warnings, including the prediction of tornadoes beyond 1 hour in advance.

(c) **PROGRAM PLAN.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, in coordination with the Director of the National Weather Service, shall develop a program plan that details the specific research, development, and technology transfer activities, as well as corresponding resources and timelines, necessary to achieve the program goal.

(d) **ANNUAL BUDGET FOR PLAN SUBMITTAL.**—Following completion of the plan, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and in coordination with the Director of the National Weather Service, shall, not less frequently than once each year, submit to Congress a proposed budget corresponding with the activities identified in the plan.

SEC. 104. HURRICANE FORECAST IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Under Secretary, in collaboration with the United States weather industry and such academic entities as the Administrator considers appropriate, shall maintain a project to improve hurricane forecasting.

(b) **GOAL.**—The goal of the project maintained under subsection (a) shall be to develop and extend accurate hurricane forecasts and warnings in order to reduce loss of life, injury, and damage to the economy, with a focus on—

(1) improving the prediction of rapid intensification and track of hurricanes;

(2) improving the forecast and communication of storm surges from hurricanes; and

(3) incorporating risk communication research to create more effective watch and warning products.

(c) **PROJECT PLAN.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and in consultation with the Director of the National Weather Service, shall develop a plan for the project maintained under subsection (a) that details the specific research, development, and technology transfer activities, as well as corresponding resources and timelines, necessary to achieve the goal set forth in subsection (b).

SEC. 105. WEATHER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once each year thereafter, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and in coordination with the Director of the National Weather Service and the Assistant Ad-

ministrator for Satellite and Information Services, shall issue a research and development and research to operations plan to restore and maintain United States leadership in numerical weather prediction and forecasting that—

(1) describes the forecasting skill and technology goals, objectives, and progress of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in carrying out the program conducted under section 102;

(2) identifies and prioritizes specific research and development activities, and performance metrics, weighted to meet the operational weather mission of the National Weather Service to achieve a weather-ready Nation;

(3) describes how the program will collaborate with stakeholders, including the United States weather industry and academic partners; and

(4) identifies, through consultation with the National Science Foundation, the United States weather industry, and academic partners, research necessary to enhance the integration of social science knowledge into weather forecast and warning processes, including to improve the communication of threat information necessary to enable improved severe weather planning and decisionmaking on the part of individuals and communities.

SEC. 106. OBSERVING SYSTEM PLANNING.

The Under Secretary shall—

(1) develop and maintain a prioritized list of observation data requirements necessary to ensure weather forecasting capabilities to protect life and property to the maximum extent practicable;

(2) consistent with section 107, utilize Observing System Simulation Experiments, Observing System Experiments, Analyses of Alternatives, and other appropriate assessment tools to ensure continuous systemic evaluations of the observing systems, data, and information needed to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), including options to maximize observational capabilities and their cost-effectiveness;

(3) identify current and potential future data gaps in observing capabilities related to the requirements listed under paragraph (1); and

(4) determine a range of options to address gaps identified under paragraph (3).

SEC. 107. OBSERVING SYSTEM SIMULATION EXPERIMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In support of the requirements of section 106, the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research shall undertake Observing System Simulation Experiments, or such other quantitative assessments as the Assistant Administrator considers appropriate, to quantitatively assess the relative value and benefits of observing capabilities and systems. Technical and scientific Observing System Simulation Experiment evaluations—

(1) may include assessments of the impact of observing capabilities on—

(A) global weather prediction;

(B) hurricane track and intensity forecasting;

(C) tornado warning lead times and accuracy;

(D) prediction of mid-latitude severe local storm outbreaks; and

(E) prediction of storms that have the potential to cause extreme precipitation and flooding lasting from 6 hours to 1 week; and

(2) shall be conducted in cooperation with other appropriate entities within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, other Federal agencies, the United States weather industry, and academic partners to ensure the technical and scientific merit of results from Observing System Simulation Experiments or other appropriate quantitative assessment methodologies.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Observing System Simulation Experiments shall quantitatively—

(1) determine the potential impact of proposed space-based, suborbital, and in situ observing systems on analyses and forecasts, including potential impacts on extreme weather events across all parts of the Nation;

(2) evaluate and compare observing system design options; and

(3) assess the relative capabilities and costs of various observing systems and combinations of observing systems in providing data necessary to protect life and property.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Observing System Simulation Experiments—

(1) shall be conducted prior to the acquisition of major Government-owned or Government-leased operational observing systems, including polar-orbiting and geostationary satellite systems, with a lifecycle cost of more than \$500,000,000; and

(2) shall be conducted prior to the purchase of any major new commercially provided data with a lifecycle cost of more than \$500,000,000.

(d) PRIORITY OBSERVING SYSTEM SIMULATION EXPERIMENTS.—

(1) GLOBAL NAVIGATION SATELLITE SYSTEM RADIO OCCULTATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research shall complete an Observing System Simulation Experiment to assess the value of data from Global Navigation Satellite System Radio Occultation.

(2) GEOSTATIONARY HYPERSPECTRAL SOUNDER GLOBAL CONSTELLATION.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research shall complete an Observing System Simulation Experiment to assess the value of data from a geostationary hyperspectral sounder global constellation.

(e) RESULTS.—Upon completion of all Observing System Simulation Experiments, the Assistant Administrator shall make available to the public the results an assessment of related private and public sector weather data sourcing options, including their availability, affordability, and cost-effectiveness. Such assessments shall be developed in accordance with section 50503 of title 51, United States Code.

SEC. 108. ANNUAL REPORT ON COMPUTING RESOURCES PRIORITIZATION.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once each year thereafter, the Under Secretary, acting through the Chief Information Officer of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the Director of the National Weather Service, shall produce and make publicly available a report that explains how the Under Secretary intends—

(1) to continually support upgrades to pursue the fastest, most powerful, and cost-effective high performance computing technologies in support of its weather prediction mission;

(2) to ensure a balance between the research to operations requirements to develop the next generation of regional and global models as well as highly reliable operational models;

(3) to take advantage of advanced development concepts to, as appropriate, make next generation weather prediction models available in beta-test mode to operational forecasters, the United States weather industry, and partners in academic and Government research; and

(4) to use existing computing resources to improve advanced research and operational weather prediction.

SEC. 109. UNITED STATES WEATHER RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 108 of the Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-567; 15 U.S.C. 313 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, not less frequently than once each year, a report, including—

“(A) a list of ongoing research projects;

“(B) project goals and a point of contact for each project;

“(C) the five projects related to weather observations, short-term weather, or subseasonal forecasts within Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research that are closest to operationalization;

“(D) for each project referred to in subparagraph (C)—

“(i) the potential benefit;

“(ii) any barrier to operationalization; and

“(iii) the plan for operationalization, including which line office will financially support the project and how much the line office intends to spend;

“(6) establish teams with staff from the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the National Weather Service to oversee the operationalization of research products developed by the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research;

“(7) develop mechanisms for research priorities of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research to be informed by the relevant line offices within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the relevant user community, and the weather enterprise;

“(8) develop an internal mechanism to track the progress of each research project within the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and mechanisms to terminate a project that is not adequately progressing;

“(9) develop and implement a system to track whether extramural research grant goals were accomplished;

“(10) provide facilities for products developed by the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research to be tested in operational simulations, such as test beds; and

“(11) encourage academic collaboration with the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the National Weather Service by facilitating visiting scholars.”;

(2) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the” and inserting “The”; and

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

“(c) SUBSEASONAL DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘subseasonal’ means the time range between 2 weeks and 3 months.”.

SEC. 110. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEARS 2017 AND 2018.—For each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018, there are authorized to be appropriated to Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research—

(1) \$111,516,000 to carry out this title, of which—

(A) \$85,758,000 is authorized for weather laboratories and cooperative institutes; and

(B) \$25,758,000 is authorized for weather and air chemistry research programs; and

(2) an additional amount of \$20,000,000 for the joint technology transfer initiative described in section 102(b)(4).

(b) LIMITATION.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title.

TITLE II—SUBSEASONAL AND SEASONAL FORECASTING INNOVATION

SEC. 201. IMPROVING SUBSEASONAL AND SEASONAL FORECASTS.

Section 1762 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-198; 15 U.S.C. 313 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a)” and inserting “(a) FINDINGS.—”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “(b)” and inserting “(b) POLICY.—”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:
“(c) FUNCTIONS.—The Under Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Weather Service and the heads of such other programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as the Under Secretary considers appropriate, shall—

“(1) collect and utilize information in order to make usable, reliable, and timely foundational forecasts of subseasonal and seasonal temperature and precipitation;

“(2) leverage existing research and models from the weather enterprise to improve the forecasts under paragraph (1);

“(3) determine and provide information on how the forecasted conditions under paragraph (1) may impact—

“(A) the number and severity of droughts, fires, tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, heat waves, coastal inundation, winter storms, high impact weather, or other relevant natural disasters;

“(B) snowpack; and

“(C) sea ice conditions; and

“(4) develop an Internet clearinghouse to provide the forecasts under paragraph (1) and the information under paragraphs (1) and (3) on both national and regional levels.

“(d) COMMUNICATION.—The Director of the National Weather Service shall provide the forecasts under paragraph (1) of subsection (c) and the information on their impacts under paragraph (3) of such subsection to the public, including public and private entities engaged in planning and preparedness, such as National Weather Service Core partners at the Federal, regional, State, tribal, and local levels of government.

“(e) COOPERATION.—The Under Secretary shall build upon existing forecasting and assessment programs and partnerships, including—

“(1) by designating research and monitoring activities related to subseasonal and seasonal forecasts as a priority in one or more solicitations of the Cooperative Institutes of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research;

“(2) by contributing to the interagency Earth System Prediction Capability; and

“(3) by consulting with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to determine the highest priority subseasonal and seasonal forecast needs to enhance national security.

(f) FORECAST COMMUNICATION COORDINATORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall foster effective communication, understanding, and use of the forecasts by the intended users of the information described in subsection (d). This may include assistance to States for forecast communication coordinators to enable local interpretation and planning based on the information.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—For each State that requests assistance under this subsection, the Under Secretary may—

“(A) provide funds to support an individual in that State—

“(i) to serve as a liaison among the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, other Federal departments and agencies, the weather enterprise, the State, and relevant interests within that State; and

“(ii) to receive the forecasts and information under subsection (c) and disseminate the forecasts and information throughout the State, including to county and tribal governments; and

“(B) require matching funds of at least 50 percent, from the State, a university, a nongovernmental organization, a trade association, or the private sector.

“(3) LIMITATION.—Assistance to an individual State under this subsection shall not exceed \$100,000 in a fiscal year.

“(g) COOPERATION FROM OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Each Federal department and agency shall cooperate as appropriate with the Under Secretary in carrying out this section.

“(h) REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017, the Under Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report, including—

“(A) an analysis of the how information from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on subseasonal and seasonal forecasts, as provided under subsection (c), is utilized in public planning and preparedness;

“(B) specific plans and goals for the continued development of the subseasonal and seasonal forecasts and related products described in subsection (c); and

“(C) an identification of research, monitoring, observing, and forecasting requirements to meet the goals described in subparagraph (B).

“(2) CONSULTATION.—In developing the report under paragraph (1), the Under Secretary shall consult with relevant Federal, regional, State, tribal, and local government agencies, research institutions, and the private sector.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) FOUNDATIONAL FORECAST.—The term ‘foundational forecast’ means basic weather observation and forecast data, largely in raw form, before further processing is applied.

“(2) NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE CORE PARTNERS.—The term ‘National Weather Service core partners’ means government and nongovernment entities which are directly involved in the preparation or dissemination of, or discussions involving, hazardous weather or other emergency information put out by the National Weather Service.

“(3) SEASONAL.—The term ‘seasonal’ means the time range between 3 months and 2 years.

“(4) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means a State, a territory, or possession of the United States, including a Commonwealth, or the District of Columbia.

“(5) SUBSEASONAL.—The term ‘subseasonal’ means the time range between 2 weeks and 3 months.

“(6) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term ‘Under Secretary’ means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

“(7) WEATHER INDUSTRY AND WEATHER ENTERPRISE.—The terms ‘weather industry’ and ‘weather enterprise’ are interchangeable in this section and include individuals and organizations from public, private, and academic sectors that contribute to the research, development, and production of weather forecast products, and primary consumers of these weather forecast products.

“(8) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018, there are authorized out of funds appropriated to the National Weather Service, \$26,500,000 to carry out the activities of this section.”

TITLE III—WEATHER SATELLITE AND DATA INNOVATION

SEC. 301. NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION SATELLITE AND DATA MANAGEMENT.

(a) SHORT-TERM MANAGEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL OBSERVATIONS.—

(1) MICROSATELLITE CONSTELLATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall complete and operationalize the Constellation Observing System for Meteorology, Ionosphere, and Climate-1 and Climate-2 (COSMIC) in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(i) by deploying constellations of microsattelites in both the equatorial and polar orbits;

(ii) by integrating the resulting data and research into all national operational and research weather forecast models; and

(iii) by ensuring that the resulting data of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s COSMIC-1 and COSMIC-2 programs are free and open to all communities.

(B) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not less frequently than once each year until the Under Secretary has completed and operationalized the program described in subparagraph (A) pursuant to such subparagraph, the Under Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the status of the efforts of the Under Secretary to carry out such subparagraph.

(2) INTEGRATION OF OCEAN AND COASTAL DATA FROM THE INTEGRATED OCEAN OBSERVING SYSTEM.—In National Weather Service Regions where the Director of the National Weather Service determines that ocean and coastal data would improve forecasts, the Director, in consultation with the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the Assistant Administrator of the National Ocean Service, shall—

(A) integrate additional coastal and ocean observations, and other data and research, from the Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS) into regional weather forecasts to improve weather forecasts and forecasting decision support systems; and

(B) support the development of real-time data sharing products and forecast products in collaboration with the regional associations of such system, including contributions from the private sector, academia, and research institutions to ensure timely and accurate use of ocean and coastal data in regional forecasts.

(3) EXISTING MONITORING AND OBSERVATION-CAPABILITY.—The Under Secretary shall identify degradation of existing monitoring and observation capabilities that could lead to a reduction in forecast quality.

(4) SPECIFICATIONS FOR NEW SATELLITE SYSTEMS OR DATA DETERMINED BY OPERATIONAL NEEDS.—In developing specifications for any satellite systems or data to follow the Joint Polar Satellite System, Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellites, and any other satellites, in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall ensure the specifications are determined to the extent practicable by the recommendations of the reports under subsection (b) of this section.

(b) INDEPENDENT STUDY ON FUTURE OF NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION SATELLITE SYSTEMS AND DATA.—

(1) AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to perform the services covered by this subsection.

(B) TIMING.—The Under Secretary shall seek to enter into the agreement described in subparagraph (A) before September 30, 2018.

(2) STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Under an agreement between the Under Secretary and the National Academy of Sciences under this subsection, the National Academy of Sciences shall conduct a study on matters concerning future satellite data needs.

(B) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study under subparagraph (A), the National Academy of Sciences shall—

(i) develop recommendations on how to make the data portfolio of the Administration more robust and cost-effective;

(ii) assess the costs and benefits of moving toward a constellation of many small satellites, standardizing satellite bus design, relying more on the purchasing of data, or acquiring data from other sources or methods;

(iii) identify the environmental observations that are essential to the performance of weather models, based on an assessment of Federal, academic, and private sector weather research, and the cost of obtaining the environmental data;

(iv) identify environmental observations that improve the quality of operational and research weather models in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act;

(v) identify and prioritize new environmental observations that could contribute to existing and future weather models; and

(vi) develop recommendations on a portfolio of environmental observations that balances essential, quality-improving, and new data, private and nonprivate sources, and space-based and Earth-based sources.

(C) DEADLINE AND REPORT.—In carrying out the study under subparagraph (A), the National Academy of Sciences shall complete and transmit to the Under Secretary a report containing the findings of the National Academy of Sciences with respect to the study not later than 2 years after the date on which the Administrator enters into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences under paragraph (1)(A).

(3) ALTERNATE ORGANIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Under Secretary is unable within the period prescribed in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) to enter into an agreement described in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph with the National Academy of Sciences on terms acceptable to the Under Secretary, the Under Secretary shall seek to enter into such an agreement with another appropriate organization that—

(i) is not part of the Federal Government;

(ii) operates as a not-for-profit entity; and

(iii) has expertise and objectivity comparable to that of the National Academy of Sciences.

(B) TREATMENT.—If the Under Secretary enters into an agreement with another organization as described in subparagraph (A), any reference in this subsection to the National Academy of Sciences shall be treated as a reference to the other organization.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated, out of funds appropriated to National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service, to carry out this subsection \$1,000,000 for the period encompassing fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

SEC. 302. COMMERCIAL WEATHER DATA.

(a) DATA AND HOSTED SATELLITE PAYLOADS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce may enter into agreements for—

(1) the purchase of weather data through contracts with commercial providers; and

(2) the placement of weather satellite instruments on cohosted government or private payloads.

(b) STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Under Secretary, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a strategy to enable the procurement of quality commercial weather data. The strategy shall assess the range of commercial opportunities, including public-private partnerships, for obtaining surface-based, aviation-based, and space-based weather observations. The strategy shall include the expected cost-effectiveness of these opportunities as well as provide a plan for procuring data, including an expected implementation timeline, from these nongovernmental sources, as appropriate.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The strategy shall include—

(A) an analysis of financial or other benefits to, and risks associated with, acquiring commercial weather data or services, including through multiyear acquisition approaches;

(B) an identification of methods to address planning, programming, budgeting, and execution challenges to such approaches, including—

(i) how standards will be set to ensure that data is reliable and effective;

(ii) how data may be acquired through commercial experimental or innovative techniques and then evaluated for integration into operational use;

(iii) how to guarantee public access to all forecast-critical data to ensure that the United

States weather industry and the public continue to have access to information critical to their work; and

(iv) in accordance with section 50503 of title 51, United States Code, methods to address potential termination liability or cancellation costs associated with weather data or service contracts; and

(C) an identification of any changes needed in the requirements development and approval processes of the Department of Commerce to facilitate effective and efficient implementation of such strategy.

(3) **AUTHORITY FOR AGREEMENTS.**—The Assistant Administrator for National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service may enter into multiyear agreements necessary to carry out the strategy developed under this subsection.

(c) **PILOT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **CRITERIA.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall publish data and metadata standards and specifications for space-based commercial weather data, including radio occultation data, and, as soon as possible, geostationary hyperspectral sounder data.

(2) **PILOT CONTRACTS.**—

(A) **CONTRACTS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall, through an open competition, enter into at least one pilot contract with one or more private sector entities capable of providing data that meet the standards and specifications set by the Under Secretary for providing commercial weather data in a manner that allows the Under Secretary to calibrate and evaluate the data for its use in National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration meteorological models.

(B) **ASSESSMENT OF DATA VIABILITY.**—Not later than the date that is 3 years after the date on which the Under Secretary enters into a contract under subparagraph (A), the Under Secretary shall assess and submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives the results of a determination of the extent to which data provided under the contract entered into under subparagraph (A) meet the criteria published under paragraph (1) and the extent to which the pilot program has demonstrated—

(i) the viability of assimilating the commercially provided data into National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration meteorological models;

(ii) whether, and by how much, the data add value to weather forecasts; and

(iii) the accuracy, quality, timeliness, validity, reliability, usability, information technology security, and cost-effectiveness of obtaining commercial weather data from private sector providers.

(3) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020, there are authorized to be appropriated for procurement, acquisition, and construction at National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service, \$6,000,000 to carry out this subsection.

(d) **OBTAINING FUTURE DATA.**—If an assessment under subsection (c)(2)(B) demonstrates the ability of commercial weather data to meet data and metadata standards and specifications published under subsection (c)(1), the Under Secretary shall—

(1) where appropriate, cost-effective, and feasible, obtain commercial weather data from private sector providers;

(2) as early as possible in the acquisition process for any future National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration meteorological space system, consider whether there is a suitable, cost-effective, commercial capability available or that will be available to meet any or all of the observational requirements by the planned operational date of the system;

(3) if a suitable, cost-effective, commercial capability is or will be available as described in

paragraph (2), determine whether it is in the national interest to develop a governmental meteorological space system; and

(4) submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report detailing any determination made under paragraphs (2) and (3).

(e) **DATA SHARING PRACTICES.**—The Under Secretary shall continue to meet the international meteorological agreements into which the Under Secretary has entered, including practices set forth through World Meteorological Organization Resolution 40.

SEC. 303. UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION.

In meeting the requirements under this title, the Under Secretary shall avoid unnecessary duplication between public and private sources of data and the corresponding expenditure of funds and employment of personnel.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL WEATHER COORDINATION

SEC. 401. ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION SERVICES WORKING GROUP.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Science Advisory Board shall continue to maintain a standing working group named the Environmental Information Services Working Group (in this section referred to as the “Working Group”)—

(1) to provide advice for prioritizing weather research initiatives at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to produce real improvement in weather forecasting;

(2) to provide advice on existing or emerging technologies or techniques that can be found in private industry or the research community that could be incorporated into forecasting at the National Weather Service to improve forecasting skill;

(3) to identify opportunities to improve—

(A) communications between weather forecasters, Federal, State, local, tribal, and other emergency management personnel, and the public; and

(B) communications and partnerships among the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the private and academic sectors; and

(4) to address such other matters as the Science Advisory Board requests of the Working Group.

(b) **COMPOSITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Working Group shall be composed of leading experts and innovators from all relevant fields of science and engineering including atmospheric chemistry, atmospheric physics, meteorology, hydrology, social science, risk communications, electrical engineering, and computer sciences. In carrying out this section, the Working Group may organize into subpanels.

(2) **NUMBER.**—The Working Group shall be composed of no fewer than 15 members. Nominees for the Working Group may be forwarded by the Working Group for approval by the Science Advisory Board. Members of the Working Group may choose a chair (or co-chairs) from among their number with approval by the Science Advisory Board.

(c) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not less frequently than once each year, the Working Group shall transmit to the Science Advisory Board for submission to the Under Secretary a report on progress made by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in adopting the Working Group’s recommendations. The Science Advisory Board shall transmit this report to the Under Secretary. Within 30 days of receipt of such report, the Under Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a copy of such report.

SEC. 402. INTERAGENCY WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECAST INNOVATION COORDINATION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish an Interagency Committee for Advancing Weather Services to improve coordination of relevant weather research and forecast innovation activities across the Federal Government. The Interagency Committee shall—

(1) include participation by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and its constituent elements, the National Science Foundation, and such other agencies involved in weather forecasting research as the President determines are appropriate;

(2) identify and prioritize top forecast needs and coordinate those needs against budget requests and program initiatives across participating offices and agencies; and

(3) share information regarding operational needs and forecasting improvements across relevant agencies.

(b) **CO-CHAIR.**—The Federal Coordinator for Meteorology shall serve as a co-chair of this panel.

(c) **FURTHER COORDINATION.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall take such other steps as are necessary to coordinate the activities of the Federal Government with those of the United States weather industry, State governments, emergency managers, and academic researchers.

SEC. 403. OFFICE OF OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH AND NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE EXCHANGE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the Director of National Weather Service may establish a program to detail Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research personnel to the National Weather Service and National Weather Service personnel to the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research.

(b) **GOAL.**—The goal of this program is to enhance forecasting innovation through regular, direct interaction between the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research’s world-class scientists and the National Weather Service’s operational staff.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The program shall allow up to 10 Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research staff and National Weather Service staff to spend up to 1 year on detail. Candidates shall be jointly selected by the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the Director of the National Weather Service.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not less frequently than once each year, the Under Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on participation in such program and shall highlight any innovations that come from this interaction.

SEC. 404. VISITING FELLOWS AT NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Weather Service may establish a program to host postdoctoral fellows and academic researchers at any of the National Centers for Environmental Prediction.

(b) **GOAL.**—This program shall be designed to provide direct interaction between forecasters and talented academic and private sector researchers in an effort to bring innovation to forecasting tools and techniques to the National Weather Service.

(c) **SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT.**—Such fellows shall be competitively selected and appointed for a term not to exceed 1 year.

SEC. 405. WARNING COORDINATION METEOROLOGISTS AT WEATHER FORECAST OFFICES OF NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) **DESIGNATION OF WARNING COORDINATION METEOROLOGISTS.**—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Director of the National Weather Service shall designate at least one warning coordination meteorologist at each weather forecast office of the National Weather Service.

(2) *NO ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES AUTHORIZED.*—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize or require a change in the authorized number of full time equivalent employees in the National Weather Service or otherwise result in the employment of any additional employees.

(3) *PERFORMANCE BY OTHER EMPLOYEES.*—Performance of the responsibilities outlined in this section is not limited to the warning coordination meteorologist position.

(b) *PRIMARY ROLE OF WARNING COORDINATION METEOROLOGISTS.*—The primary role of the warning coordination meteorologist shall be to carry out the responsibilities required by this section.

(c) *RESPONSIBILITIES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to paragraph (2), consistent with the analysis described in section 409, and in order to increase impact-based decision support services, each warning coordination meteorologist designated under subsection (a) shall—

(A) be responsible for providing service to the geographic area of responsibility covered by the weather forecast office at which the warning coordination meteorologist is employed to help ensure that users of products of the National Weather Service can respond effectively to improve outcomes from weather events;

(B) liaise with users of products and services of the National Weather Service, such as the public, media outlets, users in the aviation, marine, and agricultural communities, and forestry, land, and water management interests, to evaluate the adequacy and usefulness of the products and services of the National Weather Service;

(C) collaborate with such weather forecast offices and State, local, and tribal government agencies as the Director considers appropriate in developing, proposing, and implementing plans to develop, modify, or tailor products and services of the National Weather Service to improve the usefulness of such products and services;

(D) ensure the maintenance and accuracy of severe weather call lists, appropriate office severe weather policy or procedures, and other severe weather or dissemination methodologies or strategies; and

(E) work closely with State, local, and tribal emergency management agencies, and other agencies related to disaster management, to ensure a planned, coordinated, and effective preparedness and response effort.

(2) *OTHER STAFF.*—The Director may assign a responsibility set forth in paragraph (1) to such other staff as the Director considers appropriate to carry out such responsibility.

(d) *ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to paragraph (2), a warning coordination meteorologist designated under subsection (a) may—

(A) work with a State agency to develop plans for promoting more effective use of products and services of the National Weather Service throughout the State;

(B) identify priority community preparedness objectives;

(C) develop plans to meet the objectives identified under paragraph (2); and

(D) conduct severe weather event preparedness planning and citizen education efforts with and through various State, local, and tribal government agencies and other disaster management-related organizations.

(2) *OTHER STAFF.*—The Director may assign a responsibility set forth in paragraph (1) to such other staff as the Director considers appropriate to carry out such responsibility.

(e) *PLACEMENT WITH STATE AND LOCAL EMERGENCY MANAGERS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—In carrying out this section, the Director of the National Weather Service

may place a warning coordination meteorologist designated under subsection (a) with a State or local emergency manager if the Director considers doing so is necessary or convenient to carry out this section.

(2) *TREATMENT.*—If the Director determines that the placement of a warning coordination meteorologist placed with a State or local emergency manager under paragraph (1) is near a weather forecast office of the National Weather Service, such placement shall be treated as designation of the warning coordination meteorologist at such weather forecast office for purposes of subsection (a).

SEC. 406. IMPROVING NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION COMMUNICATION OF HAZARDOUS WEATHER AND WATER EVENTS.

(a) *PURPOSE OF SYSTEM.*—For purposes of the assessment required by subsection (b)(1)(A), the purpose of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration system for issuing watches and warnings regarding hazardous weather and water events shall be risk communication to the general public that informs action to prevent loss of life and property.

(b) *ASSESSMENT OF SYSTEM.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall—

(A) assess the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration system for issuing watches and warnings regarding hazardous weather and water events; and

(B) submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Under Secretary with respect to the assessment conducted under subparagraph (A).

(2) *ELEMENTS.*—The assessment required by paragraph (1)(A) shall include the following:

(A) An evaluation of whether the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration system for issuing watches and warnings regarding hazardous weather and water events meets the purpose described in subsection (a).

(B) Development of recommendations for—

(i) legislative and administrative action to improve the system described in paragraph (1)(A); and

(ii) such research as the Under Secretary considers necessary to address the focus areas described in paragraph (3).

(3) *FOCUS AREAS.*—The assessment required by paragraph (1)(A) shall focus on the following:

(A) Ways to communicate the risks posed by hazardous weather or water events to the public that are most likely to result in action to mitigate the risk.

(B) Ways to communicate the risks posed by hazardous weather or water events to the public as broadly and rapidly as practicable.

(C) Ways to preserve the benefits of the existing watches and warnings system.

(D) Ways to maintain the utility of the watches and warnings system for Government and commercial users of the system.

(4) *CONSULTATION.*—In conducting the assessment required by paragraph (1)(A), the Under Secretary shall—

(A) consult with such line offices within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as the Under Secretary considers relevant, including the National Ocean Service, the National Weather Service, and the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research;

(B) consult with individuals in the academic sector, including individuals in the field of social and behavioral sciences, and other weather services;

(C) consult with media outlets that will be distributing the watches and warnings;

(D) consult with non-Federal forecasters that produce alternate severe weather risk communication products;

(E) consult with emergency planners and responders, including State and local emergency management agencies, and other government users of the watches and warnings system, including the Federal Emergency Management

Agency, the Office of Personnel Management, the Coast Guard, and such other Federal agencies as the Under Secretary determines rely on watches and warnings for operational decisions; and

(F) make use of the services of the National Academy of Sciences, as the Under Secretary considers necessary and practicable, including contracting with the National Research Council to review the scientific and technical soundness of the assessment required by paragraph (1)(A), including the recommendations developed under paragraph (2)(B).

(5) *METHODOLOGIES.*—In conducting the assessment required by paragraph (1)(A), the Under Secretary shall use such methodologies as the Under Secretary considers are generally accepted by the weather enterprise, including social and behavioral sciences.

(c) *IMPROVEMENTS TO SYSTEM.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Under Secretary shall, based on the assessment required by subsection (b)(1)(A), make such recommendations to Congress to improve the system as the Under Secretary considers necessary—

(A) to improve the system for issuing watches and warnings regarding hazardous weather and water events; and

(B) to support efforts to satisfy research needs to enable future improvements to such system.

(2) *REQUIREMENTS REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS.*—In carrying out paragraph (1)(A), the Under Secretary shall ensure that any recommendation that the Under Secretary considers a major change—

(A) is validated by social and behavioral science using a generalizable sample;

(B) accounts for the needs of various demographics, vulnerable populations, and geographic regions;

(C) accounts for the differences between types of weather and water hazards;

(D) responds to the needs of Federal, State, and local government partners and media partners; and

(E) accounts for necessary changes to Federally operated watch and warning propagation and dissemination infrastructure and protocols.

(d) *WATCHES AND WARNINGS DEFINED.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Except as provided in paragraph (2), in this section, the terms “watch” and “warning”, with respect to a hazardous weather and water event, mean products issued by the Administration, intended for consumption by the general public, to alert the general public to the potential for or presence of the event and to inform action to prevent loss of life and property.

(2) *EXCEPTION.*—In this section, the terms “watch” and “warning” do not include technical or specialized meteorological and hydrological forecasts, outlooks, or model guidance products.

SEC. 407. NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION WEATHER READY ALL HAZARDS AWARD PROGRAM.

(a) *PROGRAM.*—The Director of the National Weather Service is authorized to establish the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Ready All Hazards Award Program. This award program shall provide annual awards to honor individuals or organizations that use or provide National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio All Hazards receivers or transmitters to save lives and protect property. Individuals or organizations that utilize other early warning tools or applications also qualify for this award.

(b) *GOAL.*—This award program draws attention to the life-saving work of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Ready All Hazards Program, as well as emerging tools and applications, that provide real-time warning to individuals and communities of severe weather or other hazardous conditions.

(c) *PROGRAM ELEMENTS.*—

(1) *NOMINATIONS.*—Nominations for this award shall be made annually by the Weather

Field Offices to the Director of the National Weather Service. Broadcast meteorologists, weather radio manufacturers and weather warning tool and application developers, emergency managers, and public safety officials may nominate individuals or organizations to their local Weather Field Offices, but the final list of award nominees must come from the Weather Field Offices.

(2) **SELECTION OF AWARDEES.**—Annually, the Director of the National Weather Service shall choose winners of this award whose timely actions, based on National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio All Hazards receivers or transmitters or other early warning tools and applications, saved lives or property, or demonstrated public service in support of weather or all hazard warnings.

(3) **AWARD CEREMONY.**—The Director of the National Weather Service shall establish a means of making these awards to provide maximum public awareness of the importance of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio, and such other warning tools and applications as are represented in the awards.

SEC. 408. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WEATHER FORECASTING ACTIVITIES.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report analyzing the impacts of the proposed Air Force divestiture in the United States Weather Research and Forecasting Model, including—

- (1) the impact on—
 - (A) the United States weather forecasting capabilities;
 - (B) the accuracy of civilian regional forecasts;
 - (C) the civilian readiness for traditional weather and extreme weather events in the United States; and
 - (D) the research necessary to develop the United States Weather Research and Forecasting Model; and
- (2) such other analysis relating to the divestiture as the Under Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 409. NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE; OPERATIONS AND WORKFORCE ANALYSIS.

The Under Secretary shall contract or continue to partner with an external organization to conduct a baseline analysis of National Weather Service operations and workforce.

SEC. 410. REPORT ON CONTRACT POSITIONS AT NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the use of contractors at the National Weather Service for the most recently completed fiscal year.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the most recently completed fiscal year, the following:

- (1) The total number of full-time equivalent employees at the National Weather Service, disaggregated by each equivalent level of the General Schedule.
- (2) The total number of full-time equivalent contractors at the National Weather Service, disaggregated by each equivalent level of the General Schedule that most closely approximates their duties.
- (3) The total number of vacant positions at the National Weather Service on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, disaggregated by each equivalent level of the General Schedule.
- (4) The five most common positions filled by full-time equivalent contractors at the National Weather Service and the equivalent level of the General Schedule that most closely approximates the duties of such positions.

(5) Of the positions identified under paragraph (4), the percentage of full-time equivalent contractors in those positions that have held a prior position at the National Weather Service or another entity in National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(6) The average full-time equivalent salary for Federal employees at the National Weather Service for each equivalent level of the General Schedule.

(7) The average salary for full-time equivalent contractors performing at each equivalent level of the General Schedule at the National Weather Service.

(8) A description of any actions taken by the Under Secretary to respond to the issues raised by the Inspector General of the Department of Commerce regarding the hiring of former National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration employees as contractors at the National Weather Service such as the issues raised in the Investigative Report dated June 2, 2015 (OIG-12-0447).

(c) **ANNUAL PUBLICATION.**—For each fiscal year after the fiscal year covered by the report required by subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall, not later than 180 days after the completion of the fiscal year, publish on a publicly accessible Internet website the information described in paragraphs (1) through (8) of subsection (b) for such fiscal year.

SEC. 411. WEATHER IMPACTS TO COMMUNITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) **REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Weather Service shall review existing research, products, and services that meet the specific needs of the urban environment, given its unique physical characteristics and forecasting challenges.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The review required by paragraph (1) shall include research, products, and services with the potential to improve modeling and forecasting capabilities, taking into account factors including varying building heights, impermeable surfaces, lack of tree canopy, traffic, pollution, and inter-building wind effects.

(b) **REPORT AND ASSESSMENT.**—Upon completion of the review required by subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the research, products, and services of the National Weather Service, including an assessment of such research, products, and services that is based on the review, public comment, and recent publications by the National Academy of Sciences.

SEC. 412. WEATHER ENTERPRISE OUTREACH.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Under Secretary may establish mechanisms for outreach to the weather enterprise—

- (1) to assess the weather forecasts and forecast products provided by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and
- (2) to determine the highest priority weather forecast needs of the community described in subsection (b).

(b) **OUTREACH COMMUNITY.**—In conducting outreach under subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall contact leading experts and innovators from relevant stakeholders, including the representatives from the following:

- (1) State or local emergency management agencies.
- (2) State agriculture agencies.
- (3) Indian tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)) and Native Hawaiians (as defined in section 6207 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7517)).
- (4) The private aerospace industry.
- (5) The private earth observing industry.
- (6) The operational forecasting community.
- (7) The academic community.
- (8) Professional societies that focus on meteorology.
- (9) Such other stakeholder groups as the Under Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 413. HURRICANE HUNTER AIRCRAFT.

(a) **BACKUP CAPABILITY.**—The Under Secretary shall acquire backup for the capabilities of the WP-3D Orion and G-IV hurricane aircraft of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that is sufficient to prevent a single point of failure.

(b) **AUTHORITY TO ENTER AGREEMENTS.**—In order to carry out subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall negotiate and enter into 1 or more agreements or contracts, to the extent practicable and necessary, with governmental and non-governmental entities.

(c) **FUTURE TECHNOLOGY.**—The Under Secretary shall continue the development of Airborne Phased Array Radar under the United States Weather Research Program.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020, support for implementing subsections (a) and (b) is authorized out of funds appropriated to the Office of Marine and Aviation Operations.

SEC. 414. STUDY ON GAPS IN NEXRAD COVERAGE AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO ADDRESS SUCH GAPS.

(a) **STUDY ON GAPS IN NEXRAD COVERAGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall complete a study on gaps in the coverage of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service (“NEXRAD”).

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—In conducting the study required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

- (A) identify areas in the United States where limited or no NEXRAD coverage has resulted in—
 - (i) instances in which no or insufficient warnings were given for hazardous weather events, including tornadoes; or
 - (ii) degraded forecasts for hazardous weather events that resulted in fatalities, significant injuries, or substantial property damage; and
- (B) for the areas identified under subparagraph (A)—
 - (i) identify the key weather effects for which prediction would improve with improved radar detection;
 - (ii) identify additional sources of observations for high impact weather that were available and operational for such areas on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including dense networks of x-band radars, Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (commonly known as “TDWR”), air surveillance radars of the Federal Aviation Administration, and cooperative network observers;
 - (iii) assess the feasibility and advisability of efforts to integrate and upgrade Federal radar capabilities that are not owned or controlled by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including radar capabilities of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Defense;
 - (iv) assess the feasibility and advisability of incorporating State-operated and other non-Federal radars into the operations of the National Weather Service;
 - (v) identify options to improve hazardous weather detection and forecasting coverage; and
 - (vi) provide the estimated cost of, and timeline for, each of the options identified under clause (v).

(3) **REPORT.**—Upon the completion of the study required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report that includes the findings of the Secretary with respect to the study.

(b) **RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE RADAR COVERAGE.**—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the study under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to the congressional committees referred to in subsection (a)(3) recommendations for improving

hazardous weather detection and forecasting coverage in the areas identified under subsection (a)(2)(A) by integrating additional observation solutions to the extent practicable and meteorologically justified and necessary to protect public safety.

(c) **THIRD-PARTY CONSULTATION REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE RADAR COVERAGE.**—The Secretary of Commerce may seek reviews by, or consult with, appropriate third parties regarding the scientific methodology relating to, and the feasibility and advisability of implementing, the recommendations submitted under subsection (b), including the extent to which warning and forecast services of the National Weather Service would be improved by additional observations.

TITLE V—TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2017
SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2017”.

SEC. 502. REFERENCES TO THE TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act enacted as title VIII of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-479; 33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

SEC. 503. EXPANSION OF PURPOSES OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Section 803 (33 U.S.C. 3202) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “research,” after “warnings,”;

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) to enhance and modernize the existing United States Tsunami Warning System to increase the accuracy of forecasts and warnings, to ensure full coverage of tsunami threats to the United States with a network of detection assets, and to reduce false alarms;”;

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

“(3) to improve and develop standards and guidelines for mapping, modeling, and assessment efforts to improve tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery;”;

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (8), respectively;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) to improve research efforts related to improving tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery;”;

(6) in paragraph (5), as redesignated—

(A) by striking “and increase” and inserting “, increase, and develop uniform standards and guidelines for”; and

(B) by inserting “, including the warning signs of locally generated tsunami” after “approaching”;

(7) in paragraph (6), as redesignated, by striking “, including the Indian Ocean; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (6), as redesignated, the following:

“(7) to foster resilient communities in the face of tsunami and other similar coastal hazards; and”.

SEC. 504. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI FORECASTING AND WARNING PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (a) of section 804 (33 U.S.C. 3203(a)) is amended by striking “Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Gulf of Mexico region” and inserting “Atlantic Ocean region, including the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico”.

(b) **COMPONENTS.**—Subsection (b) of section 804 (33 U.S.C. 3203(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “established” and inserting “supported or maintained”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (9) as paragraphs (8) through (10), respectively;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) to the degree practicable, maintain not less than 80 percent of the Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis buoy array at operational capacity to optimize data reliability;”.

(5) by amending paragraph (5), as redesignated by paragraph (3), to read as follows:

“(5) provide tsunami forecasting capability based on models and measurements, including tsunami inundation models and maps for use in increasing the preparedness of communities and safeguarding port and harbor operations, that incorporate inputs, including—

“(A) the United States and global ocean and coastal observing system;

“(B) the global Earth observing system;

“(C) the global seismic network;

“(D) the Advanced National Seismic system;

“(E) tsunami model validation using historical and paleotsunami data;

“(F) digital elevation models and bathymetry; and

“(G) newly developing tsunami detection methodologies using satellites and airborne remote sensing;”;

(6) by amending paragraph (7), as redesignated by paragraph (3), to read as follows:

“(7) include a cooperative effort among the Administration, the United States Geological Survey, and the National Science Foundation under which the Director of the United States Geological Survey and the Director of the National Science Foundation shall—

“(A) provide rapid and reliable seismic information to the Administrator from international and domestic seismic networks; and

“(B) support seismic stations installed before the date of the enactment of the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2017 to supplement coverage in areas of sparse instrumentation;”;

(7) in paragraph (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “, including graphical warning products,” after “warnings”;

(B) by inserting “, territories,” after “States”; and

(C) by inserting “and Wireless Emergency Alerts” after “Hazards Program”; and

(8) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “provide and” before “allow”; and

(B) by inserting “and commercial and Federal undersea communications cables” after “observing technologies”.

(c) **TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.**—Subsection (c) of section 804 (33 U.S.C. 3203(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.**—The program under this section shall operate a tsunami warning system that—

“(1) is capable of forecasting tsunami, including forecasting tsunami arrival time and inundation estimates, anywhere in the Pacific and Arctic Ocean regions and providing adequate warnings;

“(2) is capable of forecasting and providing adequate warnings, including tsunami arrival time and inundation models where applicable, in areas of the Atlantic Ocean, including the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico, that are determined—

“(A) to be geologically active, or to have significant potential for geological activity; and

“(B) to pose significant risks of tsunami for States along the coastal areas of the Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, or Gulf of Mexico; and

“(3) supports other international tsunami forecasting and warning efforts.”.

(d) **TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.**—Subsection (d) of section 804 (33 U.S.C. 3203(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall support or maintain centers to support the tsunami warning system required by subsection (c). The Centers shall include—

“(A) the National Tsunami Warning Center, located in Alaska, which is primarily responsible for Alaska and the continental United States;

“(B) the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center, located in Hawaii, which is primarily responsible for Hawaii, the Caribbean, and other areas of the Pacific not covered by the National Center; and

“(C) any additional forecast and warning centers determined by the National Weather Service to be necessary.

“(2) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The responsibilities of the centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) Continuously monitoring data from seismological, deep ocean, coastal sea level, and tidal monitoring stations and other data sources as may be developed and deployed.

“(B) Evaluating earthquakes, landslides, and volcanic eruptions that have the potential to generate tsunami.

“(C) Evaluating deep ocean buoy data and tidal monitoring stations for indications of tsunami resulting from earthquakes and other sources.

“(D) To the extent practicable, utilizing a range of models, including ensemble models, to predict tsunami, including arrival times, flooding estimates, coastal and harbor currents, and duration.

“(E) Using data from the Integrated Ocean Observing System of the Administration in coordination with regional associations to calculate new inundation estimates and periodically update existing inundation estimates.

“(F) Disseminating forecasts and tsunami warning bulletins to Federal, State, tribal, and local government officials and the public.

“(G) Coordinating with the tsunami hazard mitigation program conducted under section 805 to ensure ongoing sharing of information between forecasters and emergency management officials.

“(H) In coordination with the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, evaluating and recommending procedures for ports and harbors at risk of tsunami inundation, including review of readiness, response, and communication strategies, and data sharing policies, to the maximum extent practicable.

“(I) Making data gathered under this Act and post-warning analyses conducted by the National Weather Service or other relevant Administration offices available to the public.

“(J) Integrating and modernizing the program operated under this section with advances in tsunami science to improve performance without compromising service.

(3) **FAIL-SAFE WARNING CAPABILITY.**—The tsunami warning centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1) shall maintain a fail-safe warning capability and perform backup duties for each other.

(4) **COORDINATION WITH NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.**—The Administrator shall coordinate with the forecast offices of the National Weather Service, the centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1), and such program offices of the Administration as the Administrator or the coordinating committee, as established in section 805(d), consider appropriate to ensure that regional and local forecast offices—

“(A) have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings for the communities they serve;

“(B) leverage connections with local emergency management officials for optimally disseminating tsunami warnings and forecasts; and

“(C) implement mass communication tools in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Tsunami Warning, Education, and

Research Act of 2017 used by the National Weather Service on such date and newer mass communication technologies as they are developed as a part of the Weather-Ready Nation program of the Administration, or otherwise, for the purpose of timely and effective delivery of tsunami warnings.

“(5) UNIFORM OPERATING PROCEDURES.—The Administrator shall—

“(A) develop uniform operational procedures for the centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1), including the use of software applications, checklists, decision support tools, and tsunami warning products that have been standardized across the program supported under this section;

“(B) ensure that processes and products of the warning system operated under subsection (c)—

“(i) reflect industry best practices when practicable;

“(ii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with internationally recognized standards for information technology; and

“(iii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with other warning products and practices of the National Weather Service;

“(C) ensure that future adjustments to operational protocols, processes, and warning products—

“(i) are made consistently across the warning system operated under subsection (c); and

“(ii) are applied in a uniform manner across such warning system;

“(D) establish a systematic method for information technology product development to improve long-term technology planning efforts; and

“(E) disseminate guidelines and metrics for evaluating and improving tsunami forecast models.

“(6) AVAILABLE RESOURCES.—The Administrator, through the National Weather Service, shall ensure that resources are available to fulfill the obligations of this Act. This includes ensuring supercomputing resources are available to run, as rapidly as possible, such computer models as are needed for purposes of the tsunami warning system operated under subsection (c).”

(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—Subsection (e) of section 804 (33 U.S.C. 3203(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

“(1) develop requirements for the equipment used to forecast tsunami, including—

“(A) provisions for multipurpose detection platforms;

“(B) reliability and performance metrics; and

“(C) to the maximum extent practicable, requirements for the integration of equipment with other United States and global ocean and coastal observation systems, the global Earth observing system of systems, the global seismic networks, and the Advanced National Seismic System;

“(2) develop and execute a plan for the transfer of technology from ongoing research conducted as part of the program supported or maintained under section 6 into the program under this section; and

“(3) ensure that the Administration’s operational tsunami detection equipment is properly maintained.”

(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—Subsection (f) of section 804 (33 U.S.C. 3203(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—When deploying and maintaining tsunami detection technologies under the program under this section, the Administrator shall—

“(1) identify which assets of other Federal agencies are necessary to support such program; and

“(2) work with each agency identified under paragraph (1)—

“(A) to acquire the agency’s assistance; and
 “(B) to prioritize the necessary assets in support of the tsunami forecast and warning program.”

(g) UNNECESSARY PROVISIONS.—Section 804 (33 U.S.C. 3203) is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);

(2) by striking subsections (i) through (k); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

(h) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATIONS.—Subsection (g) of section 804 (33 U.S.C. 3203(g)), as redesignated by subsection (g)(3), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs 2 ems to the right;

(2) in the matter before subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator”;

(3) in paragraph (1), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the occurrence of a significant tsunami warning.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CONTENTS.—In a case in which notice is submitted under paragraph (1) within 30 days of a significant tsunami warning described in subparagraph (C) of such paragraph, such notice shall include, as appropriate, brief information and analysis of—

“(A) the accuracy of the tsunami model used;

“(B) the specific deep ocean or other monitoring equipment that detected the incident, as well as the deep ocean or other monitoring equipment that did not detect the incident due to malfunction or other reasons;

“(C) the effectiveness of the warning communication, including the dissemination of warnings with State, territory, local, and tribal partners in the affected area under the jurisdiction of the National Weather Service; and

“(D) such other findings as the Administrator considers appropriate.”

SEC. 505. MODIFICATION OF NATIONAL TSUNAMI HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 805(a) (33 U.S.C. 3204(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the heads of such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, shall conduct a community-based tsunami hazard mitigation program to improve tsunami preparedness and resiliency of at-risk areas in the United States and the territories of the United States.”

(b) NATIONAL TSUNAMI HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM.—Section 805 (33 U.S.C. 3204) is amended by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

“(c) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—The Program conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) Technical and financial assistance to coastal States, territories, tribes, and local governments to develop and implement activities under this section.

“(2) Integration of tsunami preparedness and mitigation programs into ongoing State-based hazard warning, resilience planning, and risk management activities, including predisaster planning, emergency response, evacuation planning, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and community development and redevelopment planning programs in affected areas.

“(3) Coordination with other Federal preparedness and mitigation programs to leverage Federal investment, avoid duplication, and maximize effort.

“(4) Activities to promote the adoption of tsunami resilience, preparedness, warning, and

mitigation measures by Federal, State, territorial, tribal, and local governments and non-governmental entities, including educational and risk communication programs to discourage development in high-risk areas.

“(5) Activities to support the development of regional tsunami hazard and risk assessments. Such regional risk assessments may include the following:

“(A) The sources, sizes, and other relevant historical data of tsunami in the region, including paleotsunami data.

“(B) Inundation models and maps of critical infrastructure and socioeconomic vulnerability in areas subject to tsunami inundation.

“(C) Maps of evacuation areas and evacuation routes, including, when appropriate, traffic studies that evaluate the viability of evacuation routes.

“(D) Evaluations of the size of populations that will require evacuation, including populations with special evacuation needs.

“(E) Evaluations and technical assistance for vertical evacuation structure planning for communities where models indicate limited or no ability for timely evacuation, especially in areas at risk of near shore generated tsunami.

“(F) Evaluation of at-risk ports and harbors.

“(G) Evaluation of the effect of tsunami currents on the foundations of closely-spaced, coastal high-rise structures.

“(6) Activities to promote preparedness in at-risk ports and harbors, including the following:

“(A) Evaluation and recommendation of procedures for ports and harbors in the event of a distant or near-field tsunami.

“(B) A review of readiness, response, and communication strategies to ensure coordination and data sharing with the Coast Guard.

“(7) Activities to support the development of community-based outreach and education programs to ensure community readiness and resilience, including the following:

“(A) The development, implementation, and assessment of technical training and public education programs, including education programs that address unique characteristics of distant and near-field tsunami.

“(B) The development of decision support tools.

“(C) The incorporation of social science research into community readiness and resilience efforts.

“(D) The development of evidence-based education guidelines.

“(8) Dissemination of guidelines and standards for community planning, education, and training products, programs, and tools, including—

“(A) standards for—

“(i) mapping products;

“(ii) inundation models; and

“(iii) effective emergency exercises; and

“(B) recommended guidance for at-risk port and harbor tsunami warning, evacuation, and response procedures in coordination with the Coast Guard and the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

“(d) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In addition to activities conducted under subsection (c), the program conducted under subsection (a) may include the following:

“(1) Multidisciplinary vulnerability assessment research, education, and training to help integrate risk management and resilience objectives with community development planning and policies.

“(2) Risk management training for local officials and community organizations to enhance understanding and preparedness.

“(3) In coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, interagency, Federal, State, tribal, and territorial intergovernmental tsunami response exercise planning and implementation in high risk areas.

“(4) Development of practical applications for existing or emerging technologies, such as modeling, remote sensing, geospatial technology, engineering, and observing systems, including the

integration of tsunami sensors into Federal and commercial submarine telecommunication cables if practicable.

“(5) Risk management, risk assessment, and resilience data and information services, including—

“(A) access to data and products derived from observing and detection systems; and

“(B) development and maintenance of new integrated data products to support risk management, risk assessment, and resilience programs.

“(6) Risk notification systems that coordinate with and build upon existing systems and actively engage decisionmakers, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments and agencies, business communities, nongovernmental organizations, and the media.

“(e) NO PREEMPTION WITH RESPECT TO DESIGNATION OF AT-RISK AREAS.—The establishment of national standards for inundation models under this section shall not prevent States, territories, tribes, and local governments from designating additional areas as being at risk based on knowledge of local conditions.

“(f) NO NEW REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act may be construed as establishing new regulatory authority for any Federal agency.”

(c) REPORT ON ACCREDITATION OF TSUNAMIREADY PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on which authorities and activities would be needed to have the TsunamiReady program of the National Weather Service accredited by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program.

SEC. 506. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 806 (33 U.S.C. 3205) is amended—
(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking “The Administrator shall” and all that follows through “establish or maintain” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, in consultation with such other Federal agencies, State, tribal, and territorial governments, and academic institutions as the Administrator considers appropriate, the coordinating committee under section 805(d), and the panel under section 808(a), support or maintain”;

(2) in subsection (a), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking “and assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling. Such research program shall—” and inserting the following: “assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling, and standards development.

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The research program supported or maintained under subsection (a) shall—”;

(3) in subsection (b), as designated by paragraph (2)—

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

“(1) consider other appropriate and cost effective solutions to mitigate the impact of tsunami, including the improvement of near-field and distant tsunami detection and forecasting capabilities, which may include use of a new generation of the Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis array, integration of tsunami sensors into commercial and Federal telecommunication cables, and other real-time tsunami monitoring systems and supercomputer capacity of the Administration to develop a rapid tsunami forecast for all United States coastlines;”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—
(i) by striking “include” and inserting “conduct”; and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) develop the technical basis for validation of tsunami maps, numerical tsunami models, digital elevation models, and forecasts; and”;

and
(E) in paragraph (5), as redesignated by subparagraph (C), by striking “to the scientific community” and inserting “to the public and the scientific community”.

SEC. 507. GLOBAL TSUNAMI WARNING AND MITIGATION NETWORK.

Section 807 (33 U.S.C. 3206) is amended—
(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The Administrator shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State and in consultation with such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, provide technical assistance, operational support, and training to the Inter-governmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Meteorological Organization of the United Nations, and such other international entities as the Administrator considers appropriate, as part of the international efforts to develop a fully functional global tsunami forecast and warning system comprised of regional tsunami warning networks.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “shall” each place it appears and inserting “may”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “establishing” and inserting “supporting”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “establish” and inserting “support”; and

(ii) by striking “establishing” and inserting “supporting”.

SEC. 508. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Act is further amended—

(1) by redesignating section 808 (33 U.S.C. 3207) as section 809; and

(2) by inserting after section 807 (33 U.S.C. 3206) the following:

“SEC. 808. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

“(a) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator shall designate an existing working group within the Science Advisory Board of the Administration to serve as the Tsunami Science and Technology Advisory Panel to provide advice to the Administrator on matters regarding tsunami science, technology, and regional preparedness.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) COMPOSITION.—The Panel shall be composed of no fewer than 7 members selected by the Administrator from among individuals from academia or State agencies who have academic or practical expertise in physical sciences, social sciences, information technology, coastal resilience, emergency management, or such other disciplines as the Administrator considers appropriate.

“(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.—No member of the Panel may be a Federal employee.

“(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Panel shall—

“(1) review the activities of the Administration, and other Federal activities as appropriate, relating to tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation; and

“(2) submit to the Administrator and such others as the Administrator considers appropriate—

“(A) the findings of the working group with respect to the most recent review conducted under paragraph (1); and

“(B) such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the working group considers appropriate to improve Federal tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation.

“(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the findings and recommendations received by the Administrator under subsection (c)(2).”

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-479; 120 Stat. 3575) is amended by striking the item relating to section 808 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 808. Tsunami Science and Technology Advisory Panel.

“Sec. 809. Authorization of appropriations.”.

SEC. 509. REPORTS.

(a) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act enacted as title VIII of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-479; 33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.), as amended by this Act.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed description of the progress made in implementing sections 804(d)(6), 805(b), and 806(b)(4) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-479; 33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

(B) A description of the ways that tsunami warnings and warning products issued by the Tsunami Forecasting and Warning Program established under section 804 of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203), as amended by this Act, may be standardized and streamlined with warnings and warning products for hurricanes, coastal storms, and other coastal flooding events.

(b) REPORT ON NATIONAL EFFORTS THAT SUPPORT RAPID RESPONSE FOLLOWING NEAR-SHORE TSUNAMI EVENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly, in coordination with the Director of the United States Geological Survey, Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and the heads of such other Federal agencies as the Administrator considers appropriate, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the national efforts in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act that support and facilitate rapid emergency response following a domestic near-shore tsunami event to better understand domestic effects of earthquake derived tsunami on people, infrastructure, and communities in the United States.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of scientific or other measurements collected on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to quickly identify and quantify lost or degraded infrastructure or terrestrial formations.

(B) A description of scientific or other measurements that would be necessary to collect to quickly identify and quantify lost or degraded infrastructure or terrestrial formations.

(C) Identification and evaluation of Federal, State, local, tribal, territorial, and military first responder and search and rescue operation centers, bases, and other facilities as well as other critical response assets and infrastructure, including search and rescue aircraft, located

within near-shore and distant tsunami inundation areas on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(D) An evaluation of near-shore tsunami response plans in areas described in subparagraph (C) in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and how those response plans would be affected by the loss of search and rescue and first responder infrastructure described in such subparagraph.

(E) A description of redevelopment plans and reports in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act for communities in areas that are at high-risk for near-shore tsunami, as well identification of States or communities that do not have redevelopment plans.

(F) Recommendations to enhance near-shore tsunami preparedness and response plans, including recommended responder exercises, predisaster planning, and mitigation needs.

(G) Such other data and analysis information as the Administrator and the Secretary of Homeland Security consider appropriate.

(3) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 510. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 809 of the Act, as redesignated by section 808(a)(1) of this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) \$25,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, of which—

“(A) not less than 27 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year shall be for activities conducted at the State level under the tsunami hazard mitigation program under section 805; and

“(B) not less than 8 percent of the amount appropriated shall be for the tsunami research program under section 806.”

SEC. 511. OUTREACH RESPONSIBILITIES.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in coordination with State and local emergency managers, shall develop and carry out formal outreach activities to improve tsunami education and awareness and foster the development of resilient communities. Outreach activities may include—

(1) the development of outreach plans to ensure the close integration of tsunami warning centers supported or maintained under section 804(d) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203(d)), as amended by this Act, with local Weather Forecast Offices of the National Weather Service and emergency managers;

(2) working with appropriate local Weather Forecast Offices to ensure they have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings to the communities they serve; and

(3) evaluating the effectiveness of warnings and of coordination with local Weather Forecast Offices after significant tsunami events.

SEC. 512. REPEAL OF DUPLICATE PROVISIONS OF LAW.

(a) **REPEAL.**—The Tsunami Warning and Education Act enacted by Public Law 109–424 (120 Stat. 2902) is repealed.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to repeal, or affect in any way, the Tsunami Warning and Education Act enacted as title VIII of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reau-

thorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–479; 33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 353, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017 advances weather research and technology and will transform our Nation’s weather industry.

I thank the vice chairman of the Science Committee, Mr. LUCAS, for sponsoring this legislation.

We must better understand short-term weather events so that we can better protect lives and property. Severe weather routinely affects large portions of the United States. Nearly every year, we witness the devastating effects of tornadoes and intense storms across our country. This bill will ensure that Americans are more protected from severe weather because of accurate supercomputing, forecasts, and earlier warnings.

H.R. 353 directs the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, to prioritize its research to improve weather data, modeling, computing, forecasting, and warnings. This enables NOAA to support its core mission of protecting lives and property.

The bill strengthens NOAA’s ability to study the underlying atmospheric science while simultaneously advancing innovative technologies and reforming operations to provide better weather data models and forecasts.

Also, the legislation creates a tornado research program to develop more accurate, effective, and timely tornado forecasts. This program will increase our understanding of these deadly events, just as the Hurricane Forecast Improvement Program advanced our ability to predict and forecast hurricanes.

The bill improves weather observation systems through the use of observing system simulation experiments and next generation computing and modeling capabilities. These requirements will help ensure we use the best and most appropriate technologies to protect our country from severe weather. It prompts NOAA to actively embrace new commercial data and private sector weather solutions through a multiyear commercial weather data pilot program. Further, it directs

NOAA to seriously consider commercial data options rather than rely on slow, costly, and often delayed government-owned satellites.

For far too long, our government has relied on these massive multibillion-dollar government weather satellites. The government has failed to consider other options that could help strengthen our weather industry. The Science Committee has jurisdiction over NOAA’s satellite office and conducts ongoing oversight of the agency’s satellite program. Our conclusion is that NOAA is in need of real reform.

Over the years, events at NOAA have revealed mismanagement, cost overruns, and launching delays of its weather satellites. This detracts from our ability to accurately predict our own weather, which places Americans in harm’s way. It is also a tremendous burden to taxpayers who have to pay the massive bills for these satellites. This is a waste of resources that should be put to better use.

This bill gives NOAA a new vision and allows NOAA the flexibility to buy new, affordable, and potentially better sources of data from the private sector. With more and better options, we can finally have the power to make real improvements to our weather forecasting capabilities. This is long overdue.

The bill also creates a much-needed technology transfer fund in NOAA’s research office to help push technologies into operation. This ensures that the technologies that are developed are effectively employed and do not sit idly on the lab bench.

I again thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and I thank the former Environment Subcommittee chairman, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, for their initiative on this issue. I also want to thank Senator THUNE for helping produce bipartisan and bicameral legislation that will protect all Americans from harmful weather events. Americans from coast to coast will now be better prepared for severe weather with the passage of this bill.

Recently, we have seen the devastating effects of severe weather across our country, especially in Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Missouri, Kansas, Alabama, and Mississippi, among other States. This bill will help these residents be better prepared so that they can protect their property and their families.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 353, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act, which also includes the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act.

The Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act is a product of hard work and negotiation over the past two Congresses. I want to thank

Congressman FRANK LUCAS, Chairman LAMAR SMITH, and former Environment Subcommittee Chairs JIM BRIDENSTINE and CHRIS STEWART, who were great partners in getting us here today.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is responsible for important work at the cutting edge of science and public service. Weather forecasting is one of the most critical tasks for our country. At a time when budget uncertainty jeopardizes some of the most fundamental services NOAA provides to our Nation, it is imperative that we support legislation like H.R. 353 to give the agency the resources and flexibility needed to fulfill its mission.

The northwest Oregon communities I represent and communities across the country rely on timely and accurate weather forecasts to decide when to harvest their crops, when to go to sea to fish, how to navigate the roads safely when there is freezing rain or snow and to prepare for possible flood conditions.

The National Weather Service provides excellent forecasting products to support our economy, but with the increasing frequency and severity of severe weather events, there can be and should be improvements in our forecasting capabilities and delivery. Improvements in forecasts can provide more lead time to allow communities to prepare, especially in severe weather events. More effective communication of forecast information to the public and those in harm's way can reduce the loss of life and property.

This bill connects the research side of NOAA—the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research—more effectively to the forecasting needs of the National Weather Service, cultivating a research-to-operations pipeline that is essential for the continued improvement of our weather forecasting enterprise. The bill contains several provisions that will improve interactions and information sharing between NOAA's researchers and the National Weather Service. It improves communication between NOAA and the broader research and private weather communities. The bill also formally establishes the pilot program currently operating at NOAA to engage in contracts with the commercial sector for weather forecasting data.

Even the best forecasts will not adequately serve the public's needs unless there are effective communication systems in place. H.R. 353 directs NOAA to do more research, listen to experts, and improve its risk communication techniques.

The bill also establishes interagency coordination through the Office of Science and Technology Policy across multiple agencies outside NOAA that share responsibilities for weather research and forecast communications. This is essential, and it highlights the important role the Office of Science and Technology Policy and NOAA share to help speed the adoption of best

tools and practices across the various agencies of the Federal Government.

The legislation before us today also includes the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act, legislation I have introduced over the past three Congresses. The Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act seeks to improve our country's understanding of the threat posed by tsunami events by improving forecasting and notification systems, developing supportive technologies, and supporting local community outreach preparedness and response plans. This bill helps to address the risk faced by communities on both coasts and in the Gulf of Mexico by improving our mitigation and research program and enhancing community outreach and planning.

Many, if not most, of my colleagues represent districts that have experienced some kind of natural disaster. The threat of a catastrophic earthquake and tsunami is real because of the Cascadia Subduction Zone. West Coast Members take this threat very seriously.

I have heard from coastal communities, people who fish, the tourism and maritime industries, marine and public safety officials, sheriffs, emergency managers, small-business owners, older Americans, and students who are concerned that their communities are not prepared for a tsunami.

Students at Seaside High School, a coastal community in my district, engaged in a year-long project to educate Oregonians about the threat a tsunami has on lives and property. Three of the four public schools in Seaside are still located inside the tsunami inundation zone. The high school students have practiced their evacuation route, and they know that, in the projected time between a major earthquake and the devastating wave of a tsunami, they couldn't make it to higher ground. That is unacceptable.

The University of Oregon and Oregon State University are working on seismic warning systems and tsunami preparedness to help make sure that our communities are prepared and have the best research available to give the most warning time possible, and this bill compliments their work.

I am proud to have worked on this legislation which is so important to the people of northwest Oregon and all coastal communities, but I do remain very concerned that the funding level is below current spending. This cut would have serious consequences. The operation and maintenance funding for the buoy network we rely on to detect tsunami could decrease, adding hours of delay in appropriately warning coastal communities.

Tsunami warning centers in Alaska and Hawaii are likely to see a reduction in staff, resulting in gaps in coverage and creating greater risks because of time delays in sending out accurate warnings and, in some instances, not being able to provide adequate warning at all.

Tsunami are among the most deadly natural disasters. In the past two decades, tsunami have caused the deaths of roughly a quarter million people around the world. These disasters also have profound economic consequences. The 2001 tsunami in Japan caused more than \$200 billion in economic losses.

We are fortunate, in the United States, to have been spared these catastrophes so far.

□ 1445

But our coastlines, from the Gulf of Mexico to Alaska, are very susceptible to the same kind of disasters we have seen in Indonesia and in Japan. It is not a matter of if, it is a matter of when.

Tsunami program activities protect coastal Oregonians just as hurricane forecasting protects coastal Floridians, Carolinians, and others up and down the East Coast of the United States. It is important that we reauthorize these lifesaving activities, and just as important to provide the necessary funding to support them.

I will work tirelessly with my colleagues to make sure this program receives the full funding it needs to serve our communities and save lives and property.

Although there are always areas where we can do more, this underlying bill, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act, with the tsunami bill, is a good bipartisan agreement and one that I am proud to support while continuing to ask for current levels of funding.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on H.R. 353.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), who is the vice chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and also the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SMITH, for his continued leadership on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and for bringing forward this important legislation.

H.R. 353, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017, prioritizes improving weather forecasting for the protection of lives and property at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This is a core program of the agency that has been in need of improved direction and investment for years.

The bill directs NOAA to develop plans to restore our country's leadership in weather forecasting. It is no secret that many people in our weather community are distraught that our forecasting capacities have deteriorated in recent years. Some even say that America no longer has the best weather prediction system in the world. In fact, we routinely rely on forecasts of other countries to predict what will happen in this country. This

is unacceptable, but I am glad we are here today to pass legislation that will dramatically improve our weather forecasting system.

The bill before us today enhances our ability to predict severe weather by focusing research and computing resources on improved weather forecasting, quantitative observing data planning, next generation modeling, and an emphasis on research-to-operations technology transfer.

As a Representative from Oklahoma, I understand the need for accurate and timely weather predictions firsthand. Every year, the loss of life from deadly tornadoes in my home State are a stark reminder that we can do better to predict severe weather events and provide longer lead times to protect Americans in harm's way.

I am proud that this legislation has a dedicated tornado warning improvement program. The goal of this program is to reduce the loss of life from tornadoes by advancing the understanding of fundamental meteorological science. This will allow detection and notifications of severe weather that are more accurate, effective, and timely. Constituents in my home State will benefit greatly from longer tornado warning lead times, which will save lives and better protect property.

Being better prepared for severe weather events is of the utmost important. The bill will improve our forecasting by encouraging innovations and new technologies through a joint technology transfer fund at NOAA's Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research. This transfer is essential to get new forecasting, models, and technologies out of the research side of NOAA and into the operational forecasts to better protect our country.

Furthermore, the legislation will enhance our forecasting by directing NOAA to engage new commercial data and private sector solutions. This legislation includes a pilot project, which will provide NOAA a clear demonstration of the valuable data from commercial technologies. The private sector has the potential to aid our forecasting skill while reducing government cost with innovative solutions. In order to increase our weather skills, we must not limit ourselves by solely relying on government data.

This legislation packs in multiple efforts to protect lives and property from severe weather. From encouraging new technologies both inside and outside of NOAA to the careful planning and prioritization of weather research, this legislation will put our country back on track to be a world leader in weather prediction.

The time has come for Americans to have the most accurate and timely weather predictions. They deserve nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE

BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 353, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017.

Climate and weather are not fundamentally partisan concerns; they affect all of our constituents, regardless of their party affiliation. The bill we are considering today, which is the culmination of more than 4 years of bipartisan compromise and negotiation, demonstrates what can be accomplished when we work together to address the concerns of our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, weather affects all of us each and every day. It is a constant presence in our lives. Extreme weather events, which are becoming more severe and more frequent, are damaging lives and property in my home State of Texas, across the continental U.S., and all the way to the islands of Hawaii.

Sadly, the devastation caused by tornadoes, hurricanes, and other severe weather incidents have become a far more familiar occurrence and, really, too much of it for far more Americans. It should go without saying that we need to help Americans avoid and cope with these potentially devastating events by utilizing the very best weather forecasting and warning capabilities.

In that regard, the National Weather Service and the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, or NOAA, play a central role in protecting the lives and property of every American. H.R. 353 will help accelerate innovation that NOAA can make use of, turning cutting-edge weather research into essential weather forecasting tools and products; tools the forecasters can then use to protect American lives.

The legislation improves collaboration and cooperation within NOAA and removes barriers that exist between the weather research community, our Nation's forecasters, and the private sector weather enterprise. Improving these relationships will strengthen the accuracy and timing of our weather predictions and, ultimately, will save lives and make our communities safer.

H.R. 353 also reauthorizes NOAA's tsunami warning activities. Communities along our Western Coasts are particularly impacted by the threat of tsunamis. While this bill reauthorizes tsunami warning and research activities at NOAA, it does so at a level far below current agency spending. Such a cut makes little sense. Even in a tough fiscal climate, we should be wary of cuts to programs that negatively affect our ability to protect American lives and property from natural disasters.

I want to applaud Environment Subcommittee Ranking Member SUZANNE BONAMICI for her fight to retain funding for these programs at their current level, and I hope that we can work together with our colleagues to maintain current tsunami funding when it comes time for appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, strengthening our resilience to severe weather events is both vital and necessary to strengthen our Nation's economic security. H.R. 353 will advance our weather forecasting capabilities, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), who is the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SMITH, for yielding me time to speak on this important legislation.

It has become increasingly apparent with every major weather event that our forecasting services are desperately in need of a major overhaul. I am happy to support legislation that will do just that.

H.R. 353, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act, will put our country's weather forecasting back on track to provide citizens with life-saving predictions and warnings.

I specifically point to this bill's innovative language on weather technology planning. H.R. 353 calls on NOAA to evaluate the combination of observing systems it needs to meet weather forecasting requirements. It also requires the agency to conduct experiments on different observing systems to evaluate their costs and benefits.

Such reforms will grant NOAA more flexibility to develop new technologies while scrapping older approaches that do not bring enough value to our forecasts. We need to better assess our observing system resources instead of continuing to rely on outdated methods.

This bill will help push NOAA to consider new approaches, including those from the private sector. For its part, the growing private sector has signaled it is ready and willing to work with NOAA to bring better weather forecasting to our citizens, and we should welcome this development.

I am confident that H.R. 353 will create the kind of meaningful change that we want to see at NOAA. This bill will better protect American lives and property with more accurate weather forecasting. I applaud the sponsors. I encourage all Members to support this bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), who is also a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his exceptional leadership on this very important legislation.

In 2012, 7-year-old Jamal Stevens was in his bed when a tornado tore through the house, tossing him onto the embankment along Interstate 485, hundreds of feet from his room.

The warning from the National Weather Service came 10 minutes later,

after the tornado had already touched down. This is because my hometown of Charlotte relies on radar nearly 100 miles away, meaning that the National Weather Service is using weak or inaccurate readings when issuing crucial safety warnings for Charlotteans.

In 2013, the current system provided a tornado warning, but for citizens in an entirely wrong neighborhood. More recently, a tornado in December of 2015 struck neighboring Union County with no warning from the National Weather Service.

Fortunately, our region has not suffered any fatalities due to the inadequate coverage, but we shouldn't wait for tragedy to act.

The Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act requires the Commerce Department to identify weak coverage areas and identify solutions to the problem by improving existing government radars or incorporating non-Federal radars into the National Weather Service's operations.

Americans across the country rely on the National Weather Service to detect and provide warning for severe weather such as thunderstorms and tornadoes. But Charlotte is currently the largest metropolitan area without an adequate radar coverage. Addressing this shortcoming is an important step for public safety.

With that in mind, I do urge my colleagues to support H.R. 353. I thank the chairman so much for his support on this critical legislation.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), who is a very active member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SMITH, for yielding me time to highlight my support for H.R. 353, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017.

This past weekend, deadly storms ravaged Louisiana's Third District, my district, tragically taking the lives of Francine Gotch and her 3-year-old daughter, Nevaeh Alexander, when their singlewide trailer flipped during high winds produced by a tornado.

The United States was once at the forefront of weather forecasting; however, that ability has diminished over the years with the capabilities of some other countries now paralleling or even exceeding our own.

I do not know if a better weather forecasting service would have made a difference this past weekend. However, as elected officials, we must make it a priority to protect American lives and property to the fullest extent.

□ 1500

We must never waver in this most significant responsibility. This legislation will put America back on track to lead the world in accurately predicting

severe weather events with a renewed focus on increasing weather research and placing new technologies into operation.

More specifically, this bill also creates a tornado forecasting improvement program to develop more accurate, effective, and timely tornado forecasts that will allow for increased tornado warning lead times, which is crucial to saving lives and would perhaps have saved the lives of that mother and her young daughter this past weekend.

Mr. Speaker, with the number of hurricanes, floods, and tornadoes that have hit Louisiana in the last few decades, my constituency knows all too well the danger that mother nature can pose, as well as the need for reliable information to adequately prepare for such occurrences.

Constituents in my district need good, commonsense legislation like this to protect their families and their property. I applaud the efforts of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee Chairman SMITH and Representative LUCAS for leading this effort to protect Americans from severe weather.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) who is the vice chairman of the Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on important issues like these.

Unfortunately, my home State of Indiana is no stranger to severe weather. As we enter peak tornado season, my constituents are vulnerable to tornado outbreaks which could lead to loss of life and destruction. Protecting lives and property from severe weather needs to be a top priority at NOAA. I am glad we are addressing this issue for that reason today.

This legislation will greatly improve our ability to predict severe weather, like the tornadoes that affect my district, through a focused program to enhance forecasting. When mere seconds make the difference between life and death, my constituents deserve the most accurate and timely forecasts available, and I am confident that this legislation will help give them that information.

I am also pleased that this bill gives NOAA the ability to incorporate data and forecasting skill from private sector companies like Harris Corporation in northeast Indiana, which employs about 450 engineers and technicians in my district. These talented professionals build the world's most advanced weather satellite instruments.

Many government-operated systems are slow and costly, and the private sector can be used to fill critical weather data needs. Directing NOAA to integrate next-generation commercial solutions improves our ability to protect lives and property.

The time to think outside of the government-only-weather-data box is now. That is why I applaud the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mr. SMITH, as well as my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) for bringing this important legislation to the forefront. I look forward to its passage into law.

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

Mr. Speaker, in addition to thanking all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard on this legislation, I want to take a moment, also, to thank all of the staff in our offices and committee on both sides of the aisle who worked so hard on this legislation.

I encourage all my colleagues to support the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act, which includes the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act. This legislation will improve weather forecasting and tsunami preparedness.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the culmination of hard work and negotiations that have spanned 5 years. Today, we finalize this House-initiated weather policy reform legislation that will benefit residents throughout the United States. H.R. 353 greatly improves our ability to predict short-term severe weather events. It better protects lives and property, a core mission of NOAA that has needed greater attention in recent years.

Again, I want to thank Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BRIDENSTINE for their initiative on this issue. I thank the former Environment Subcommittee chairman, Representative CHRIS STEWART, for his years of commitment to this subject as well.

I especially appreciate Ms. BONAMICI and her 5 years of effort to make this a bipartisan bill. I would like to thank the Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Environment staff for their years of effort on this bill, especially Taylor Jordan, who worked diligently to ensure that this bill became a reality. I also recognize the minority staff who were central to the process as well.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will transform our weather forecasting ability. It ensures that we, once again, have a world-class forecasting system that will protect lives and property from the dangers of severe weather.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 353.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT OF 2017

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 240, I call up the bill (H.R. 1343) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise its rules so as to increase the threshold amount for requiring issuers to provide certain disclosures relating to compensatory benefit plans, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 240, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-11 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1343

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 "Encouraging Employee Ownership Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. INCREASED THRESHOLD FOR DISCLOSURES RELATING TO COMPENSATORY BENEFIT PLANS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise section 230.701(e) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, so as to increase from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 the aggregate sales price or amount of securities sold during any consecutive 12-month period in excess of which the issuer is required under such section to deliver an additional disclosure to investors. The Commission shall index for inflation such aggregate sales price or amount every 5 years to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rounding to the nearest \$1,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 115-75, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1343, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act. I also want to commend the Republican and Democrat sponsors of this important bill: Mr. HULTGREN of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY of Maryland, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. MACARTHUR of New Jersey, Ms. SINEMA of Arizona, and Mr. STIVERS of Ohio.

Their bipartisan efforts resulted in a bipartisan bill that will help small businesses, including startups, to successfully reward their hardworking employees; and, while doing so, this bill will allow small businesses to effectively deploy their capital to grow and to create jobs on Main Streets all across our country.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that small businesses are the heart and soul of the American economy. In fact, they helped create more than 60 percent of the Nation's net new jobs over the past two decades. So if our Nation is to have a healthier economy that offers more opportunity to more Americans, then we must encourage small-business growth and small-business startups, and this starts with ensuring they have access to the capital and credit they need to grow.

Yet as we have heard from countless witnesses who have appeared before the House Financial Services Committee, community banks and credit unions in particular—the primary source of our small-business loans—are simply drowning, Mr. Speaker, in a sea of complicated and costly regulations. The same occurs with the maze of burdensome securities regulations that are written with the largest public companies in mind but end up hurting smaller companies.

Although small companies are at the forefront of innovation and job creation, they often face significant obstacles in obtaining funding in our capital markets. These obstacles often result from the proportionately larger burden that securities regulations place on small companies when they seek to access capital both in the public and private markets.

These small companies also face difficult challenges on how best they can deploy their limited resources and capital—to grow and thrive or to be able to sufficiently compensate their workforce, which is a critical component of their success.

Currently, the SEC allows private companies to offer their own securities to employees as part of written compensation agreements without having to comply with burdensome Federal securities registration requirements under what is called SEC rule 701. Now, unfortunately, one of the rule's thresholds has not been adjusted in two decades. What the bipartisan supporters of

this bill are proposing is simply to modernize this SEC rule with a modest increase in that threshold.

Increasing the rule 701 threshold gives private companies more flexibility to reward and retain employees and permits private companies to keep valuable, skilled employees without having to use other methods such as borrowing money or selling securities. Updating this rule can encourage more companies to offer more incentives to more employees.

As one witness who testified before Congress said, this bill "would support a valuable compensation practice that allows small businesses to hire the most highly skilled workers" and better enable small, emerging growth companies that are at a competitive disadvantage with bigger businesses to attract and retain employees.

Allowing employees to become owners in the company also benefits those employees. As startups and small companies reach success, we all want their employees to also reap the benefits of that success. That is what is happening with companies that are able to offer stock options as part of their employee compensation plans.

For example, when Google was in its early stages, it hired someone to be an in-house, part-time masseuse and compensated her with both cash and stock options. That masseuse is now worth millions today. Another example is from an ad-tech company, MoPub. Thirty-six of its 100 employees became millionaires when the company was acquired by Twitter because MoPub's CEO set his employees up for success by offering them performance-based stock-option grants.

So, Mr. Speaker, shouldn't we want more American workers to have the opportunities like at Google and MoPub? Don't we want more Americans to have an opportunity to obtain an ownership stake in the places that they work? That way the workers can earn the large financial upside that comes when the company performs well, and the company benefits by being able to attract talented workers.

Unfortunately, again, Mr. Speaker, too many companies right now shy away from offering employees greater ownership opportunities because an expensive, bureaucratic, burdensome, top-down regulation in Washington hasn't been updated in nearly 20 years. Mr. Speaker, we can fix that today. We can fix that by passing this common-sense, bipartisan bill, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act.

We can provide American workers with more opportunities to share in the successes and profits of companies they work for. We can help to foster capital formation so more Americans can go back to work, have good careers, pay their mortgages, plan for a secure retirement, and ultimately give their families a better life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this common-sense bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

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

H.R. 1343, Encouraging Employee Ownership Act of 2017, eliminates important disclosures that private companies must provide to their employees in the event they are compensating those employees with stock.

This bill would limit transparency. If companies want to pay their employees in stocks, they should have to simply disclose to their workers the risks associated with those investments.

Currently, private companies can provide up to \$5 million worth of stock compensation annually to their employees and are not required to provide any financial disclosure. This bill would lift that cap to \$10 million.

If companies choose to provide an employee with stock compensation, they should be required to inform that employee of the appropriate financial information, benefits, and the risks associated with that investment, including 2 years of company financial statements. All of this information is commonly available to typical investors.

Let's be clear: this stock is compensation for their work. Employees deserve to understand the value of their compensation prior to accepting it. They deserve the same protections that other investors would get.

I agree with Professor Mercer Bullard, who is a professor of law at the University of Mississippi School of Law, who testified before the Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments Subcommittee voicing his concerns about the bill. In his testimony, he noted that to take advantage of the terms of this legislation, an issuer would have to have at least \$34 million in total assets. Surely, such minimal disclosures are not too burdensome for those sort of companies.

I do also understand that some proponents of this legislation argue that such an exemption is needed because disclosure of company information to employees runs the risk that confidential information could be leaked to competitors.

Employees with access to such information could simply be subject to non-disclosure agreements, which are typical today. Indeed, nondisclosure agreements are a simple solution that protects the company, but does not deny the employees the right to understand the worth of, or the risks associated with, the compensation they are receiving. Unfortunately, this bill would limit that transparency and those protections.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the chairman for his leadership on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses and entrepreneurs are what drive the American economy. I meet with them in my district, the Second District of Michigan, all the time. I know my colleagues do as well back in their districts.

We see them firsthand. We see firsthand the benefits that their dreams, their innovations, their inspiration, and their hard work provide to our communities.

These innovators, entrepreneurs, and risk-takers are critical for our country's economic growth and prosperity. In fact, small businesses are responsible for 60 percent of the Nation's net new jobs over the past two decades. Not 2 years, not 10 years, but over the last 20 years, the last two decades.

If our Nation is going to have an economy that provides opportunity for every American, then we must promote and encourage success and growth in our small businesses and our startups. It is this notion that brings us this legislation we are discussing today.

H.R. 1343, Encouraging Employee Ownership Act, would simply level the playing field for small companies by updating Federal rules that allow small businesses to better compensate their employees with ownership in their own businesses.

Currently, Securities and Exchange Commission rule 701 permits private companies to offer their securities as part of written compensation agreements to employees, directors, general partners, trustees, officers, or certain consultants without having to comply with rigid Federal securities registration requirements. SEC rule 701, therefore, allows small companies to reward its employees.

Despite the SEC having the authority to increase the \$5 million threshold disclosure via rulemaking, the SEC has once again chosen to prioritize highly politicized regulatory undertakings instead of focusing on its core mission. That mission includes facilitating capital formation. If the SEC cannot or will not focus its priorities, Congress will.

It is imperative that small businesses in west Michigan, all of Michigan, and across America have the ability to compete. A critical element of competition and success is for those small businesses to be able to offer compensation packages that attract and retain top-tier talent.

In today's world, that includes rewarding employees in stock options. To me, this just makes common sense. Small-business employees have a clear and vested interest in the success of their employer.

By increasing the rule 701 threshold to \$10 million, it will give private companies more flexibility to attract, reward, and retain those highly valuable

employees. This simple change will allow companies to offer twice as much stock to their employers annually, as they currently can, without having to trigger additional disclosure information to investors about compensation packages that include these security offerings.

By reforming this regulatory burden, startups, small businesses, and emerging growth companies will be better equipped to attract highly talented individuals from companies that are better capitalized and able to maybe provide some additional cash compensation.

By incentivizing employees with stock options, small businesses will now be able to compete on a more level playing field with older, larger, and maybe more established companies. They are going to be able to retain their invaluable employees as well.

This bill is an example of the positive bipartisan results that can be achieved when Republicans and Democrats reach across the aisle. I commend the sponsors of the bill, Representatives Hultgren, Delaney, Higgins, MacArthur, Sinema, and Stivers for their leadership on this issue. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1343.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, the value of companies doesn't always go up. It is not true that the stock market always goes up and only goes up. It would be nice if Methuselahs at Google and every other company in America could get stock options and end up millionaires, but the truth is the world doesn't work that way. That is why disclosure is very important. That is why there is nothing wrong and no one objects to employees being compensated with stock options, but those employees ought to at least know the value of those stock options.

If you give me a check and it has a monetary value, I can read it and I know how much it is. If you give me stock options and you don't tell me because you don't have to disclose how much they are worth, then that is not fair, and that is what we object to.

This bill simply allows companies to avoid disclosure to employees of what those stock options are worth. That is wrong, and that is why we oppose it.

Let me just start in terms of the context, Mr. Speaker. Today we consider yet another bill in favor of the moneyed interests. Today we consider another bill that basically helps out people who have a lot while so many Americans are struggling to get by and problems abound almost everywhere.

I have got to wonder, of all the things the American public want, why is a revision to the SEC's rule—section 701, to be precise—the priority for this week?

We have been here for about 3 months now. The Republicans have set

the agenda. They are in the majority. They get to decide which bills come up. Why do they keep on bringing up bills that only the moneyed interests want?

Mr. Speaker, in the past few months, congressional Republicans—I almost called them corporate Republicans—who decide which bills are the priority, have brought forth a hodgepodge of pieces of legislation. I will just review a few.

Republicans made it easier to drug test people receiving unemployment compensation.

Do you think the unemployed want that?

I doubt it.

Republicans have passed and the President even signed a law to protect corporate firms from having to disclose labor violations like wage theft before winning government contracts. I have got a feeling the employees were not calling for that.

House and Senate Republicans passed laws that allow internet service providers to sell your browser history. I don't think most folks on the internet today were clamoring for that gem, which I was proud to vote "no" on.

Republicans enacted a new law making it easier to dump coal debris near rivers and streams.

Republicans stopped efforts to help governments around the world avoid corruption.

H.J. Res. 41 removed the requirement that corporations disclose resource payments to foreign governments, which is a crushing blow to democracy activists working in fragile nations.

Mr. Speaker, this particular piece of legislation comes within a certain kind of context—a context where we are not talking about increase in pay, making people safer, making water cleaner, making foreign governments more honest. It is quite the opposite.

In the 3 months that we have been back in Congress, these laws removing competition, removing disclosure, and removing consumer privacy are all priorities of Republicans, who set the agenda.

Mr. Speaker, people who might be clued into this broadcast today need to know what the majority has been up to. It has not been up to business.

These are all multinational corporate interests that don't punish people for polluting, allow them to sell your internet browser's history, allow them to make money off of testing laid-off workers receiving employment compensation that is due them, and don't make corporate interests disclose payments to foreign governments when they drill for oil and minerals.

I just want the American people and Members to understand what is going on here, what is the larger context of this piece of legislation that we look at today.

When I talk to my constituents, they don't bring up any of this stuff. Mr. Speaker, they want to know: Where is the jobs bill? When are we going to get back to work? Somebody said we were

going to work on real infrastructure, real fair trade. When is that going to happen?

Well, the people who are in charge around here, I guess they are going to get around to it at some point.

My constituents say: Can't we raise the minimum wage from something higher than \$7.25 an hour, which is the Federal minimum wage? When is that bill coming up? Or, what about reconstructing our roads and our bridges and allowing us to raise a gas tax to invest in our Nation's infrastructure?

They say they want to increase skills. Let's invest in preschool, Pell grants, and community college. Let's put the people, not the corporate wish list, first.

Today we are asked to vote on a bill that basically makes it easier for private companies to provide options, like stocks, rather than compensation to their employees. As I have said, fundamentally, this may not be a bad thing if disclosure is made. This bill makes it not required. This bill makes it easier for firms to offload some of their options to employees without disclosing financial information to them.

While I am glad to see employers reward employees with stock and other compensation in addition to salaries, workers should be told the value of the compensation they receive. I don't think that is asking too much, Mr. Speaker.

With this bill, H.R. 1343, it is possible that employees would be promised stock options which could be worth less than promised or even completely worthless.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Employees could decide to forego a salary increase and accept lower pay in order to receive more stock options; yet, those stock options could be worth way less than they expected.

Why should employees receive less information than any other minority shareholder?

If an employee is trusted enough to run day-to-day aspects of the business, they should be trusted enough to receive full disclosure about the stock. Employees should be able to receive information on the financial position of the company so they can make an educated decision.

It is not difficult to allow participating employees to sign nondisclosure agreements, and it can't be because these disclosures are an additional burden on the firm. These firms prepare these types of disclosures to receive rule 701 exemption from the SEC in the first place.

□ 1530

So I am also concerned about the mismatch of power between corporations and their employees, and I am very concerned that employees can be

susceptible to pressure. Let me do a quick example.

George Maddox was one of 21,000 people who worked for Enron. After working at Enron for 30 years, he had 14,000 shares of company stock valued at \$1.3 million. When Enron collapsed, he had literally nothing, Mr. Speaker. All of his retirement was Enron stocks. If you haven't watched the movie "Enron: The Smartest Guys in the Room" recently, I would urge you to watch it again. You could also read Bethany McLean's book by the same name.

One image consistently stuck with me: a staff rally where leaders extolled the virtues of the firm. Just as we heard on the other side of the aisle a moment ago, leaders whipped employees into a frenzy to buy Enron stock, even as leaders knew it was worthless. In fact, corporate leaders had already sold their stock while urging employees to buy. Enron had a strategy of buying companies and then pressuring new employees to buy Enron stock to keep the stock price inflated. Since Enron usually fired 10 percent of the workers every year, workers felt pressured to buy stock to show commitment to the firm.

I can't just support a bill that gives employees fewer protections than investors. I can't support a bill that encourages employees to possibly forgo cash in their paychecks in exchange for some unverified investment option. It is not right.

Mr. Speaker, I see you reaching for the gavel. I will include the rest of my comments in the RECORD. I urge a "no" vote on this particular piece of legislation until it allows for disclosures.

Today we consider another bill requested by corporations.

But, I got to wonder, of all the things the American public want, why is a revision to the Securities and Exchange Commission rules—Section 701 to be precise—the priority for this week?

We've been here for three months now.

House Republicans set the agenda.

They lead this governing body.

Why do they keep bringing us bills that corporate America wants?

In the past few months, Congressional Republicans, who decide which bills are priorities have brought forward a hodgepodge of corporate requests.

Here are some of the bills that are now law.

Republicans made it easier to drug test people receiving unemployment compensation (H.J. Res. 42).

Republicans passed—and the President signed—a law to protect corporate firms from having to disclose labor violations—like wage theft—before winning government contracts (H.J. Res. 37).

House and Senate Republicans passed laws that allow internet services providers to sell your browser history.

Republicans enacted a new law making it easier to dump coal debris near rivers and streams (H.J. Res. 38).

Republicans stopped efforts to help governments around the world avoid corruption.

H.J. Res. 41 removed the requirement that corporations disclose resource payments to foreign governments.

Which is a crushing blow to democracy activists working in fragile nations.

And, a law preventing State governments from setting up retirement plans for residents who do not have a work-based plan.

So, in the three months we've been back, these laws—removing competition, disclosure, and consumer privacy—are the priorities of Republicans who set the agenda.

These are all asks of corporate America—don't punish us for polluting streams; let us sell your internet browser history; let us make money drug testing laid off workers receiving unemployment due them, and; don't make us disclose our payments to foreign governments when we drill for oil or minerals.

When I talk to my constituents, they don't ask for any of these.

They say, "Where's the jobs bill?"

My constituents say, can't we raise the minimum wage from \$7.25 an hour?

They say, our roads and bridges need work. Let's raise the gas tax a skoch and invest in infrastructure?

They say, we want to increase our skills; let's invest in pre-school, Pell grants and community colleges.

Let's put people, not corporate wish lists—first.

But, nope, today we are asked to vote on a bill that makes it easier for private companies to provide options—like stocks—rather than compensation to their employees.

This bill makes it easier for firms to offload some of their options to their employees without disclosing financial information to them.

While I'm glad to see companies reward employees with stock and other compensation in addition to salaries, workers should be told the value of the compensation they receive.

With this bill—H.R. 1343—it is possible that employees would be promised stock options which could be worth less than promised, or even, completely worthless.

So, employees could decide to forego a salary increase—or accept lower pay—in order to receive more stock options, yet, those stock options could be worth way less than expected.

Why should employees receive less information than that of any other minority shareholder?

If an employee is trusted enough to run the day-to-day aspects of the business, they should be trusted enough to receive full disclosure about the stock.

Employees should be able to receive information on the financial position of the company so they can make an educated decision.

It's not difficult to allow participating employees to sign non-disclosure agreements.

And it can't be because these disclosures are an additional burden on the firm.

Because these companies prepared these types of disclosures to receive the Rule 701 exemption from the SEC in the first place.

I'm also concerned about the mismatch in power between the corporations and their employees.

I am very concerned that employees can be more susceptible to pressure to take options instead of salary increases.

For example, we could ask George Maddox.

George was one of the 21,000 people who worked at ENRON.

After working at ENRON for 30 years, he had 14,000 shares of company stock. It was valued at \$1.3 million.

Then ENRON collapsed, and he had literally nothing.

All his retirement was in ENRON stocks.

If you haven't watched the movie ENRON: The Smartest Guys in the Room recently, I'd urge you to watch it again.

You could also read Bethany McLean's book by the same name.

One image has consistently stuck with me.

A staff rally where leadership extolled the virtues of the firm.

Leaders whipped employees into a frenzy to buy ENRON stock even as the leaders knew it was worthless.

In fact, corporate leaders had already sold their stock while urging employees to buy.

ENRON had a strategy of buying companies and then pressuring the new employees to buy ENRON stock to keep the stock price inflated.

And since ENRON usually fired 10% of workers every year, workers felt pressured to buy stock to show a commitment to the firm.

I just can't support a bill that gives employees fewer protections than investors.

I can't support a bill that encourages employees to possibly forego cash in their paychecks in exchange for some unverified investment option.

I don't think the supporters of this bill are doing this for nefarious reasons.

I'm sure they find my reference to Enron hyperbolic.

They might also say that it's irrelevant since Enron was a public company and we are talking about private companies.

So, let's talk about Palantir Technologies.

This \$20 billion company convinced top-tier engineers to accept below-market salaries by promising them generous stock options.

But some employees who accepted this bargain, hoping to make money on selling their shares, cannot sell them.

The only buyer of their stocks is Palantir Technologies themselves—or a buyer approved by Palantir Technologies.

Palantir is not a small firm.

Palantir is the third biggest American tech startup, behind only Uber and AIR B-N-B.

It was also founded in 2004, which makes Palantir as old as Facebook—which is a long time to wait to cash in your options.

Pushing employees to own more of employer's stock exposes workers—like George Maddox—to put all their retirement eggs in one basket—what we call "concentration risk."

I ask this Congress to stop doing the bidding of corporate America until we address the priorities of American families and workers.

We should increase wages and access to affordable housing, provide clean air and clean water, and protect our privacy.

We should not make it easier for employers to pressure workers to choose options over salary without adequate disclosures. Vote no on H.R. 1343.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), my fellow subcommittee chairman.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I also want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for his work on this legislation and, more broadly, issues surrounding American entrepreneurship. He has been a tireless advocate.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 weeks, the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, which I chair, has held hearings to examine the impact regulations have had on financial institutions, small businesses, and American consumers. What we have seen is that the burdens stemming from Dodd-Frank and associated Obama era policies continue to harm consumers and small businesses.

We have what some have referred to as a two-speed economy. Large banks and their large customers are thriving, but the story isn't as bright for small businesses. That is why H.R. 1343 is so important. Small businesses and startups don't necessarily have the same opportunities to access the capital markets as their larger competitors, but from a regulatory standpoint, the small guys are treated the same as the big guys.

Mr. HULTGREN's legislation takes an important step in addressing some of the disparities that exist. H.R. 1343 will allow small businesses to attract and retain employees through incentives similar to those that may be offered by large businesses. Unlike the gentleman who just got done speaking, this is not about Enrons. It is about small businesses that we are talking about.

It will also ease some of the reporting burden on small and emerging businesses. The bill does so simply by increasing the SEC rule 701 threshold, taking the existing rule and simply expanding it, a figure that hasn't been touched since 1999.

It is essential that Washington take steps to level the playing field for small businesses and eliminate this two-speed economy. The bill the House will consider today is another step toward job creation and a more reasonable regulatory environment.

I again want to thank and commend Mr. HULTGREN for his leadership and ask that my colleagues join me in supporting H.R. 1343.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), a member of the Committee on Financial Services, my classmate, and a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Michigan for yielding me this time, the vice ranking member of our committee, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), my good friend, for cosponsoring this legislation with me.

I do rise in support of H.R. 1343, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a very simple piece of legislation. The chairman of the committee said it was a simple piece of legislation. It is very straightforward. It simply raises the threshold as to the amount of stock a private corporation can give its employees, from \$5 million to \$10 million, without triggering additional disclosure.

What this bill is not about is rolling back disclosure because, as a practical matter, it simply defines the threshold as to when additional disclosure is required. That threshold was originally

established in 1988 at \$5 million. Five million dollars was good in 1988; it is no longer good in 2017. We have simply escalated that amount by inflation, and we have come up with the number \$10 million, which is proposed in the legislation.

One of the reasons this legislation does not roll back disclosures, which is a myth that I intend to debunk here this afternoon, is because, as a practical matter, what corporations will do is, in fact, not give additional stock to their employees if, in fact, it triggers additional disclosures. That is what actually happens in the private market is this threshold defines the amount of stock that a company will, in fact, give to its employees in any given year; and, if we don't raise the cap from \$5 million to \$10 million, we are effectively preventing companies from allowing their employees to share in stock ownership.

Private companies make decisions, Mr. Speaker, to stay private for many reasons: either because they are too small and they don't want to go public; or they don't want to, in fact, disclose their confidential information; or they don't want the costs or burdens of being a public company; or because they don't want to give up control. Whatever reason they have, it is a very important decision for a private company to stay private and not go public. The current threshold of \$5 million effectively forces a company to make the kind of disclosures it would have to make as a public company if it elects to give more than \$5 million of stock to its employees.

We, as policymakers, should encourage more employee ownership in the markets because it is good for both the corporations and the employees. It is good for the corporations because it creates a better culture. It allows the management team and the employees of the company to have a more long-term perspective, and it reduces turnover, which is one of the highest costs that companies have. So it is very good for the companies.

But, in fact, Mr. Speaker, it is even better for the employees. The data suggest that companies that have high employee ownership are much less likely to lay off their employees during a recession. So it creates, effectively, better retention, which is obviously in the interest of employees.

But the other thing it does—and I think this is the most important point—is it encourages kind of an inclusive capitalism whereby workers actually own more of the U.S. economy. This is something, as Democrats, we should care about, in particular, because we have talked for many years about how the growth in the U.S. economy and the increases in productivity have disproportionately gone to capital and not to workers.

We believe there are many reasons this has occurred, but one of the things we should be advocating for, strongly, is increasing workers' ownership of

capital. It will inevitably lead to more savings among workers, and it will start balancing out the distribution of profits in society. One of the ways we do that is to eliminate the barriers for companies to issue stock to their employees, which is effectively what this bill does.

So if we care about this concept of inclusive capitalism, if we believe American workers should own a greater percentage of the economy and, therefore, benefit from the productivity enhancements that are occurring in the economy and the economic growth that is occurring in the economy, we should put policies in place specifically to make it easier for corporations to engage in shared employee ownership, which is exactly what this bill does.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DELANEY. I had firsthand experience with this prior to coming to Congress. I started two businesses as private companies, and they both became publicly traded companies. I shared ownership in those companies broadly with my team. It was very good for my business, and it was very good for hundreds of them when those initial public offerings occurred.

So I have firsthand experience with this. I do think it is good public policy across the long term, and I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1343.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the author of this legislation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I do want to thank my colleagues for being here. I think this is a really important discussion that we are having today. It is such an honor to serve with all of my colleagues.

I do think some who have spoken opposed to this legislation really don't understand the impact. There is nothing in this legislation that takes away any disclosures. Disclosures still remain. The same disclosures that have been in place for 30 years remain exactly there. This does not have anything to do with Enron, a publicly traded company. It is completely different. This is private sector. This is opening up opportunity. I think, by arguing against this, ultimately, it is taking away opportunity from employees to benefit.

It is such a privilege to serve with people like the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), who was part of this, opening up opportunities to hundreds of families. Congressman MACARTHUR, similarly, opened up opportunities that changed lives, as well as Congressman TROTT, who is going to be speaking as well. They opened up opportunities to people who would never have had opportunity to own a com-

pany, to own that and to have it completely change their family and their future.

I rise to support H.R. 1343, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act of 2017.

My legislation is based on a simple principle: Employees who own a stake in the company they work for every day want to see it do well and will do their best to make sure that that business succeeds. Their sense of ownership over details, large and small, makes a real difference to the bottom line and, just as importantly, to the quality of life of the employers and employees. When the company succeeds, the employee succeeds. The business, in turn, receives a large boost in productivity, enabling it to expand its reach and invest in new technology and equipment.

EEOA would make it easier for companies in Illinois and nationwide to let hardworking employees own a stake in the business they pour their sweat into every single day. This benefit also helps companies attract top talent, even if the company is just starting out.

Warren Ribley of the Illinois Biotechnology Industry Organization, which represents companies that employ thousands of residents in the 14th Congressional District, believes: "... offering an ownership stake to employees is a critical tool in recruiting top talent to job-generating companies. And there is no doubt that an equity stake encourages employees to drive hard for success of that enterprise."

Unfortunately, some companies are shying away from offering employee ownership because of regulations that limit how much ownership they can safely offer. SEC rule 701 mandates various disclosures for certain privately held companies that use more than \$5 million worth of securities for employee compensation per year.

This threshold was arbitrarily set by the SEC in 1999. For businesses that want to offer more stock to more employees, this rule forces those businesses to make confidential disclosures that could greatly damage future innovation if they fell into the wrong hands; this includes business-sensitive information, including the financials and corresponding materials like future plans and capital expenditures. The SEC's original rulemaking acknowledged these concerns.

And these disclosures aren't just risky, they are costly. As the Chamber of Commerce has explained, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act would instead "help give employees of American businesses a greater chance to participate in the success of their company."

EEOA builds off the JOBS Act reform to rule 12(g), which increased the number of shareholders of record that a company could have without SEC registration from 500 to 2,000 and exempted employee compensation securities from the registration requirements. This idea championed in the JOBS Act,

that the law should treat employee compensation securities differently than traditional securities, has not been extended to the SEC rule 701.

My bill is simple. It is a bipartisan fix. EEOA raises the outdated threshold for enhanced disclosure from \$5 million to \$10 million, keeping pace with inflation every 5 years. We are taking something that is already working and making it available for even more companies and, more importantly, more employees.

To be clear, issuers who are exempt from enhanced disclosure would still have to comply with all pertinent anti-fraud civil liability requirements. Furthermore, the employees purchasing these securities observe the business they work for every day and have a closer perspective on its operation that is not available to the traditional investor, thus negating the need for additional disclosure. We should applaud the employee ownership from the board room to the shop floor.

I thank the bipartisan cosponsors of this EEOA legislation, especially Congressman DELANEY for his hard work and Congressmen STIVERS, SINEMA, HIGGINS of New York, MACARTHUR, GOTTHEIMER, and TROTT. I thank Speaker RYAN and Chairman HENSARLING for their support in advancing this critical legislation.

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

I appreciate the comments of my colleague and friend. I do, however, disagree that the question here derives from a lack of understanding of the legislation. I think it is entirely possible—in fact, I would suggest that it is likely—that members of a body such as this, from 435 distinct districts and different experiences, can look at the same information, fully understand it, and come to different conclusions as to what sort of policy ought to be in place, and that is where I have landed on this particular subject. I fully understand.

□ 1545

I also think it is important to note that we can't on one hand say that this is not about disclosure and on the other hand mention that these disclosure requirements could have a negative impact and encourage or discourage companies from engaging in the practice of awarding employees with stock as a part of their compensation.

It is a question of disclosure. This legislation is about the disclosure requirements that should be applied in this case. That is really what we have heard from both sides of this argument: where should that disclosure requirement be, and at what level should it be incurred?

What I would say is—and I think this is important to note, speaking for myself—I know many other members of the Financial Services Committee and Members of this body that may oppose this legislation feel strongly that the direction toward awarding employees

with stock ownership is a positive direction. It is something that my friend, Mr. DELANEY, has not only advocated for, but has practiced in his own private sector experience. It is a positive thing for a company and it is a positive thing for the employees.

The only point that I continue to drive home and that others have reiterated is that it is important that employees understand the nature of the stock that is being awarded to them and that the disclosure requirements make clear employees are aware of the compensation and its true value. That is really the point of my objection.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter I received from Public Citizen, which articulates some of these same arguments.

PUBLIC CITIZEN,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2017.

MEMBER,
House Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of more than 400,000 members and supporters of Public Citizen, we offer the following comments on bills facing a committee vote March 9, 2017.

In securities lawmaking, we believe the committee's compass should always point to investor protection. Well informed investors who can trust disclosures form the bedrock of capital formation. We are concerned that a few of these measures point in a different direction.

HR 910: The "Fair Access to Investor Research Act of 2017" directs the SEC to eliminate restrictions on research reports that cover Exchange Traded Funds (ETFs). The result of this measure means that firms promoting ETFs can simultaneously publish reports that appear to be impartial analysis. This may lead investors to take unwarranted comfort in the security. In the last decade, ETFs have grown from about 100 funds with \$100 billion in assets to more than 1300 funds with \$1.8 trillion in assets. That makes the playing field for mischief immense.

Puffery parading as research led to the dot-com bubble in the late 1990s, where analysts disregarded fundamental metrics such as a revenue and income when recommending the purchase of new internet-based firms. This measure improves on a previous iteration of the legislation by allowing fundamental fraud oversight by the SEC. But the bill ignores the basic hazard that a firm's motivation in funding research may be sales promotion and not bona fide education for its clients. We also note that ETFs represent the securities of active firms. That is, an ETF holds assets such as stocks or bonds. That means this has little to do with capital formation. Now, research reports insulated from government scrutiny may too often serve to promote more turnover and commissions, not sound guidance. For these reasons, we oppose this bill and encourage members to vote no.

HR 1343: The "Encouraging Employee Ownership Act of 2017" increases from \$5 million to \$10 million the amount of securities a firm may sell annually to its employees without providing certain basic financial information. We believe this is misguided for a number of reasons. First, defenders of this measure reference the potential for leakage of proprietary information. There's little evidence of this problem. It's simply not in the self-interest of an employee-owner to divulge critical information to a rival, especially if it would undermine the value of the stock. Second, employees who are compensated in

stock (instead of additional cash) should be entitled to be informed about the financial condition of their company, the same as any other investor. Other company creditors, such as the firm's bank or major supplier, receive this information, however this measure reduces stock-compensated employees to a class below these other creditors. Young firms may be struggling with cash-flow problems and choose to use stock rather than cash for compensation. But those employees should be informed about such risks. Third, the basic thrust of this measure is to lead employees to hold a greater share of their savings in the firm. An employee invested in his or her own firm may be more productive and lead to greater profits at the firm that the employee then shares; but there is a point beyond which this dynamic dissipates. Any prudent investor should diversify. Over-concentration in one asset, especially where the firm's prospects are less than stellar, compounds the employee-investor's risk. We oppose this bill, and encourage members to do the same.

HR 1366: The "U.S. Territories Investor Protection Act" extends basic U.S. securities law oversight to investment firms operating in Puerto Rico and other U.S. territories. To date, these firms have escaped oversight, disclosure and conflict-of-interest requirements that mainland firms face. We support this common sense reform.

Sincerely

BARTLETT NAYLOR,
Public Citizen.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan, the distinguished chairman of the Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments Subcommittee, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, what we are here talking about today is opportunity. We are not talking about the money interests. We are not talking about waving the bloody shirt of the Enron debacle. What we are talking about here today, Mr. Speaker, is in the interest of innovators. It is in the interest of talented Millennials who have huge student loans, who have a great idea to benefit themselves, their community, their economy. We are here to be in the interest of hardworking workers who have no big investment dollars, but have an abundance of sweat equity. We are here in the interest, Mr. Speaker, of building businesses and growing this economy. If we do that, we are growing jobs and opportunity for our citizens. And we are in the interest, Mr. Speaker, again, not of the money interest, but of efforts all over this country, led by people like JOHN DELANEY of Maryland and Stephen Case of Virginia, to build out venture capital and entrepreneurship in places other than Boston, Massachusetts; Menlo Park; places like Detroit; Flint; Little Rock; St. Louis; and Chicago. That is why we are here today. This bill is a simple, common-sense, small step in that effort.

For many years, in my private sector life, I helped young companies form and raise capital for them. In my own business, I extended stock options and

opportunities to buy stock to those very people who did not have the excess cash to invest. Many companies issue stock to compensate their employees, but it is especially important to startup businesses and private businesses. It is especially important to those businesses that are trying to compete with big private enterprises that have a public stock to offer as an incentive. And structuring competitive compensation in private businesses is very challenging.

Further, for employees, this stock ownership is a huge source of pride, allowing individuals to participate in the growth and prosperity that their hard work and sweat equity have helped build.

Through rule 701, the SEC allows private companies to offer up to \$5 million in their own securities without additional regulatory bureaucracy. My friend from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) and my friend from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY) have simply made a small change, Mr. Speaker; and that is to raise that commensurate with inflation to \$10 million to reflect the world we live in today. This is not rocket science; this is something we need to do for building our economy.

As we celebrate the fifth anniversary of the signing of the JOBS Act by President Obama and the successes this legislation has yielded in capital formation for small and emerging growth companies, I urge my colleagues to support this effort by my friend from Illinois in this bipartisan, commonsense job-creating proposal.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Various measurements of the economy have shown economic growth and an increase in the stock market. The frustration that I hear from so many of my constituents is that: With all of this economic growth, why haven't my prospects improved? Why has there been wage stagnation? Why aren't my family and I earning any more than I was?

It is true, because a lot of the benefits of this economic growth have gone to shareholders and consumers rather than workers. We are all consumers, and we have all benefited from that. And do you know what? We are all shareholders through pensions and through retirement accounts, public and private. Many people also put food on their table and pay their rent, wearing their hat as an employee or a worker.

One of the things that we can do not just by passing this bill, but by passing a whole host of legal changes both in the tax framework and in the regulatory framework to make it easier for employees to own companies, is allow employees and workers to share in the

value that is being created on the shareholder side of the ledger. Then, and only then, can we have an economy that works for more people rather than just a few.

This bill is a small step in that direction. It can reduce the cost and remove a detriment that small to midsize companies have from aggressively pursuing employee stock ownership. But it is just a first step.

There is a lot of work that we need to do to reorient the economy around a shareholder economy that aligns the incentives of workers with those of shareholders. It is good for sustainable profits, it is good for long-term economic growth, it is good for stability. It is a better way to make sure that of this vast value that is being created, we all can partake in it on both sides of the ledger, as shareholders and as workers.

That is why I rise today in support of the bill, and that is why I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to see this as but a modest first step towards a shareholder economy that works for every worker.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the balance of time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 8 years, our Nation has experienced sluggish economic growth. Americans have suffered through stagnant paychecks and a lack of new opportunities. Last year, the economy grew at a meager 1.6 percent, which is half of the historic average.

However, there has been one job filled that has grown at a faster rate than any other; and that job is those who specialize in regulatory compliance. This is a testament to the crushing onslaught of new regulations under the previous administration, where compliance with regulation and red tape was emphasized more than growing businesses and creating jobs.

We in Congress must do our part to foster economic growth and relieve our job creators of the excessive burden of complying with unnecessary regulation. The bill before us today will do exactly that.

Currently, businesses that offer more than \$5 million in stock to their own employees are required by law to comply with costly financial disclosures. This number was set nearly 20 years ago. It is time to update the law and raise this threshold to encourage small-business startups and give them the resources they need to expand and create jobs.

The Encouraging Employee Ownership Act would raise this threshold to

\$10 million and give private businesses more flexibility to reward their employees with ownership of a company. This bill passed the Financial Services Committee last month with strong bipartisan support.

This is just one of the many steps that we must take to foster innovation and encourage capital formation, to provide every American with opportunities that they deserve. We must build an economy that is open and accessible to every single American, not one that is closed off to those who can't afford to comply with the high cost of bureaucratic red tape and endless government paperwork.

As a former small-business owner for 20 years, I know the employees benefit tremendously from any opportunity to participate in a company's success. I support this bill because I know from personal experience this model works and helps startup companies to retain their best employees over the long term.

Americans are not satisfied with the stagnant economy that has become the new norm in our Nation. It is unacceptable for government to stand in the way of prosperity and make it harder for Americans to succeed. Small businesses employ half of U.S. workers, and we must promote, not hinder, small business growth.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, empowers Main Street, not Wall Street. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

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

I would just point out again that the position many of us are taking does not contradict the principles that are being articulated. In fact, the law does not preclude any company from awarding stock as compensation at any level. It simply requires that information be provided so that those individuals who are receiving that compensation have the information and have the resources to understand the value of that compensation. I just want to reiterate that because it is important that the position not be mischaracterized as one that wants to dampen the ability of companies to reward their employees with stock or use that as a form of compensation. It is just important that they have transparency in that process so people who are receiving that compensation understand its true value.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), my fellow Michiganiaan.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1343, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act.

I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. DELANEY, for their thoughtful and bipartisan work on this issue.

This is a commonsense, simple bill that makes it easier for employees to obtain ownership in the companies

they work for. When I was in the private sector, I gave dozens of employees an ownership interest. It worked out great for them, it worked out great for the company, and it worked out great for our customers. Ownership interest gave them an upside that could not be realized through a salary. The stock instilled loyalty and dedication. More importantly, it created a family atmosphere. We were all in it together. Our opportunities would rise and fall, depending on our collective success.

To have a career where someday, through your hard work, you can end up owning a piece of action is what the American Dream is all about. The outdated cap is keeping this dream, for no good reason, from many Americans.

I suspect that those who oppose the bill, while they may understand the legislation, probably have never worked in the private sector and have no clue how meaningful incentives and opportunities, such as stock ownership, are to individuals. I found it was the best way to motivate and reward employees. In fact, it worked so well, no one ever left the company except to retire.

My friends from Michigan and Minnesota oppose the bill because of a lack of transparency. The argument is flawed because it assumes stock ownership opportunities comprise all or a significant portion of the individual's compensation. This is not correct. A stock ownership benefit is typically over and above salary and bonuses.

To require the owner of a small business or a startup to make disclosures will cause many employers not to give employees this opportunity. Implicit in their argument is an assumption, like in so many other areas of life, that individuals cannot be trusted to make decisions on their own, that they need the help of all of the smart politicians and bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., to tell them what to do and what they need to see, and, of course, we cannot trust people to make decisions and discern for themselves whether stock ownership is a fair opportunity.

This bill had the support of a bipartisan group in our committee. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1343.

□ 1600

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1343, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act of 2017. This is bipartisan legislation that will remove outdated barriers to capital formation and job creation imposed on the small businesses and startups that are driving America's innovation economy.

The SEC still hasn't updated a rule from 17 years ago that imposed an undue burden on entrepreneurs when they want to attract and retain talent

through employee compensation plans. Startup ventures, by offering their employees a stake in the company through equity and other forms of deferred compensation, can reward hardworking employees by giving them direct ownership while their business continues to grow.

SEC rules governing these compensation plans haven't been updated since 1999, and they are imposing burdensome compliance and reporting requirements on the very entrepreneurs we should be encouraging to expand and create more good-paying, private sector jobs. We see the effects of this compliance tax placing a drain on our economy because it diverts the resources and human capital of entrepreneurs away from expansion and job creation.

In my district on Long Island and nationwide, entrepreneurs who have the next great invention or idea are struggling to gain access to capital. By regulating small startup ventures as if they are large, publicly traded companies, the SEC is imposing an unnecessary mound of paperwork on startups. A large corporation may have the lawyers and accountants to fill out the mountain of paperwork imposed on them by the SEC, but a small business can't compete, and that is why they need relief.

This Congress we have an opportunity through bipartisan reforms like this legislation to reverse that troubling trend by removing the regulatory burdens that harm the economy, consumers, and prospects for job growth.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from the Committee on Financial Services, RANDY HULTGREN, for his leadership on this issue.

I urge adoption of this commonsense bipartisan bill.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the balance of time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1343, which passed the Committee on Financial Services by a very large bipartisan vote of 48-11. I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY) for introducing this essential piece of legislation.

As the coowner of a small manufacturing business in New York, this legislation would help companies in New York and across our Nation to grow stronger while allowing hardworking employees to have a stake in a business' future through ownership.

Company leaders across America understand that greater employee investment through ownership will develop a stronger workplace culture and increase productivity by giving private companies more flexibility in retaining and rewarding employees, the people we so vitally need to grow our businesses.

I want to thank the sponsors of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I have heard a number of my colleagues point to the red tape and the unnecessary burdens that are placed on a company that wishes to provide stock compensation.

Let me be clear about what it is that we would require. This is what is required for a company that exceeds the threshold: That they provide a copy of the compensation plan or a contract, if they disclose that; a copy of a summary plan description, if it is an ERISA retirement plan or, if not, a summary of the plan's material terms; risk factors associated with the stock; and the company's most recent financial statements from the last 2 years, which don't need to be audited.

This is important information for anyone receiving stock as compensation in order to understand the value of that stock and not a burdensome requirement on a company, particularly a company of the size that would be required under the increased threshold that is being proposed by this law.

If there is any aspect of this debate which is common sense, it is common sense that a person receiving compensation ought to have information that tells them the value of that compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important debate and discussion. It is one that this body is well-served by taking on.

I do agree, as I said, that this is an important direction for us to take as a nation. And it certainly makes sense that, in order for us to fully all participate in the economy, employee ownership is a value. It creates more productive companies, more competitive companies. It provides better compensation, and, as has been pointed out, it creates more stable organizations less likely to lay people off, more likely to be sustainable companies. That is all good, and that is important.

It comes down to the question of transparency. Employees deserve to know the state of their employer's finances, if they are to accept stock in lieu of monetary compensation. They deserve no less protection than other investors in the company.

We shouldn't fear that kind of transparency. A company that wants its employees to accept stock instead of monetary compensation should embrace this sort of compensation. If they want to empower those employees and they want to make them a part of the company, they should provide them with

the information that helps them understand the value of that ownership.

Transparency is important for individuals to make informed choices, not informed choices coming from a dictate from Washington but information that they have the right to have. It empowers them with knowledge that allows them to make choices about the form of compensation that they would accept.

That is what this legislation really is about, and that is why I oppose the legislation and encourage my colleagues to join me in that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

My colleague on the other side is trying to maybe split some hairs. We heard some rhetoric earlier on the floor here which, I think, shows why many on both sides of the aisle scratch their heads in opposition to this bill. We heard about monied interests. We heard about corporate wish lists. We heard about Enron which is, by the way, a publicly traded company which has absolutely nothing to do with this bill. Now, that all might play really well on a leftwing political base, but that is detached from the realities of what our economy is about.

As we have talked, 60 percent of all new job creation happens in small businesses. These are not corporations. These are LLCs, limited liability corporations. These are subchapter S sole proprietorships. These are small entrepreneurs and innovators.

By the way, I looked up the definition of innovator. It is a person who introduces new methods, ideas, or products. Those are the kind of dynamic elements that we are seeing here. And I think this confusion between corporations and Enron and what we are trying to do here is really a disservice to the American people.

This is about making sure that we update basically an inflation escalator from 1988. We update a rule that the SEC could have the power to do, which it has not done, that benefits employees and benefits those owner-employer's workers who oftentimes, more often than not, work alongside their employees. So they are the ones who are seeing this on a daily basis.

I can just say to you that, as was pointed out by my colleague from across the aisle from Maryland, if we don't do this, what most of those small businesses are going to do is say: You know what, it is just not worth the effort; I am not going to do it. And we will see that lack of upside going to those employees.

As was pointed out by my fellow colleague from Michigan, this is beyond their salary, this is beyond bonuses. This is an additional way to make sure that those relationships get cemented in.

So, at a minimum, all you would be doing is voting to confirm the inflation escalator from 1988. It is not a radical change to the law. This is a common-

sense, I believe, innovative way of trying to make sure that this next generation of workers has the ability to really reap the benefits of success here in the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-75.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 3. GAO REPORT ON IMPACT ON EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the impact on employee ownership of the revisions required by section 2, including the impact on—

- (1) the number of employees participating in compensatory benefit plans; and
- (2) diversification of the securities held by employee pension benefit plans subject to title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 240, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would require GAO to do a study on the impact of this legislation on employee ownership. When employees are offered the opportunity to have an ownership stake in the place they work, there are benefits for both workers and businesses in our entire economy.

Many studies have shown that employee ownership increases productivity, promotes employee retention and stability, and has long-term growth benefits for the business. I believe that the underlying legislation is an important first step to increase employee ownership opportunities, but we should want to make sure that opportunities for participation are widely available to employees at different income levels.

The amendment also requests the GAO to see the effect of this legislation on the diversification of securities held in ERISA-governed retirement plans. As we all know, diversification in any type of financial portfolio can help weather dramatic fluctuations in the economy and limit financial risk for retirees.

By requesting the GAO study, we will be able to understand this legislation's full impact on employee ownership and make necessary changes and improvements in the future.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for offering this important amendment to study the impact of this legislation on employee ownership.

I believe that employee ownership opportunities should be made widely available to all employees of a company, from the boardroom to the shop floor.

As the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) stated, this legislation is an important step forward to increasing ownership opportunities and gives companies more flexibility to make those opportunities available.

We should understand how this legislation would help increase participation for employees at all key levels. A study will help us understand what we can do in the future to incentivize employee ownership and increase employee ownership participation.

If the gentleman would withdraw his amendment, I would like to work with him in requesting GAO to carry out this study.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), and I take the gentleman at his word. I look forward to working with him on this important issue in coordination with GAO.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Swalwell of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1343 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION.

Any exemption, safe harbor, or other authority provided by this Act or a regulation issued pursuant to this Act shall not apply to an issuer if the issuer or a director, officer, or affiliate of the issuer has withheld information from Congress relevant to its investigation of any collusion between persons associated with the Russian Government and persons associated with the presidential campaign of Donald J. Trump to influence the outcome of the 2016 United States presidential election.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Russia attacked our democracy this past Presidential election. This motion asks Members of this House: Do you want to do something about it? Do you want to do all you can to make sure it doesn't happen again?

□ 1615

If you do, support this amendment. If you don't, vote against it, and watch Russia and other adversaries of ours with similar cyber capabilities carry out similar attacks, and the very democracy that we treasure will erode before our eyes. But I believe we are a better body than one that would let another country attack us and then divide us.

What does this motion to recommit do? It requires any company—particularly, I am concerned about financial institutions—to cooperate with all investigations into collusion between President Trump, his campaign, his family, his businesses, and anyone on his team and Russia's interference campaign during the 2016 election.

The evidence is overwhelming. In the 2016 election, Russia ran a multifaceted electronic interference campaign against our democracy. They used paid social media trolls. They hacked Democratic emails and disseminated the information in those emails through cutouts like WikiLeaks and Guccifer 2.0. They had a clear preference for Donald Trump as their candidate. It was ordered by their own President, Vladimir Putin.

And most concerning for every person in this House—should be—they are sharpening their knives, and they intend to do it again. That was the final finding in the intelligence report. They are sharpening their knives and intend to do it again not just to the United States, but to our allies like France and Germany, who are a part of the best check on Russia, the NATO alliance.

Why are we concerned about finances and companies cooperating with the United States in this investigation? Well, we know from the Kremlin's playbook that they use financial entanglements as a means to recruit individuals or to peddle influence.

Why are we concerned about financial ties among Donald Trump and his team? Because unlike any Presidential candidate in the history of our Presidential elections, there are an unprecedented amount of personal, political, and financial ties to a foreign adversary. They include, but are not limited to:

Paul Manafort, where it is alleged he was paid by pro-Russian Ukraine Gov-

ernment individuals and also paid up to \$10 million a year by Vladimir Putin's associates;

Former national security adviser Michael Flynn, who should have known better as the former Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, should have known about Russia's playbook and their ability to influence people, but after leaving the DIA, went over to Moscow, sat next to Vladimir Putin, and was paid by Russia's propaganda tool, Russia Today, also known as RT, who General Flynn would have known is an arm of Russia's intelligence services;

Donald J. Trump, Jr., who said in 2008, in terms of high-end product influx into the United States, Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross section of a lot of our assets. In Dubai, and certainly with our project in SoHo, and anywhere in New York, we see a lot of money pouring in from Russia;

President Trump, who has invested in the past in Russia: over half a dozen trademarks granted to him in Russia, a vodka brand he tried to peddle in Russia, a Miss Universe contest that he held in Moscow in 2013, and Russia has invested in our President. There are Russian businessowners who have bought condos in his Trump Tower building. There are loans from banks that have paid fines for laundering money through Russia. There is a home sale in 2008 where the President reaped 129 percent in profit. He bought a home in 2004 in West Palm Beach for \$40 million; sold it in 2008, as the real estate market was collapsing, for over \$90 million; sold it to a Russian businessman known as the fertilizer king. No one else in that ZIP Code reaped a profit of 129 percent.

So why are banks particularly relevant for this motion? We know they are used by Russia to move money and extend influence. Their cooperation will be crucial to understanding how Russia finances its interference campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit and get to the bottom of exactly what happened with Russia.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out a couple of things.

The Senate Banking Committee has moved an identical bill forward, unannounced, recently.

Regarding the subject matter that the gentleman from California was throwing out, this bill is not about anything other than providing hard-working Americans an opportunity to succeed. It is not about relitigating the last election or even about Susan Rice illegally unmasking American citizens. This is about an underlying bill that will help American citizens.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion to recommit, and I urge them to vote "yes" on the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 228, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

YEAS—185

Adams	Evans	Moore
Aguilar	Foster	Moulton
Barragan	Fudge	Nadler
Bass	Gabbard	Napolitano
Beatty	Gallego	Neal
Bera	Garamendi	Nolan
Beyer	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Bishop (GA)	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Blumenauer	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Blunt Rochester	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bonamici	Grijalva	Panetta
Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
F.	Hanabusa	Payne
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Pelosi
Brown (MD)	Heck	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Bustos	Himes	Peterson
Butterfield	Hoyer	Pingree
Capuano	Huffman	Pocan
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Polis
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Quigley
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Keating	Rosen
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kihuen	Rush
Cleaver	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sánchez
Cohen	Kind	Sarbanes
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kuster (NH)	Schiff
Cooper	Langevin	Schneider
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Costa	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Scott, David
Crist	Lee	Serrano
Crowley	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Sinema
DeFazio	Loeb	Sires
DeGette	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Delaney	Lowenthal	Soto
DeLauro	Lowe	Speier
DelBene	Lujan Grisham,	Swalwell (CA)
Demings	M.	Takano
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Maloney,	Titus
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Tonko
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Torres
F.	Matsui	Tsongas
Ellison	McCollum	Vargas
Engel	McGovern	Veasey
Eshoo	McNerney	Vela
Españillat	Meeks	Velázquez
Esty	Meng	Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—228

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

NOT VOTING—16

Bishop (UT)
Bridenstine
Davis, Danny
Frankel (FL)
Grothman
Jones
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
McEachin
Murphy (FL)
Poe (TX)
Rohrabacher
Slaughter
Suozi
Visclosky

□ 1644

Messrs. NEWHOUSE, KINZINGER, WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Messrs. CULBERSON, COLLINS of Georgia, LOUDERMILK, HUDSON, THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, WALKER, COOK, MULLIN, BANKS of

Indiana, GRAVES of Georgia, and ROKITA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”
Messrs. DOGGETT and CÁRDENAS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 215.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 215.

Stated against:

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 215.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 331, nays 87, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

YEAS—331

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Clay
Clever
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan

Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—87

Adams
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clarke (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Conyers
Crist
Cummings
DeFazio
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Espallat
Evans
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Crist
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
McCollum
McGovern
Meng
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Pallone
Payne
Pingree
Pocan
Raskin
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Serrano
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Smith (WA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Velázquez
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Bridenstine
Davis, Danny
Grothman
McEachin
Murphy (FL)
Poe (TX)
Rice (SC)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Slaughter
Visclosky

□ 1657

Mr. DEFAZIO changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. ESTY and Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 50

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 50.

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

There was no objection.

EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of the Equal Pay Act in 1963, it has been illegal for an employer to pay a woman less than a man for the same work. But the unfortunate reality is that today, over 50 years later, women are still making less than men, and that is unacceptable.

Labor Department statistics cite, when comparing median salaries for all annual full-time jobs, women are making 81 cents on the dollar compared to men. Some of this is from blatant bias and discrimination, which is illegal and unacceptable. But most of the pay gap comes from factors like women going into lower-paying career fields; seeking flexibility since they are still primary caregivers for children and, increasingly, parents; or not being able to afford child care.

Here in the House, I am working on putting forward ideas and solutions to empower women to close this pay gap. Last year I joined my colleagues to create and lead a Working Group on Women in the 21st century workforce. It is examining the challenges women still face and working to expand equal opportunity and improve outcomes for all women.

Mr. Speaker, I have been fighting for women my whole life. I know we still have work to do, and I am committed to making equal opportunity for women a reality. After all, this is America and we pick the best man for the job, even if she is a woman, and that means making sure she is getting paid what she deserves.

□ 1700

CONGRATULATING TEXAS WESLEYAN MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my alma mater, Texas Wesleyan University. On March 21, 2017, Texas Wesleyan's men's basketball team brought home their second NAIA title to Fort Worth, Texas. From the start, Texas Wesleyan Rams were up against a tough fight as they faced off with Life University in the championship match.

Thanks to the Ram's MVP, Dion Rogers, who scored 28 points in the final match, and with another 21 points scored by Ryan Harris, the Rams were led to victory.

But the road to the championship wasn't easy. The Rams showed true perseverance, heart, and dedication to win 5 games in 6 days against the toughest competition in the Nation.

Congratulations to the Rams, the coaching staff, parents, families, and the city of Fort Worth for this hard fought victory.

Go Rams.

Mr. Speaker, the Rams were not the only team making Fort Worth proud. Just 9 days later, Texas Christian University across town also won a championship, and my colleague, KAY GRANGER, who represents west Fort Worth, is here to tell that story.

CONGRATULATING TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY'S MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Texas Christian University's men's basketball team on their National Invitational Tournament championship.

After a 12-win season last year, the Horned Frogs showed the grit and tenacity my hometown of Fort Worth is known for. They finished the season with 24 wins.

With their win over the Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets in the title game last week, the Horned Frogs capped off a memorable and historic comeback season. In fact, this 2017 NIT title is Texas Christian University's first postseason championship in school history.

I want to recognize the TCU players and coaches for a job well done. Go Frogs.

EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Equal Pay Day. The year is 2017, and women, especially women of color, still earn significantly less than their male counterparts.

Pay inequality disproportionately impacts women of color. For example, White women earn 80 cents to every dollar that her White male counterpart makes, African-American women earn an average of 63 cents per every dollar, and Latina women on average earn 54 cents for every dollar.

This may seem like mere pennies on the dollar, but, over a lifetime, this translates to an estimated loss of almost \$700,000 for a high school graduate and \$1.2 million for a college graduate. \$1.2 million—can you imagine what these earnings mean to working families of today? That is health insurance, retirement savings, and food on the table. Unequal pay for equal work just doesn't add up. It is morally and mathematically wrong.

Pay inequality is not only a women's issue, but a family issue. To my male colleagues, I ask: In 2017, do you not believe in strong women? In 2017, do you not believe in equality?

NATIONAL PET ADOPTION DAY

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about H. Res. 133, a bill I introduced with my friend and Texas colleague, Congressman MARC VEASEY.

This resolution expresses support for the designation of April 11 as National Pet Adoption Day and the month of April as National Pet Adoption Month. Simply, we are aiming to highlight the importance of pet adoption.

Mr. Speaker, each year, 2.7 million adoptable dogs and cats are euthanized in the United States. As a rancher and lifelong animal lover, this is heartbreaking.

The Humane Society of the United States, ASPCA, Animal Welfare Institute, and local shelters such as PAWS Shelter of Central Texas have endorsed this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we request that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe April 11 as National Pet Adoption Day and the month of April as National Pet Adoption Month.

More than 60 Members of Congress have signed on to our bipartisan resolution, and I encourage others to do so. For those who may be watching this back home, call your Representative in Washington and have them support this bill.

In God We Trust.

EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Equal Pay Day. This day marks how far into this year that a woman must work to earn what a man earned up to December 31 of last year.

In the United States, a woman is paid 20 percent less than her male counterpart. In California, a woman earns 86 percent of what men earn. Pay disparities in California are even more stark for women of color. Latinas make just 56 percent of what a man makes.

In order to continue to close the pay gap, Congress must pass the Paycheck

Fairness Act. That law would strengthen the Equal Pay Act by requiring employers to demonstrate that wage differences are not due to gender, and they would hold employers accountable for discriminatory actions.

This bill, which I proudly cosponsored, is only one step forward. Congress must also pass legislation to address family leave and fight to protect a woman's right to choose, because, ultimately, the challenges and burdens women face are shared by all Americans, and when half of our citizenry is in any way impeded from their full potential, all of our country suffers.

MICHIGAN FARMERS AND TRUCKERS AID WILDFIRE VICTIMS

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the selfless actions of farmers in my district and across Michigan. In early March, wildfires spread through Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Colorado, devastating families and destroying crops and livestock—farmers' income for next year.

Hearing of the devastation, Michigan farmers and truckers mobilized quickly to bring aid to the farmers in need of immediate assistance. Selfless individuals have donated their resources, including over 250 bales of hay, fencing, cattle feed, financial support, and more. Convoys of volunteers, farmers, and truckers have volunteered their time and their vehicles to drive these resources hundreds of miles to affected areas. Farmers in 68 of 83 Michigan counties have donated supplies or driven to deliver aid, and their efforts are expanding. This weekend, 50 students from Sanilac County 4-H are delivering aid to Ashland.

These selfless acts are truly inspiring and humbling. I am proud to recognize their efforts and was happy to be able to aid some of these efforts by getting permits issued for their travel.

EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is Equal Pay Day, and I am privileged to rise in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act today. This legislation would strengthen the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by ensuring that women can hold employers accountable for what they earn and challenge discrimination. Representative ROSA DELAURO has introduced this bill for two decades, which is two decades too long.

Women in Ohio make 75 cents for every dollar a man makes, which is unacceptable. It is time we close the decades-old loophole that prevents the United States from closing this gender pay gap once and for all.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would close loopholes in the Equal Pay Act of

1963, by holding employers accountable for discriminatory practices. The bill would end the practice of pay secrecy, ease workers' ability to individually or jointly challenge pay discrimination, and strengthen the available remedies for wronged employees.

President Trump said on equal pay: "If they do the same job, they should get the same pay." Boy, do I agree. So let's make it happen.

WAS SURVEILLANCE OF TRUMP ILLEGAL?

(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, criminal laws may well have been broken when the Obama administration conducted surveillance of candidate and then-President-elect Trump and those close to him, including his family members.

It is reported that a former national security adviser under President Obama ordered the names of Trump associates to be revealed rather than kept confidential, as would normally be the case with any American citizen.

This exposing and disseminating personal information may well have been a criminal act. A serious question is: Who authorized the surveillance in the first place? To direct intelligence or law enforcement agencies to conduct surveillance of political opponents is a violation of the Constitution and a threat to our democracy. But the Obama administration wrongfully asked the IRS to target conservative organizations, so anything is possible.

One thing is for sure—the American people need to learn a lot more about what the Obama administration did and who did it.

NEW YORK IS NUMBER ONE IN CLOSING THE GAP

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, think all the way back to New Year's Day—94 days ago—and contemplate for just a moment the fact that if a full-time working woman were to take all of the money she made between way back then and today, and she added that to what she had made working all of last year, well, she just now would have an amount equal to what a typical man made just last year. Well, welcome to Equal Pay Day.

The exact size of the gender pay gap can vary. It tends to be smaller when you are younger, worse when you are older, and worse still if you are a woman of color. Even where you choose to live can make a difference.

My thanks to the Democratic staff of the Joint Economic Committee, where I sit as the ranking member, for producing a new report that updates all these numbers, as well as State-by-State numbers on the gender wage gap.

I encourage all my colleagues to take a look at this report to see just how your State is doing. The best news I read all day was that New York State is number one. That was good news.

RECOGNIZING GREENBERG TRAUURIG

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Greenberg Traurig, an iconic law firm located in my congressional district whose growth, over the past 50 years, has been symbolic of the growth of our south Florida community.

In 1967, attorneys Larry Hoffman, Mel Greenberg, and Robert Traurig saw an opportunity to capitalize on south Florida's emergence as a center of global commerce and joined together to found the law firm Greenberg Traurig Hoffman. Over time, these visionaries played an important role in defining the south Florida skyline and its corporate landscape. Now their firm has expanded across Florida, across our country, and even internationally.

Fifty years after its founding, Greenberg Traurig today has more than 2,000 attorneys practicing in 38 locations on three continents. With a culture strongly rooted in providing legal excellence for clients and an unparalleled commitment to community service, Greenberg Traurig prospered and grew alongside Miami to the extent that both are now global influencers.

I am truly proud to have Greenberg Traurig, founded in my congressional district, as a continued partner in the growth of south Florida, and I wish the firm another 50 years of continued success.

RECOGNIZING ZACH MAIORANA AND HIS BATTLE WITH CYSTIC FIBROSIS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of my constituent, Zach Maiorana, and his ongoing battle with cystic fibrosis. At birth, Zach was diagnosed with cystic fibrosis and has been courageously battling this condition for the past 2½ years.

Cystic fibrosis is a complex, genetic disease that primarily affects the lungs and digestive systems. Those diagnosed with CF require intensive daily treatment and regular physician visits to maintain a healthy lifestyle.

Despite this diagnosis, Zach and his family have channeled their determination into becoming advocates for those impacted by cystic fibrosis—a true testament to their perseverance and will to live their lives to the fullest extent possible.

Now it is up to us. This Congress can be the one to prioritize research and

funding to combat this disease and continue making progress. In 1955, children born with CF likely would not make it through elementary school. Today, more than half of those living with CF are older than age 18, and many are living into their thirties, forties, and beyond. Investment into new therapies for this disease and continuous focus on improvement have made promising gains for those suffering with CF.

I commend Zach and the entire Maiorana family for their strength, and I hope that my colleagues will stand up to cystic fibrosis and advocate for all those who are affected in this country.

□ 1715

JOB AND TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAETZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) in the beginning of our Special Order this evening.

REMEMBERING DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.,
ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF HIS DEATH

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I commend Representative KAPTUR for her outstanding leadership in this Congress and past Congresses. She has been a beacon of hope for so many of my constituents and so many poor and disenfranchised Americans. She never cowered in the face of those who restrict the rights of all.

Ms. KAPTUR has been my friend and someone whom I have shared so many conversations with about justice and fighting for justice, creating a nation where all people have the opportunity to have freedom, justice, and equality. I want to commend her for being such a stalwart battler for the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 49th anniversary of one of the darkest days in the history of this Nation: the day that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., America's drum major for justice, was assassinated.

Dr. King was murdered while standing on the balcony of the Lorraine Motel in Memphis, Tennessee, on April 4, 1968. He was there to advocate for the rights of Black sanitation workers who were fighting for their dignity: for equal pay, for equal treatment, and for racial justice in the American workplace.

In one of the dimmest hours in our history, a voice of reason, a voice of mercy, a voice of compassion, a voice for justice, a voice of the beloved community was silenced. Yet, Mr. Speaker, his work to hold the United States to its constitutional promises that are rooted in the very fabric of our Declaration of Independence remains largely incomplete.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, America remains a divided nation, even more so now. We are tremendously disconnected from the ideals set forth by Dr. King's monumental "I Have a Dream" speech. Today, we still live in two Americas: one white and privileged, another filled with people of color, the poor, the disabled, and those lost in the margins, where people of color—Black and Brown—continue to be judged by the color of their skin rather than the content of their character.

In the year 2017, Mr. Speaker, we find the names of countless men and women who have lost their lives at the hands of too many law enforcement officials and too many police departments all across this country. Those individuals, Mr. Speaker, are now etched in the social justice history of this Nation because they were first judged by the color of their skin and not by the content of their character.

The list is far-reaching, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking of Michael Brown, Tamir Rice, Freddie Gray, Laquan McDonald, Alton Sterling, Philando Castile, Rekia Boyd, Tanisha Anderson, Yvette Smith, Shereese Francis, and, lastly, 4-year-old Aiyana Stanley-Jones and so many, many others. I could go on and on and on, but the names of the men, women, and children victimized by errant and wayward police departments all across this Nation would keep us here for days, even months, if we were to recite them all.

These stalwart young citizens are joined also by the many martyrs who lost their lives in the struggle for American justice, just like Dr. King: Viola Liuzzo; Emmett Till; Jimmie Lee Jackson; Medgar Evers; Chaney, Goodman, and Schwerner; the four little girls in Birmingham, Alabama; Fred Hampton; and many, many others who gave their lives during the fifties and sixties.

In my hometown of Chicago, Mr. Speaker, the killing of Laquan McDonald rocked our city and the Nation by pulling the scab off a festering wound of police relations and the Black community.

McDonald's death by 16 shots from a single police weapon fired by a police officer led to multiple investigations of previous police-involved shootings and also sparked the investigation by the United States Department of Justice under then-Attorney General Loretta Lynch and the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois. That investigation concluded that the Chicago Police Department officers engage "in a pattern or practice of using force, including deadly force," that is a unreasonable. This report also found the Chicago Police Department has failed to hold officers accountable when they use force contrary to Department policy or otherwise commit misconduct.

To put it bluntly, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice found and reported that the Chicago Police Department engages in force in violation of the United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today because I am just beside myself. I am angry. I am so fed up, Mr. Speaker, because I learned recently that Attorney General Jefferson Sessions has issued a memorandum ordering officials at the Justice Department to review police reform consent agreements all across the country, including the agreement that is being negotiated with the City of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has fallen so very, very far. Dr. King's dream has not been realized in this Nation. The day before his assassination—this Attorney General has retreated so very, very far from the high ideals of American justice.

It is proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that police agencies—not all police officers, not all agencies, not all departments—but there are too many police departments, too many law enforcement officials, too many police officers who have wantonly killed innocent young men of color in this Nation, and it did not just begin in this year. It has been going on for decades. We are now at a point where some departments have been placed under a consent decree. The U.S. Attorney is now trying to retreat from that pattern.

I am here, Mr. Speaker, to ask—to demand—that Attorney General Sessions retreat from his position, that he stop this memorandum from circulating in the department, and that he see the light of day that many innocent American citizens are being killed because of the wayward actions of those police officers who think that they are above the law. They can't just continue to kill wantonly and think that they are above the American law and the American Constitution.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RUSH is always calling the Nation to its higher principles. I thank him so very much for sharing our Special Order this evening.

Congressman DAVID CICILLINE of Rhode Island is here on the floor. I also want to thank Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI for sharing his hour with us.

The focus tonight really is on jobs and trade, an issue on the mind of millions and millions of Americans. We have been joined by Congressman BRENDAN BOYLE of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as well.

I will place this up for the Nation to see. It is a chart showing just U.S. trade relations with Mexico and Canada and what has happened since the deal was negotiated back in the early 1990s. It was also prepared before that, during the 1980s, when the United States actually had some trade surpluses on this continent with both Canada and Mexico.

This shows, in 1994, when NAFTA was actually enacted. You could see the United States begin to kind of fall into deficit. Then we had just a precipitous trade deficit, including the collapse of the peso after the NAFTA trade agreement was signed.

This is serious business for our country because this red ink represents lost jobs, lost productive power, and communities in disrepair across this country, where production units were just picked up and put either north or south of the border.

Tonight, we want to focus on President Trump's Manufacturing Jobs Initiative, which he announced during the campaign and afterwards. Here were his words:

Everything is going to be based on bringing our jobs back, the good jobs, the real jobs. They have to come back.

Well, after all we have lost, we certainly do need job creation in this country.

□ 1730

We are now into the third month of Mr. Trump's Presidency and closing in on his first 100 days in office, a period when most Presidents are able to pass something through this Congress that really matters to the American people. I remember when we were able to save Social Security back during the 1980s and when a Congress was elected in response to Ronald Reagan's excesses, and it was in the first quarter of the year that that was done. So we are waiting. It is 100 days now, and nothing significant has been done on the jobs and trade front.

Candidate Donald Trump's campaign for President in my region of America was actually founded on the principle of fixing jobs and trade. People listened. But if we look at this first 100 days, we see that he has really taken a back seat to his billionaire donors and their interests and a staff that seems to be more and more peopled with individuals who spent a whole lot of time at Goldman Sachs, which is a company that has been notorious in helping to outsource jobs.

Throughout the campaign, Mr. Trump touted his trade policies, assuring voters he would renegotiate NAFTA. Well, we have been waiting. During a debate, he said: "NAFTA is the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere, but certainly ever signed in this country."

I would say that that agreement is the foundational agreement, the precepts on which all subsequent trade deals have been negotiated that have placed America in a red ink position: many more imports coming into this country, many more of our jobs being outsourced elsewhere than our exports going out.

So I ask: Are the strong planks for a new NAFTA part of what the Trump administration is proposing?

Well, no. A leaked draft notice last week revealed a tepid agenda on trade that is little more than a rehash of what the President said in his campaign rhetoric. It is not a real plan. The one action item identified in the Trump trade agenda is the announcement of a study to find out why the United States is losing in global trade. It actually doesn't focus completely on

NAFTA itself, and we need healing in this hemisphere before we start looking around the world.

The reality is we know why the deficit is so bad. Bad trade deals have led to a loss of nearly 4 million American jobs and a deficit just last month of \$43.6 billion. President Trump promised a trade deal that would get Americans back to work and reduce our deficit. Instead, our deficit with NAFTA and Mexico and Canada is 31 percent higher. It got worse than a year ago. So I hope the President understands the real urgency of stopping U.S. job outsourcing, especially in the manufacturing sector. He should do more than pay lip service. He should really take a look at how thin his administration proposals have been on renegotiating this agreement. He should establish real goals and timetables for U.S. trade to drive policy that will fix these job-killing trade agreements and deliver real benefits for the American people.

Now, we have Members who have been very active on this trade issue since being sworn in here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to Congressman DAVID CICILLINE, former mayor of Providence, Rhode Island, and a very strong leader for working men and women across this country.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to begin by thanking her for her extraordinary leadership on this issue. From the very day that I arrived in Congress, she has been a passionate, articulate, effective voice for working men and women and for the impact that bad trade agreements have had on the economy of this country and on her region, but on working families all across America. She has done it consistently and relentlessly. It has been a privilege to work with her, but I really do want to acknowledge her extraordinary leadership and thank her for convening this Special Order hour tonight.

As Ms. KAPTUR mentioned, the consequences of bad trade agreements have been felt by many regions throughout the country, but in my home State of Rhode Island, as an example, we lost more than 41,000 jobs since NAFTA was enacted. These are good wages. These are jobs that pay, on average, above nonmanufacturing jobs—jobs that really help build the economy of our State and of this country.

When President Trump was elected, as Ms. KAPTUR mentioned, during the course of his campaign he promised that he would do something different with our trade deals. He promised hardworking Americans that he would deliver results, but we are now 10 weeks into his Presidency, and we have seen a lot of talk and no action on fair trade.

The President promised to label China a currency manipulator on day one. He hasn't done that.

The President promised to use American steel for the pipelines. He hasn't done that.

The President promised to make NAFTA work for American workers, but as Congresswoman KAPTUR mentioned, there is a leaked letter from the White House that shows he is already looking to implement the same failed policies that are good for corporate America and bad for American workers.

The executive orders that President Trump signed failed to address the real challenges that are facing hardworking Rhode Islanders and hardworking Americans.

Let's be very clear, Mr. Speaker, we don't need another report on trade policy. We need concrete actions that create good-paying jobs, that honor hard work with good wages and grow our economy. We need to end incentives that encourage corporations to ship jobs overseas and raise the Federal minimum wage. And while we should collect unpaid penalties, that is only going to happen if the President takes real action to clamp down on cheating, end job-killing trade deals, and create new standards that benefit working Americans.

It already seems that President Trump's campaign promises to get tough on trade were all bark and no bite. If President Trump does indeed deliver on his promise to renegotiate NAFTA, any new agreement must include strong labor and environmental standards, strong Buy America provisions, prescription drug cost reductions, enforceable currency manipulation standards, and other pro-worker, pro-consumer requirements.

Mr. Speaker, there is a terrific publication that I know you are aware of entitled "The New Rules of the Road: A Progressive Approach to Globalization," prepared by Jared Bernstein, who is a senior fellow at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a former chief economist and economic adviser to Vice President Biden; and Lori Wallach, a lawyer and someone who has been director of Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch since 1995.

It really sets forth the kind of principles that should guide a new trade deal: that we need to ensure that, first of all, the way it is negotiated ensures that it is going to benefit working men and women. We cannot allow corporate elites to dictate how NAFTA is renegotiated. The agreement could potentially become more damaging for working families and for our environment in the countries that we work with. If done wrong, it could increase job offshoring, push down wages, and expand the special power and protections that NAFTA provides to corporate interests that are reflected in the original deal.

What we have to ensure is that what President Trump doesn't do is make a bad trade deal worse and pander to corporate and multinational corporations and his sort of crony friends, and the process by which this will be renegotiated will help to determine that. The provisions that are in it need to be

guided by what is good for American workers and what is good to help grow American jobs.

So not unlike so many other areas, it is disappointing because there has been a lot of good rhetoric about this, but very little action by the administration. I think we are all here tonight to participate in this Special Order led by the gentlewoman from Ohio to let the administration know that we are not going anywhere, that we are going to demand that NAFTA be renegotiated, that it be a trade deal that works for American jobs and American workers, and we are not going to allow the President to simply use rhetoric but actually not do the hard work to strike a better deal for American jobs and American workers.

I want to just end where I began, by thanking the gentlewoman for yielding. This is an issue of tremendous importance to my home State, where manufacturing is so important, the birthplace of the American industrial revolution, and one of the reasons I continue to work hard on the whole Make It In America agenda. We need to start creating conditions for the creation of good manufacturing jobs here in America so we can export American-made goods, not American jobs. I thank again the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Congressman CICILLINE. He hit it right on the head. We ought to be exporting goods, not importing this many more than we export, and we ought to be creating jobs right here. I am sure he has seen companies from his community, from his State, literally picked up and then magically transported to some other environment, like Mexico, in one of the maquiladoras, and maybe windshield wipers or plastic parts or auto parts that used to be made in the United States then are made down there. I certainly have seen it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Absolutely.

Ms. KAPTUR. If we look at this chart, just for those who are listening to us this evening, if you go back to the mid-1970s, as Congressman CICILLINE pointed out, you will see the United States was pretty buoyant. We were actually exporting more than we were importing.

But then when China Most Favored Nation passed in 1979, 1994 NAFTA passed, and all of a sudden what was happening is the reverse flow started. We started importing more than we were exporting, and every time you get a billion dollars of red ink, you lose 5,000 more jobs in this country.

Well, my gosh, as NAFTA actually took full bore and then China permanent normal trade relations took effect here, CAFTA, which was the Central American Free Trade Agreement, here was the Colombian Free Trade Agreement, here was the Korean Free Trade Agreement, every single agreement that happened, we ended up getting more imports into our country than exports out, and promises were not kept.

Our focus tonight is mainly on NAFTA, but if we look at Korea, they were supposed to be taking 50,000 cars from us. We were supposed to have more balanced trade. Well, guess what, they didn't keep up their end of the bargain. Other markets around the world, such as Japan, remain closed to this day to cars from other places in the world.

You say: Congresswoman, that can't be possible.

I have seen it with my own eyes. I have visited there many times. When I first began my career, Japan had about—oh, 3 percent of the cars on their streets were from anyplace else in the world. Today maybe it is 4 percent, maybe it is 3.5 percent, but there are all kinds of nontariff barriers where they keep cars out. Yet you look at our country, they have put manufacturing plants here, they send product over here. It simply isn't a two-way street, and Japan is the second largest market in the world for automobiles. So the trade isn't fair. The American people know this. They are trying to fix this. It really requires the President's leadership to do it.

Congressman CICILLINE talked about steel trade—I just want to put on the Record—with China, and we see what a big player she is in the market and doesn't play fair. I just want to put some numbers on the Record. China's expansion of steel since 2000 has grown to over 2,300 million metric tons. That is a big number to imagine. But only 1,500 million metric tons are needed to actually serve the global marketplace. So what you have got is over 800 million metric tons of steel just floating around the world in warehouses and stored up in provinces in China, and they are dumping the steel.

Why does that matter?

Because in places like I represent, Lorain, Ohio, U.S. Steel just pink-slipped hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of more workers. Republic Steel, which sits next door to U.S. Steel, has shuttered their plant because of imported steel.

The President could do something about that. He could have done something about that the second day he was in office. Nothing has been done. All these workers, some of whom have worked in these plants for 28 years, in modernized plants where hundreds of millions of dollars of investment have been made to upgrade the capacity of these plants, rather than save that capacity for our country for the years ahead and to try to deal with this Chinese dumping, they are allowing more workers and more companies to go belly up in this country. It is wrong. It is wrong. This needs to be fixed. This is big time for jobs and economic growth in our country.

I want to thank Congressman BRENDAN F. BOYLE, who understands this problem full well. As a younger Member of Congress and one who really speaks on behalf of working men and women in Pennsylvania and coast to

coast, I thank him so much for taking time and joining us tonight. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I have to say that the working people of not just Ohio but this country are very lucky to have MARCY KAPTUR fighting for them and for her years of service. There is not a more passionate champion for working Americans in this House than the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I come here not with a prepared text, but really to speak from my heart. As the son of two hard-working parents who were working in industries that were supported by organized labor, and it depresses me to see the great decline in our workforce today that is in a union.

Now, the subject that we are speaking about tonight is about the trade deficit, and I just started talking about unions. To some that might seem as if I am off topic, but there is no question the two are absolutely related.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a fallacy that sometimes is out there about those of us who may be critical about NAFTA and other trade deals. I am not antitrade. I recognize that the United States of America, despite being a large country of over 320 million people, we are only 5 percent of the world's population. We must engage in trade with the rest of the world. I also look at those economic statistics that tell us, without question, the most productive workforce in the world today is the American worker.

So if the grounds of trade are fair and if the rules of the game are fair, we can compete with anyone. Our workers can compete and outcompete anyone in the world. But, Mr. Speaker, they have not been fighting on a fair playing field.

Now, let's not forget that over the last 20 to 23 years or so since NAFTA was passed, that happens to also coincide with this point in American history in which most wages have been stagnant. Indeed, for middle class people and lower middle class folks, their real wages have declined, not to mention the most lower income quintile, which has seen a dramatic drop in real wages.

I think that it would be unfair for any of us to say that this is because of NAFTA or that this is because of any specific trade deal. But it is also very fair for us to point out that none of these trade deals did anything to raise the living standards and wages of American workers. Here we are in an environment in Congress in which, recently, we were talking about the TPP and moving forward with other trade deals and talking about nothing really to raise wages and living standards for our own workers here at home.

Look at the example of NAFTA, something that was promised to raise wage standards in Mexico, that we would benefit from having on our

southern border a country with a rising middle class population. There is no question that would be in the best interest of the United States and, obviously, in the best interest of Mexico.

However, Mr. Speaker, here we are in the last few years with more jobs going to Mexico, including the closing of the Nabisco plant in my district that I stood on the well of the House floor and protested against. It goes to a nice new facility in Monterrey, Mexico. Is that helping to raise wages in Mexico? Actually, wages are lower today in Mexico than they were 3 years ago. That is an economic fact.

Under the letter of the law of NAFTA, that is something that our administration could take up with our Mexican counterparts, but they don't. Instead, we see Nabisco. And I am taking one specific example because it affected my district. We see them closing a plant that had existed in Philadelphia since before my parents were born lay off 325 workers, lay off double that in Chicago, and move to Monterrey, Mexico, which they can do in accordance with NAFTA.

If we are going to move forward with new trade deals, which inevitably at some point in years moving forward we will, I would simply ask—and strongly suggest—that we look out not just for the corporate interest, not just for what is in the best interest of consumers, but also what is in the best interest of American workers.

We should not be surprised that we see this tumult in the United States politically at the same time that we are seeing stagnant wages and stagnant benefits for decades. Those two are inextricably linked.

Mr. Speaker, finally, let me say to all those who are interested in working on this trade issue on both sides of the aisle: You have committed and passionate public servants on this side of the aisle who want to get it right, who want to ensure that we finally have trade deals that put American workers first and foremost.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BOYLE. He has raised so many important issues tonight on jobs and trade and how we fix this problem for the people of our country and, frankly, the world.

One of the issues is which banks are actually financing this outsourcing. I can tell you, they are not banks in the communities that I represent. They are not big enough to put all that money, to actually take these big companies and move them out of the United States and plunk them down in a Third World environment. It is largely Wall Street banks that do that. So they fly over the heads of people that live in communities across this country.

The gentleman talked about Nabisco moving. I had an experience. I went out to Newton, Iowa, a few years ago when Maytag was closing. I felt so bad as an American that a gold star label company that had manufactured reliable, high-quality products in our country

was closing. I learned what was happening. What I didn't realize was that the production that closed in Newton, Iowa, large parts of it were moved south of the border.

I was traveling down to Monterrey, Mexico. I was going down there, actually, to find out what had happened to someone who was murdered, who had been a student in our community and was murdered in Monterrey, Mexico. We went by this big complex that said Maytag, Amana, all of these American companies that had been outsourced to Monterrey. I said: Stop the cab. I am taking a picture. This is exactly what I am talking about.

I said: Let me ask a question to some of the people that were walking by and living in the area. I said: Can the people who work in that Maytag plant in Monterrey, can they afford to buy the washers they make?

Guess what? No. In fact, where they lived, there was no running water. There was no decent water to drink.

I thought: This is what we stand for as a country? What is wrong with this picture? For our country, in districts like mine, the results of all this lopsided trade are that citizens in northern Ohio, on average, are earning \$7,000 less than they did when this century began, because of this. The playing field is simply not level.

Several years ago, I was visited by a group of United Automobile Workers from Milwaukee, Wisconsin. They told me—and I just love these wonderful, generous human beings. They had all been pink-slipped. They had just lost their jobs. They came to see me to tell me their stories on trade and what it had done to them.

They said: Marcy, we are training those who are going to replace us in Mexico. But we went down to Mexico, and we felt so sorry to see where the people lived and the conditions under which they were working that we are collecting medical items, and we are doing humanitarian shipments to that town.

I thought: Oh, my goodness, what a generous group of Americans who are facing such horror in their own lives and yet they were doing that for people who live on this continent—and were, by the way, going to be earning, like, one-twentieth of what the workers in Milwaukee earned. So it was all about cheap labor.

I really felt bad for the cheapening of the Maytag product. I am probably going to get in trouble for saying that, but it is the truth. I certainly learned a lesson by traveling to Newton, Iowa.

Now, another story, this is on plastic seals. I happened to visit a plant in the Tijuana area, and I walked through the plant in Mexico. This company had been moved from Ohio and its equipment shipped down to Mexico.

I walked through this plant. It was about 100 degrees that particular day. I turned the corner. There were no fans taking out the exhaust. It was bloody hot, and it had to be 110 degrees. These

men were working. They had T-shirts on. It was very hot that summer. They were pulling down these large levers because they were melting plastic and rubber. I witnessed this.

I thought: Boy, that really looks dangerous with that thing that they are pulling down because it was moving like this. I thought: Boy, they have got to really pay attention every time they move that steam press down so they don't catch their arm in there.

I took pictures, and I sent them back to Ohio. I got a letter from one of my constituents. This constituent said: Congresswoman, did you really take a look at the picture you took?

I thought: Well, yeah, I was looking at the workers.

He said: No. No. Look at the machine, the machine, up in the right-hand corner, the button with the tape over it.

I said: Oh, yeah.

He said: I used to do that job. Do you know what that button is?

I said: No.

He said: That is the safety button.

In other words, when the equipment was shipped and the machine started, life wasn't worth as much in Mexico, so these workers were working with much greater risk of injury to themselves because the equipment had been tinkered with in a way that told me a lot about health and safety standards and how they are really not enforced in places like Mexico.

I finally want to end with a story that relates to trade. It doesn't just have to do with goods. It has to do with human beings, with people, and why negotiating trade deals is so important for what our Constitution says we stand for: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is a country that believes in liberty and justice for all. It has to do with the undocumented workers in our country who are coming from south of our border.

We hear all kinds of rhetoric about that, but the truth is that I face the reality of what happened in the agricultural sector with NAFTA. What happened is we wanted two-way trade with Mexico, but what the trade agreement did is it caused great problems in Mexico in that over 2 million small farmers in Mexico were displaced by the NAFTA agreement because our country was 18 times more efficient in corn agriculture than the Mexican people. These workers and owners of these little ejidos, these little, tiny farms that were subsistence farms, they were just completely obliterated—2 million or more people.

Well, guess what? When you lose your livelihood and the trade agreement doesn't provide for readjustment, what do you think desperate people do? They run anywhere to eat, and north of the border looks pretty attractive.

As I heard all of these speeches during the campaign about what we are going to do on trade and how we are going to fix everything, I have never heard any of the major candidates talk

about: How are you going to fix the problem for the people in Mexico who lost their livelihoods, their ability to produce for themselves?

The undocumented worker problem has a big, big root in Mexico. It was an uncaring set of governments that negotiated these agreements that caused that hemorrhage that creates an endless flow of people who are desperate, who will do anything to survive. You wouldn't want this to happen to your family.

I am all for yellow corn from the United States. I eat corn. I just served it the other night to our family. But when a trade agreement wipes out the livelihoods of millions of people, it upsets an entire continent. So now the solution is not to figure out a way to have readjustment in agriculture in Mexico as part of a renegotiated NAFTA agreement; the answer is supposed to be a wall.

Do you know what? Walls don't feed people. Proper trade agreements feed people when they are done the right way and you don't obliterate people's lives. That is what really matters.

When I see what the White House is producing, I haven't seen anything yet that really gets us to balanced trade accounts in a way that people matter and the communities in which they live matter. And it isn't always a default to what Wall Street wants and cheap labor and substandard working conditions and substandard living conditions.

We have to do better than that. We have to aspire to a system where people are invited into a trade union in which we have rising standards of living, where we have balanced trade accounts again, and where people's incomes and living standards rise. If we don't get there, we are going to have even greater social problems on this continent.

Today, I met with El Salvadoran workers, talking about the conditions in that country, what has happened there with the maquiladoras and the situations that people face in their daily lives. This race to the bottom is not working. It is not working in our country. It is not working in the Latin American countries or in Canada. We simply have to aspire to the highest values that founded this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), someone who knows all about those values. Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO is a true leader of our trade efforts to reform this really terrible trade regimen that isn't helping anyone but the wealthiest investors who have invested in the movement of these companies abroad.

Connecticut we think of as an eastern State close to New York, but Connecticut has been battered in so many corners by trade. Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO is an indefatigable Member of the House. I don't know how the people of Connecticut found her, but keep sending her here because she really

does her job with distinction. I thank her so much for joining us this evening.

□ 1800

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, what a great compliment from someone who is a tigress when it comes to making sure that the working people in her community are represented—that their interests, their families, and their economic security are represented—and who fights on a daily basis to make sure that our families have the economic wherewithal with which to succeed.

The gentlewoman from Ohio is someone who really knows that the biggest problem that we face today in this Nation is that people are in jobs that just don't pay them enough; and that they can't make it, that they are struggling.

When you lay on top of that the direction that our trade agreements have taken us, it reinforces the fact of their lack of wages and of income inequality. And you can't have a discussion about income inequality in this Nation today without starting with wages.

I am struck by those people who tell us that all of this wage stagnation and income inequality is the fault of globalization and technology. No, that is not the case. You just listen to Nobel Laureate Joseph Stiglitz, who said that this inequality and the depression of wages has come from public policy choices. And we have made the wrong public policy choices, as has been evidenced by my colleague's comments.

We support a trade policy that puts American workers before corporate interests. And although President Trump made trade a central focus of his campaign and he promised to fight for working men and women, the broken promises are piling up.

I am deeply disturbed—I know my colleague is—that President Trump's Commerce Secretary, Wilbur Ross, has suggested that the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement is a good place to start for the NAFTA renegotiations. Working men and women deserve a new North American Free Trade Agreement, not more of the same corporate-driven trade policies of the failed Trans-Pacific Partnership—an agreement, as I said, that, as a candidate, President Trump opposed. He spoke all over the country and told people that it had to go, that he was going to renegotiate NAFTA.

This is not the only about-face that this administration has taken on trade. If you listen to the Economic Policy Institute, China's past cheating to manipulate the value of their money has left over 5 million Americans without good-paying jobs. Yet, President Trump has failed to deliver on declaring China a currency manipulator. He said he was going to do that on day one. And he has yet to act on countering our massive \$347 billion trade deficit with China.

He missed his promised deadline to start NAFTA renegotiation in his first 100 days. He has already reneged on his Buy American promise that American

steel would be required for the Keystone XL pipeline. They have waived that requirement, and my colleague knows deeply what has happened to steel workers.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention that hundreds and hundreds of steel workers in my district are getting laid off right now, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut speaks.

We are facing complete closure of two plants. One has already been idled, Republic Steel; and the other, the U.S. Steel plant in Lorain, Ohio, will be by early June.

If the President really wanted to do something to make a statement, what he would do is put an embargo on the products that are being dumped by China and Korea on our market that are forcing this to happen at our steel companies.

There is a glut in the steel market globally. We have about 800 million metric tons of steel that are out there.

What China has been doing is building a steel company in every province to put people to work. Then, what do they do with the steel? They have been storing it because there is so much that the global market can't absorb 800 million more metric tons.

So companies like those I represent get hurt because they are trying to play by the rules; but the rules aren't being enforced properly, so they end up with the short end of the deal that is absolutely backwards. So what the gentlewoman says about steel is right on.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this has been happening all along in so many sectors. When you talk about the various agreements and NAFTA—and actually with regard to currency—what we fought for in the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement was to do something about currency manipulation because everything that may have been negotiated in the NAFTA agreement with tariffs and lowering them and all of that, all of that was for naught when Mexico devalued the peso. Once you do that, then your goods are cheaper than our goods and we suffer. It is the same thing that has happened in Korea, and this is what we were looking at in the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

Despite the Oval Office fanfare last Friday, President Trump's recent executive orders are, frankly, nothing but window dressing. While initiating a new Federal report—a new Federal report, God, there must be unbelievable cavernous institutions and places where we have Federal reports which go nowhere—what they are about is a common way to avoid fixing any problems that we have. The real test is going to be whether or not the Trump administration takes action to create jobs and to reduce the trade deficit.

Improving our trade policy requires new rules, not more of the status quo. And it was Mr. Ross who, I believe, said

that: My gosh, you can't throw out the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. You have to fiddle around the edges with it.

That is where they are going. Again, they are betraying the promises that were made to those workers in your district, those workers in my district, and workers all across the country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, what the gentlewoman from Connecticut is saying is very important because certain States hung in the balance in this past election. Ohio was one of them. Michigan, Pennsylvania, obviously Indiana next door was constant. If you look at each one of those States, those were the ones that actually carried for President Trump in the end because of the jobs and trade issue.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely right. That was a central part of the election last November.

Improving our trade policy requires new rules, as I said, not more status quo. We have to push a trade agenda that will create good-paying jobs and that is going to raise wages here at home. And our coalition is going to continue to hold this administration accountable. What we need to do is to try to reshape the trajectory of modern globalization, one that doesn't exacerbate that economic problem that I spoke about people being in jobs that just don't pay them enough money. The NAFTA agreement put people at such grave risk.

I know that the gentlewoman can recall this as well: we both stood on this House floor all those years ago and we said we were going to lose jobs, that we were going to increase the trade deficit, and that this was not an agreement that would benefit the working men and women of this country.

At that time, quite frankly, we were told by the then-Clinton administration that we were thugs, that we did not understand what was happening, that we were protectionist, all kinds of labels against the thinking that we said that this was not going to benefit us.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, does the gentlewoman from Connecticut remember when Gary Hufbauer said we would have trade surpluses? In other words, this is upside down. It should actually be like this. We would have surpluses then. Well, it is exactly the opposite he testified back then. I will never forget that.

The Peterson Institute said we would have jobs, we would have rising incomes, we would have more benefits for workers. Wrong, wrong, wrong.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we said it then.

What we didn't have at that time was the data, which is now right here on this floor of the House, which is why we were able to defeat the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, because

they couldn't fool us again. They could not fool us again. Not us. They couldn't fool the American people again.

We are not going down that road, not with a reheated Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement or a tweaked North American Free Trade Agreement.

I said we have to reshape that trajectory of modern globalization. It is a trajectory that needs to benefit American workers. It has to foster inclusive growth.

This is not just about large corporations and special interests that will be the beneficiaries of trade agreements. It is about trade agreements that grow our economy, that grow the economic security of the people of this country.

Implementing a new model is not going to be easy. It isn't going to be easy; we know that. But with so much on the line, we understand that it is our obligation to put the American people first, to set those new rules for a 21st century economy and give it our all.

We are going to be absolutely vigilant with where the discussions and the negotiations go on a renegotiated NAFTA agreement and future trade agreements that we may embark on.

We are not afraid of trade. We just want it to work for the people of this country, and we don't want to do what has happened to the folks in Mexico and to other countries as well.

First and foremost, I will just say that we have to be cognizant of the repercussions on the standard of living and the quality of life that our people in the United States have. These trade agreements have worked against that, and it is not going to happen again.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman DELAURO for her stellar leadership on the trade task force and the work that it has done. The hours and hours of effort on defeating the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the great assemblage that she gathered and the persistence with which she approached that, seeking to defeat that trade model, which has now been done, and to go back to the drawing board and to fix what is wrong with these, Representative DELAURO has been extraordinary.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it has been a remarkable coalition, and it is standing strong. It stands strong.

I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for being a central and integral part of this effort. I appreciate that.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for coming down this evening.

As we complete our work here this evening, I wanted to reissue our invitation to Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross to travel to Ohio to come to U.S. Steel in Lorain to really see what is happening there to the workers; and not just Lorain—we are not selfish—but all over this country where steel companies are being harmed because of imports and the fact that China, Korea,

and Russia are dumping on the international market.

We need to have an embargo. We need to let our industry survive and get over this hump of overcapacity.

We are going to need that production in the years ahead, for example, in the natural gas industry for piping and so forth. These are modern plants. America should not lose them. We have lost so many steel plants. We can't afford to lose many more for the sake of the Nation's defense.

I also wanted to invite the President to Ohio. I hope that somebody is listening. He campaigned a great deal in Ohio. I know he likes meeting people, and it certainly would be a good way to see the immediate challenge on the trade front where real lives and livelihoods are at stake in this country.

□ 1815

I also just wanted to end by saying this: When you create a system of trade where people are exploited in our country, or in other countries, that really isn't the best face that America can put forward. And unfortunately, what happens too often in our country now, for example, in trade with Mexico, when you have undocumented workers who come here, many in desperation, many of them are being trafficked across the continent. You say: Oh, Congresswoman, what do you mean trafficked? I mean, some of them come here because they are desperate, and they end up paying sometimes as much as \$8,000 to come here and work at a very low-wage job. They never get out of debt.

We have to take that system and move it into the sunlight out of the doldrums, because we can't treat people like chattel. There are millions of agricultural workers, for example, who come to this country with no contract. They are completely indentured to whatever coyote brings them across the border. That is not the system I want for this country. That is not fair to those families. It is not fair to their children. It is not fair to the places to which they come in our country.

They always feel uncomfortable. What kind of a system, what kind of a trade system would subject them to that? We are a different kind of country. We aspire to higher values. We aspire to treating people and elevating their worth, not diminishing their worth as human beings.

We have a lot to fix in these trade agreements, and I hope that President Trump will join us. I would like to tell him about what coyotes do. I would like to tell him how they behave, how some of them have been involved in murder of individuals from my district who fight for labor rights so that no one is afraid, that people feel that they have a legal system that will defend them.

We need to get to that world. Our Constitution intends it for all of the people of our country. We should behave no differently internationally.

So in closing tonight, I agree with the President. We need good jobs. We need real jobs. They have to come back to this country, and we have to treat people in other countries with worth, with their worth as human beings. We need to get back to trade balances, not trade deficits.

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

NO TAX SUBSIDIES FOR STADIUMS

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is official: the Oakland Raiders are moving to Las Vegas. Beginning in 2020, they will play in a shiny, new 65,000-seat stadium outfitted with a retractable roof that is expected to cost \$1.9 billion.

If you are an American taxpayer, you will help pay for it, even if you live nowhere near Nevada. About \$750 million for the project will be financed through municipal bonds, which are tax exempt. The Federal tax break is projected to amount to some \$120 million, according to a study by the Brookings Institution.

Congress and President Trump should take the Raiders' bad example as an impetus for reform. As the President considers a \$1 trillion plan to restore America's aging roads, rail, bridges, waterways, and airports, lawmakers should ask why so many stadiums are following the Las Vegas model, fleeing one bad economic State and using your tax dollars to go to another.

The alternative is what we did in Oklahoma City in 1993. Our residents passed a temporary 1 percent increase in sales tax to fund, without incurring a debt, a building spree called the Metropolitan Area Projects, or MAPS. Over 5 years, the plan raised \$350 million for nine projects, including a stadium now called the Chesapeake Energy Arena, home to NBA basketball's Oklahoma City Thunder. This pay-as-you-go approach may sound unremarkable, but it is nothing short of exceptional.

Most professional sports stadiums these days are financed with municipal bonds, something that they were never intended to be used for. But this kind of debt wasn't intended for lavish football stadiums or basketball arenas. Municipal bonds were supposed to give communities a way to build public projects—hospitals, schools, roads—without having to pay Federal taxes on the debt's interest. The point was to ease the financial burden on cities and States that invest in expensive but essential infrastructure.

Over the past 30 years, however, stadium financiers have exploited a loophole in the Tax Code to qualify professional sports arenas for municipal

bonds. Because Federal taxes aren't incurred on the interest of this debt, stadiums essentially receive a multi-million-dollar subsidy from Washington.

Last year, a Brookings study examined 45 stadiums built or seriously renovated since 2000; 36 were funded at least in part with municipal bonds, resulting in forgone Federal tax revenue of \$3.7 billion. That is enough money to employ 88,000 military staff sergeants or give each State a \$74 million block grant, or it could help reduce the national debt.

To solve this problem, I have introduced, along with my Democratic colleague, EARL BLUMENAUER from Oregon, H.R. 811. This bipartisan No Tax Subsidies for Stadiums Act would prohibit arena financiers from using municipal bonds. Instead of building enormous, lavish sports facilities on the backs of unsuspecting taxpayers across the Nation, financiers should ask communities to buy into their vision. If residents want a stadium to be built, fine. They should be willing to pay for it like we did in Oklahoma City; or sports franchises and leagues always have the option to finance construction like most businesses do, privately.

Funding an upgrade to America's core infrastructure will be a challenge. It shouldn't require Congress to use budget gimmicks or run up the national debt.

Closing loopholes, such as requiring stadium financiers to pay Federal taxes on bond interest that was intended to improve our decaying infrastructure, would ensure taxpayers get the best return on their dollars to improve public infrastructure that all Americans use.

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

DON'T CUT INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening joined by colleagues from the Foreign Affairs Committee to discuss President Trump's extreme, proposed cuts to the International Affairs Budget.

The President's budget proposal would reduce funding for the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development, what we know as USAID, by nearly a third. The proposal would reduce overall funding for the International Affairs Budget by \$17.4 billion, or 31 percent.

This would be a devastating reduction. U.S. diplomats and development experts work to shape a freer, more secure, and more prosperous world while advancing U.S. interests abroad. They build relationships with foreign counterparts and resolve disputes to preserve peace and reduce the need for military action.

They also provide critical services to U.S. citizens living and working overseas and screen people seeking visas to visit the United States. This work would all be compromised by the administration's funding cuts. These cuts could also undercut President Trump's purported priorities.

For example, these reductions could interrupt the Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism and U.S. efforts to disrupt money laundering and terror financing. Funding could be slashed for nonproliferation, counternarcotics, and consular affairs—efforts specifically focused on protecting Americans from foreign threats.

This work overseas is always important, but it is especially necessary now in this tumultuous time, when the United States faces complex challenges around the world:

In Asia, we see increased tensions in the South China Sea and an increasingly hostile North Korea.

In Africa, there is a devastating famine in East Africa, brutal civil wars, as well as terrorist organizations like Boko Haram and al-Shabaab.

The refugee crisis stemming from unrest in the Middle East continues, and we have just seen reports of more gas attacks on the Syrian people.

In South America, the people of Colombia have experienced devastating floods that claimed more than 270 lives, a breakdown in the rule of law in the Northern Triangle, and a government in Venezuela that has become an oppressive dictatorship.

Even in Western Europe, we continue to combat terrorist threats from organizations like ISIS, who 2 weeks ago inspired the attack in London.

These are challenging times for our world that require a fully funded International Affairs Budget. But America's unilateral diplomatic and development work is just one piece of our engagement overseas.

Following World War II, the United States helped lead the creation of several multilateral organizations to foster peace and stability in the world like the United Nations, NATO, and the World Bank. With its budget proposal and heated rhetoric, the Trump administration is threatening that architecture of peace and stability.

For example, the President recommends cutting funding for multilateral development banks by \$650 million over 3 years and capping United Nations peacekeeping contributions to 25 percent of total funding. These decisions will have a significant destabilizing impact on the global order. If America retreats from the international stage, other powers, like China, will step in to fill that void and exert their influence. We cannot afford for that to happen.

That is why my colleagues and I are here tonight, to speak out against the shortsighted, dangerous budget proposal and emphasize the importance of the United States' diplomatic and development work.

And with that, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs).

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I am very concerned about these cuts. This undermines our leadership around the world and makes Americans less safe. When you consider that foreign aid is only 1 percent of our entire budget and helps keep Americans safe, it is an investment in our security.

Fully funding our State Department and ensuring our diplomats have the resources they need prevents conflicts, diffuses crises, and works to keep American soldiers out of harm's way.

U.S. foreign aid helps protect some of the world's poorest people from disease, starvation, and death. President Trump's own Secretary of Defense, General James Mattis, said: "If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition. . . ."

I signed onto a letter led by Ranking Member ENGEL, along with my Democratic colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, urging the Speaker to oppose these draconian cuts.

We are already hearing from our allies all over the Western Hemisphere how dangerous these cuts could be to the stability of the region. Countries like Colombia fought a 52-year-long war with the FARC guerrillas, and now, when they need us the most to implement the peace deal, the Trump administration has signaled it is ready to abandon one of our strongest partners in the world. The President claims to care about protecting our sovereign border, but this budget says otherwise.

Both Republican and Democrat administrations have pushed for a strong security, economic, and trade relationship with Mexico. Pushing our neighbors away could cost billions of dollars to our U.S. businesses.

□ 1830

Instead of working with our partners in the Western Hemisphere, President Trump is preventing us from maintaining a robust relationship with our neighbors to pay for this unrealistic and ineffective wall.

In Central America, we risk seeing a repeat of the 2014 crisis when nearly 70,000 children made the dangerous journeys from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador after being threatened with violence, assault, and forced gang recruitment. Our engagement in Central America is helping to bring calm to the region, and abandoning our friends in their time of need puts America at risk. Retreating from the world will allow other countries like China and Russia to take our place as a global leader.

Instead of building a wall, the President should continue working with our neighbors to enhance cooperation instead of alienating friends who have stood by us for decades.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should have mentioned, of course, that

Congressman SIREs is the ranking member on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee on the Foreign Affairs Committee. His experience in that region in particular is vast.

I am glad that you mentioned that this is really part of a larger theme and a larger concern, because President Trump, in addition to proposing to cut a lot of funds for diplomacy and development around the world, has also shown a real hostility towards other nations, including some of our best allies and friends around the world, and that is of great concern.

For example, this issue with Mexico which you brought up, forcing Mexico to pay for the wall and constructing this wall along the 2,000-mile border that we have between the United States and Mexico and cutting aid if necessary, which he has threatened to do if Mexico won't pay for it, I have said very clearly that that creates an opportunity for China to step in or the Chinese President Xi Jinping to go into Latin America, go into Mexico and offer to give Mexico whatever Donald Trump takes away. That would strengthen China's hand in yet another region of the world.

Of course, China is a big economic competitor of the United States, and I relate to my Texas folks because Texas does an incredible amount of trade with Mexico, and we have been very fortunate over the years that Mexico buys a lot of our stuff. They buy a lot of our goods. But they don't have to just buy that stuff from Texas or the United States, generally. They could go buy it from Brazil. They could buy it from China or somewhere else.

So thank you for mentioning that.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more. Already we are starting to see the influence of China in most of the countries in South America.

You know, I had a conversation with one of the presidents of the colleges in Colombia on one of my trips. He was telling me how the influence of China in Colombia is so strong. He was telling me that the second most studied language in Colombia today is Mandarin. When you think of that, that is a frightening thought.

You talk about the influence in Nicaragua of the Chinese. They even think of building a canal, which many people think will never happen. But to have China so close to our borders is not good for America. To push away our neighbors is not good for America. We must work with our neighbors. People don't realize the amount of economic activity between the United States and the rest of Central America and Mexico.

I read something very funny the other day. Well, it is not funny, but it is really sad. They were discussing this wall that the President proposes. Some people say: Where are we going to put it? In the middle of the river? Or are we going to put it on the American side and give the river to Mexico? Or are we going to go invade Mexico and put the

wall on the Mexican side and keep the river to ourselves?

So I thought that was telling of the difficulty.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. It has been a very thorny issue, as you can imagine, especially in Texas. Both Republicans and Democrats have expressed deep concern about building a wall and spending \$20 billion to \$30 billion to do it, and that concern, I think, has reached the U.S. Congress. I think that is part of why you see a reluctance on the part of the Senate, for example, to move forward with this in their appropriations bill, in their budget.

I yield to our ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I join with my colleagues. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), who is a valued member of our committee, for his leadership on this critical issue, and also the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs). I agree with everything that they have said heretofore about these draconian cuts.

I am here because I am rising to strongly reject the Trump Administration's draconian cuts to the International Affairs Budget. Now 2½ months into the Trump Administration, I find myself deeply troubled by the direction American foreign policy is heading on many fronts. I was particularly shocked when the White House released its fiscal year 2018 budget calling for a 31 percent cut to American diplomacy and development efforts.

In my view, cutting the International Affairs Budget by even a fraction of that amount would be devastating. We haven't seen many details, but a cut that drastic would surely mean that too many efforts and initiatives that do so much good would wind up on the chopping block.

Here is the bottom line: Slashing diplomacy and development puts American lives at risk. If we no longer have diplomacy and development tools to meet international challenges, what does that leave? It leaves the military.

Now, don't get me wrong. I have always supported a strong national defense, and I do support our military, and I do support giving them more money. But I also support using military force only as a measure of last resort. We should not send American servicemembers into harm's way unless we have exhausted every other option. If we are not investing in diplomacy and development, we aren't even giving these other options a chance.

We rely on diplomacy to resolve conflicts across negotiating tables at multilateral gatherings and in quiet corners so that we don't need to resolve them down the line on the battlefield. Our diplomats work to strengthen old alliances and build new bridges of friendship and shared understanding.

Just last week, the Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing on the

Trump Administration's efforts to decimate our International Affairs Budget. In his testimony at the hearing, former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns said that morale at the State Department is "at its lowest point in my memory."

It is deeply disturbing to hear that our diplomats, many of whom serve in dangerous places at high risk to themselves and their families, are so disheartened.

Of course it is not just former diplomats who reject these cuts. A recent letter signed by more than 120 retired generals and admirals to House and Senate leadership said: "We urge you to ensure that resources for the International Affairs Budget keep pace with the growing global threats and opportunities we face. Now is not the time to retreat."

Mr. Speaker, I include their letter in the RECORD in its entirety.

FEBRUARY 27, 2017.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.*

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
*Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate.*

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
*Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER: As you and your colleagues address the federal budget for Fiscal Year 2018, we write as retired three and four star flag and general officers from all branches of the armed services to share our strong conviction that elevating and strengthening diplomacy and development alongside defense are critical to keeping America safe.

We know from our service in uniform that many of the crises our nation faces do not have military solutions alone—from confronting violent extremist groups like ISIS in the Middle East and North Africa to preventing pandemics like Ebola and stabilizing weak and fragile states that can lead to greater instability. There are 65 million displaced people today, the most since World War II, with consequences including refugee flows that are threatening America's strategic allies in Israel, Jordan, Turkey, and Europe.

The State Department, USAID, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Peace Corps and other development agencies are critical to preventing conflict and reducing the need to put our men and women in uniform in harm's way. As Secretary James Mattis said while Commander of U.S. Central Command, "If you don't fully fund the State Department, then I need to buy more ammunition." The military will lead the fight against terrorism on the battlefield, but it needs strong civilian partners in the battle against the drivers of extremism—lack of opportunity, insecurity, injustice, and hopelessness.

We recognize that America's strategic investments in diplomacy and development—like all of U.S. investments—must be effective and accountable. Significant reforms have been undertaken since 9/11, many of which have been embodied in recent legislation in Congress with strong bipartisan support—on human trafficking, the rights of

women and girls, trade and energy in Africa, wildlife trafficking, water, food security, and transparency and accountability.

We urge you to ensure that resources for the International Affairs Budget keep pace with the growing global threats and opportunities we face. Now is not the time to retreat.

Sincerely,

1. General Keith B. Alexander, USA (Ret.), Director, National Security Agency ('05-'14), Commander, U.S. Cyber Command ('10-'14)

2. General John R. Allen, USMC (Ret.), Commander, NATO International Security Force ('11-'13), Commander, U.S. Forces-Afghanistan ('11-'13)

3. Lt. General Edward G. Anderson III, USA (Ret.), Vice Commander, U.S. Element, North American Aerospace Defense Command/Deputy, Commander, U.S. Northern Command ('02-'04)

4. Lt. General Thomas L. Baptiste, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Chairman, NATO Military Committee ('04-'07)

5. Lt. General Ronald R. Blanck, USA (Ret.), Surgeon General of the United States Army ('96-'00)

6. Lt. General H. Steven Blum, USA (Ret.), Deputy Commander, U.S. North American Aerospace Defense Command and U.S. Northern Command ('09-'10)

7. Lt. General Steven W. Boutelle, USA (Ret.), Chief Information Officer and G6, United States Army ('03-'07)

8. Admiral Frank L. Bowman, USN (Ret.), Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion ('96-'04)

9. General Charles G. Boyd, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command ('92-'95)

10. General Bryan Doug Brown, LISA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command ('03-'07)

11. General Arthur E. Brown, Jr., USA (Ret.), Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Army ('87-'89)

12. Vice Admiral Michael Bucchi, USN (Ret.), Commander of the United States Third Fleet ('00-'03)

13. Lt. General John H. Campbell, USAF (Ret.), Associate Director of Central Intelligence for Military Support, Central Intelligence Agency ('00-'03)

14. General Bruce Carlson, USAF (Ret.), Director, National Reconnaissance Office ('09-'12)

15. General George W. Casey, Jr., USA (Ret.), Chief of Staff of the United States Army ('07-'11)

16. Lt. General John G. Castellaw, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Commandant for Programs and Resources ('07-'08)

17. Lt. General Dennis D. Cavin, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Army Accessions Command ('02-'04)

18. General Peter W. Chiarelli, USA (Ret.), Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army ('08-'12)

19. Lt. General Daniel W. Christman, USA (Ret.), Superintendent, United States Military Academy ('96-'01)

20. Lt. General George R. Christmas, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower and Reserve Affairs ('94-'96)

21. Admiral Vern Clark, USN (Ret.), Chief of Naval Operations ('00-'05)

22. Admiral Archie R. Clemins, USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet ('96-'99)

23. General Richard A. "Dick" Cody, USA (Ret.), Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army ('04-'08)

24. Lt. General John B. Conaway, USAF (Ret.), Chief, National Guard Bureau ('90-'93)

25. General James T. Conway, USMC (Ret.), Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('06-'10)

26. General John D.W. Corley, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Air Combat Command ('07-'09)

27. General Bantz J. Craddock, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. European Command and

NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe ('06-'09)

28. Vice Admiral Lewis W. Crenshaw, Jr., USN (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Resources, Requirements, and Assessments ('04-'07)

29. Lt. General John "Mark" M. Curran, USA (Ret.), Deputy Commanding General Futures, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command ('03-'07)

30. General Terrence R. Dake, USMC (Ret.), Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('98-'00)

31. Lt. General Robert R. Dierker, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander, U.S. Pacific Command ('02-'04)

32. Admiral Kirkland H. Donald, USN (Ret.), Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion ('04-'12)

33. Lt. General James M. Dubik, USA (Ret.), Commander, Multi National Security Transition Command and NATO Training Mission-Iraq ('07-'08)

34. Lt. General Kenneth E. Eickmann, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Aeronautical Systems Center, U.S. Air Force ('96-'98)

35. Admiral William J. Fallon, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Central Command ('07-'08)

36. Admiral Thomas B. Fargo, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Pacific Command ('02-'05)

37. Admiral Mark P. Fitzgerald, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Europe ('07-'10) and U.S. Naval Forces Africa ('09-'10)

38. General Ronald R. Fogleman, USAF (Ret.), Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force ('94-'97)

39. Lt. General Benjamin C. Freakley, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Army Accessions Command ('07-'12)

40. Lt. General Robert G. Gard, Jr., USA (Ret.), President, National Defense University ('77-'81)

41. Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, USN (Ret.), Chief of Naval Operations ('11-'15)

42. Lt. General Arthur J. Gregg, USA (Ret.), Army Deputy Chief of Staff ('79-'81)

43. Lt. General Wallace C. Greggson, USMC (Ret.), Commanding General, Marine Corps Forces Pacific and Marine Corps Forces Central Command ('03-'05)

44. Vice Admiral Lee F. Gunn, USN (Ret.), Inspector General, U.S. Navy ('97-'00)

45. General Michael W. Hagee, USMC (Ret.), Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('03-'06)

46. Lt. General Michael A. Hamel, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Air Force Space and Missile Systems Center ('05-'08)

47. General John W. Handy, USAF (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Transportation Command and Commander, Air Mobility Command ('01-'05)

48. Admiral John C. Harvey, Jr., USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Fleet Forces Command ('09-'12)

49. General Richard E. Hawley, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Air Combat Command ('96-'99)

50. General Michael V. Hayden, USAF (Ret.), Director, Central Intelligence Agency ('06-'09)

51. General Paul V. Hester, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Pacific Air Forces. Air Component Commander for the U.S. Pacific Command Commander ('04-'07)

52. General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Southern Command ('02-'04)

53. Admiral James R. Hogg, USN (Ret.), U.S. Military Representative, NATO Military Committee ('88-'91)

54. Lt. General Walter S. Hogle Jr., USAF (Ret.), Commander, 15th Air Force ('00-'01)

55. Lt. General Steven A. Hummer, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Commander for Military Operations, U.S. Africa Command ('13-'15)

56. Lt. General William E. Ingram, Jr., USA (Ret.), Director, U.S. Army National Guard ('11-'14)

57. General James L. Jamerson, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command ('95-'98)
58. Lt. General Arlen D. Jameson, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. Strategic Command ('93-'96)
59. Admiral Gregory G. Johnson, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Europe/Commander in Chief, Allied Forces Southern Europe ('01-'04)
60. Admiral Jerome L. Johnson, USN (Ret.), Vice Chief of Naval Operations ('90-'92)
61. Lt. General P. K. "Ken" Keen, USA (Ret.), Chief, Office of the U.S. Defense Representative to Pakistan ('11-'13)
62. Lt. General Richard L. Kelly, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Commandant, Installations and Logistics ('02-'05)
63. Lt. General Claudia J. Kennedy, USA (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff for Army Intelligence ('97-'00)
64. General Paul J. Kem, USA (Ret.), Commanding General, U.S. Army Materiel Command ('01-'04)
65. General William F. Kernan, USA (Ret.), Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic/Commander in Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command ('00-'02)
66. Lt. General Donald L. Kerrick, USA (Ret.), Deputy National Security Advisor to The President of the United States ('00-'01)
67. Lt. General Bruce B. Knutson, USMC (Ret.), Commanding General, Marine Corp Combat Command ('00-'01)
68. Vice Admiral Albert H. Konetzni, Jr., USN (Ret.), Deputy Commander, U.S. Fleet Forces Command and U.S. Atlantic Fleet ('01-'04)
69. General Charles Chandler Krulak, USMC (Ret.), Commandant of the Marine Corps ('95-'99)
70. (Ret.), Lt. General William J. Lennox, Jr., USA (Ret.), Superintendent, United States Military Academy ('01-'06)
71. Vice Admiral Stephen F. Loftus, USN (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Logistics ('90-'94)
72. General Lance W. Lord, USAF (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Air Force Space Command ('02-'06)
73. Admiral James M. Loy, USCG (Ret.), Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard ('98-'02)
74. Vice Admiral Joseph Maguire, USN (Ret.), Deputy Director for Strategic Operational Planning, National Counterterrorism Center ('07-'10)
75. Admiral Henry H. Mauz, Jr., USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet ('92-'94)
76. Vice Admiral Justin D. McCarthy, SC, USN (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Fleet Readiness, and Logistics ('04-'07)
77. Lt. General Dennis McCarthy, USMC (Ret.), Commander, Marine Forces Reserve ('01-'05)
78. Vice Admiral John "Mike" M. McConnell, USN (Ret.), Director of the National Security Agency ('92-'96)
79. General David D. McKiernan, USA (Ret.), Commander, International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan ('08-'09)
80. General Dan K. McNeill, USA, (Ret.), Commander, International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan ('07-'08)
81. General Merrill A. McPeak, USAF (Ret.), Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force ('90-'94)
82. Lt. General Paul T. Mikolashek, USA (Ret.), Inspector General, U.S. Army/Commanding General of the Third U.S. Army Forces Central Command ('00-'02)
83. Vice Admiral Joseph S. Mobley, USN (Ret.), Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet ('98-'01)
84. General Thomas R. Morgan, USMC (Ret.), Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps ('86-'88)
85. Lt. General Carol A. Mutter, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Marine Corps ('96-'98)
86. Admiral Robert J. Natter, USN (Ret.), Commander, Fleet Forces Command/Commander, U.S. Atlantic Fleet ('00-'03)
87. General William L. Nyland, USMC (Ret.), Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('02-'05)
88. Lt. General Tad J. Oelstrom, USAF (Ret.), Superintendent, U.S. Air Force Academy ('97-'00)
89. Admiral Eric T. Olson, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Special Operation Command ('07-'11)
90. Lt. General H. P. "Pete" Osman, USMC (Ret.), Commanding General II MEF ('02-'04)
91. Lt. General Jeffrey W. Oster, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Administrator and Chief Operating Officer, Coalition Provisional Authority, Iraq '04, Deputy Commandant for Programs and Resources, Headquarters Marine Corps ('98)
92. Admiral William A. Owens, USN (Ret.), Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff ('94-'96)
93. Lt. General Frank A. Panter, Jr., USMC (Ret.), Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics ('09-'12)
94. Vice Admiral David Pekoske, USCG (Ret.), Vice Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard ('09-'10)
95. General David H. Petraeus, USA (Ret.), Director, Central Intelligence Agency ('11-'12); Commander, Coalition Forces in Afghanistan ('10-'11) and Iraq ('07-'08)
96. Vice Admiral Carol M. Pottenger, USN (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff for Capability Development, NATO Allied Command Transformation ('10-'13)
97. Admiral Joseph W. Prueher, USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command ('96-'99)
98. Lt. General Harry D. Raduege, Jr., USAF (Ret.), Director, Defense Information Systems Agency/Commander, Joint Task Force for Global Network Operations/Deputy Commander, Global Network Operations and Defense, U.S. Strategic Command Joint Forces Headquarters, Information Operations ('00-'05)
99. Vice Admiral Norman W. Ray, USN (Ret.), Deputy Chairman, NATO Military Committee ('92-'95)
100. Lt. General John F. Regni, USAF (Ret.), Superintendent, United States Air Force Academy ('05-'09)
101. General Victor "Gene" E. Renuart, USAF (Ret.), Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command and U.S. Northern Command ('07-'10)
102. General Robert W. RisCassi, USA (Ret.), Commander in Chief, United Nations Command/Commander in Chief, Republic of Korea/U.S. Combined Forces Command ('90-'93)
103. Lt. General Norman R. Seip, USAF (Ret.), Commander, 12th Air Force/Air Forces Southern ('06-'09)
104. General Henry H. Shelton, USA (Ret.), Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff ('97-'01)
105. Admiral William D. Smith, USN (Ret.), U.S. Military Representative, NATO Military Committee ('91-'93)
106. Admiral Leighton W. Smith, Jr., USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces Europe/Commander in Chief, Allied Forces Southern Europe ('94-'96)
107. Lt. General James N. Soligan, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff for Transformation, Allied Command Transformation ('06-'10)
108. Admiral James G. Stavridis, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. European Command and NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Europe ('09-'13)
109. Lt. General Martin R. Steele, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans, Policies and Operations, U.S. Marine Corps ('97-'99)
110. General Carl W. Stiner, USA (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command ('90-'93)
111. Vice Admiral Edward M. Straw, USN (Ret.), Director, Defense Logistics Agency ('92-'96)
112. Vice Admiral William D. Sullivan, USN (Ret.), U.S. Military Representative to NATO Military Committee ('06-'09)
113. Lt. General William J. Troy, USA (Ret.), Director, Army Staff ('10-'13)
114. Admiral Henry G. Ulrich, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Europe/Commander, Joint Forces Command Naples ('05-'08)
115. General Charles F. Wald, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander, U.S. European Command ('02-'06)
116. General William S. Wallace, USA (Ret.), Commanding General, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command ('05-'08)
117. Lt. General William "Kip" E. Ward, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Africa Command ('07-'11)
118. General Charles E. Wilhelm, USMC (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Southern Command ('97-'00)
119. General Michael J. Williams, USMC (Ret.), Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('00-'02)
120. General Ronald W. Yates, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Air Force Materiel Command ('92-'95)
121. General Anthony C. Zinni, USMC (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command ('97-'00)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in 2013, Secretary of Defense Mattis similarly said: "If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition ultimately. So I think it's a cost benefit ratio. The more that we put into the State Department's diplomacy, hopefully the less we have to put into a military budget as we deal with the outcome of an apparent American withdrawal from the international scene."

That is from Secretary of Defense Mattis. I couldn't agree with him more.

Now, I believe that development helps to lift countries and communities up today so they can become strong partners on the global stage tomorrow. A lot of us think we have a moral obligation to help cure disease, improve access to education, and advance human rights. But even if it were not the right thing to do, it would be the smart thing to do because those efforts lead to greater stability, more responsive governments, and stronger rule of law—populations that share our values and priorities. Poverty and lack of opportunity, on the other hand, provide fertile ground for those who mean us harm.

All these efforts, by the way, cost cents on the dollar compared to military engagement. People think international affairs and foreign aid are a massive chunk of the Federal budget, but the chart right over here next to me shows how it actually stacks up: 1.4 percent. And we make that sliver of the pie even smaller. It will come back on us in spades. 1.4 percent of our Federal budget goes to all these programs.

The diseases we don't combat will reach our shores; the communities on which we turn our backs may be the next generation of people who mean us

harm; and the conflicts we fail to defuse may well grow into the wars we need to fight later at a much higher cost in terms of American blood and treasure. Just imagine having to tell the parents of a young American soldier that their son or daughter was killed in battle because we weren't willing to spend the tiny sums needed to prevent the conflict.

Finally, let me say that the American people don't want to see us slash diplomacy and development. In fact, recent data shows that 72 percent of Americans believe the country should play a leading global role. Nearly 6 in 10 believe funding levels at the State Department should stay the same or increase.

Fortunately, the Congress is a co-equal branch of government. I want to remind the executive branch of that. We in Congress decide how much to invest in our international affairs, not the White House.

For example, regardless of how this administration is playing footsie with Vladimir Putin, Congress will devote resources to push back against the Kremlin's efforts to spread disinformation and destabilize our allies, just like they did to the United States during last year's election campaign.

I am hopeful that, as we move forward with next year's spending bills, we continue to provide our diplomatic and development efforts the support they need and the support they have received under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike.

With the President's proposed cuts, I fear what message we are sending to the world. The United States is the global standard bearer for freedom, justice, and democracy. If we cede our role as a global leader, make no mistake, someone will step into the void. It could very well be another power that doesn't share our values or our interests. Think Russia or some country like that.

We cannot allow that to happen. I am committed to ensuring it doesn't, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to firmly reject President Trump's cuts.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ENGEL for all of his years of work on behalf of the Nation on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I know you may have a busy schedule this evening. We have got about 12 minutes left, so I thought we would just have a discussion on some of these issues. Stick with us if you can.

Mr. ENGEL. You are doing a fine job.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congressman ENGEL mentioned maintaining the United States' position as a leader in the world and not ceding that to another country, whether it is China or Russia, who has been very aggressive, and it is not just maintaining a strong defense.

I represent what is known as Military City, USA: San Antonio, Texas. Once upon a time we had five military

bases in San Antonio. We still have Joint Base San Antonio, which is a large operation. So it is not just about a strong defense, which we all support, but also about the hard work of diplomacy and development.

The United States, who has been a leader for so long, if we back away from our commitments, then we not only cede it to somebody else, but there is a good chance that a lot of that work is not going to get done, that the peoples in many nations around the world are going to become poorer, more desperate; and from that, only bad things can happen both for those peoples, but also for the neighboring countries, for the United States, and for the world.

Thank you for lending your strong voice to support for the diplomatic budget.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree with him more. And, you know, it is especially interesting since, during the campaign, President Trump attacked the previous administration for not being strong enough, for not showing American presence. And now with this cut, with this proposed 31 percent cut, I couldn't think of anything that would make us weaker or make us unable to do what we need to do.

□ 1845

So I hope the President remembers what he said during the campaign and acts accordingly so that these massive cuts can be taken away.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. No, absolutely. And Congressman SIRES, you recall that during those months, then-Candidate Trump talked about backing away from NATO; about allowing Germany, for example, to handle the issues between Russia and the Baltic States; about allowing or really forcing Japan and South Korea to go it alone or to develop even their own nuclear weapons to combat the threat of North Korea, to deal with China's aggressiveness in the South China Sea.

So the more we go down that road, not only do we abandon those nations who have been friends for so long and allies and supporters for so long in keeping the peace, but we also, in the long run, threaten our own security.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIRES. If I might, I couldn't agree with the gentleman more. Just to bring it even closer to home, we recently met with the attorneys general from the Northern Triangle. These attorneys general have been fighting corruption, have been fighting the cartel. We have assisted them with a small amount of money. These people put their lives every day in peril fighting the cartel, fighting this corruption.

In our conversation, they said to me: We need America's support to continue our work. If we stop now, all that we have accomplished until now is going to go for naught.

When you are talking about a small amount of money, the strong impact that it has on countries that, for decades, have experienced a great deal of corruption, and we finally have people that have stepped forward and want to fight this corruption and put their lives in peril every single day, I think we should support those people. Cutting and running away from these people can only hurt us.

This is just one small example of the impact that this 30 percent cut would have on this region.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. The gentleman mentioned the Northern Triangle countries of Central America. Especially over the last few years, thousands of women and children who are fleeing very desperate situations there, not only extreme poverty, but the threats of violence by drug gangs, for example, have come to the Texas-Mexico border seeking asylum.

Congress did, over the last few years, essentially, pass assistance for these nations. And we understood that, look, if you allocate \$600 million to three countries, that is not going to solve all of their problems. Nobody is under that illusion. But it can go a long way in being the seed funds to start to turn these things around and these nations around.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. I would add that we give foreign aid, and it is good for those countries, but it is also good for us. It also helps us. If there is a drug problem in Central America, it inevitably comes up to our border.

If there is some problem with some developing country, say, we have a disease that could—Ebola or something like that, and we give money to help eradicate it, well, that will prevent Ebola from coming into the United States. So it is really a win-win situation.

Again, if we are going to be the leaders of the world, certainly of the free world, and we want other countries to follow our lead, well, if you are a leader, you have to lead. What we are doing is in our own best interests, not only just in the other countries' best interests.

I think it is important to say that. And it is important to, again, say, 1 percent—1.4 percent of our total budget is all the foreign aid and all the money that we give in terms of eradicating diseases, in terms of crime, in terms of everything that is actually very important to us as well. The American people think it is much higher, but it is not.

So if you take the President's slashing of it, it would virtually make all of this impossible to do. So it is a program that is a win-win situation.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Congressman ENGEL, you mentioned Ebola, for example. Dallas, Texas, was the first American city to confront the challenge and

the problem of Ebola. So I couldn't agree with you more.

It should also be said that if you take away this aid and you have people becoming more desperate in nations around the world, they do become more susceptible to being employed by, for example, drug cartels, or being lured by terrorist organizations because these folks are desperate and need to survive. So these rogue alternatives become more attractive to them.

So it is important to point out that a lot of this development and a lot of this aid also prevents some of these things from happening.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Absolutely. Again, I want to reiterate that we are not the leaders of the world because we anointed ourselves. We are the leaders of the world because we provided leadership for all of these years, particularly after World War II, and it is important to engage with the world.

One of the gentlemen mentioned some of the things that the President said. You know, one of the things he did was he called NATO obsolete. That kind of talk worries me because it is our alliances that are the pillar of our foreign policy and the strength of the United States and our alliances which have worked so well since World War II.

So if we denigrate our alliances, and then we cut funding for all these programs that help various countries so we can be a leader by about a third, that doesn't say much for a robust foreign policy. You get to be a leader by acting like a leader, not by pulling away from the world.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Absolutely. I will give Mr. SIREs the last word. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIREs. Well, before we finish, I just want to compliment Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL on the recent resolution that we worked on together in encouraging Argentina to continue on the path under new President Macri. Former President de Kirchner decided that she was going to be an isolationist.

Argentina is too big. It is a country that could be a player in assisting us in any crisis that we have in South America. So this resolution did not cost any money, but it shows our friendship, it shows our support, and it shows that they are moving in the right direction.

So my compliments to the gentleman, my compliments to the people that signed this resolution.

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

INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about several things to do with infrastructure in the United States and in California. I am a happy new member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee here in the U.S. House, and I am very interested and dedicated to things we can do to improve all of our types of infrastructure that are so important for the economy, for the people, for movement of goods, and for the people's own convenience in doing what they need to do in their personal lives, their business lives, et cetera.

So this is, indeed, a committee and issues that will affect all of our States and have a positive effect if we put good policy in place for all of our people. We have jurisdiction over quite a few areas. One of the important things we will be working on in the short term have to do with airports as well as reauthorization of the FAA, Federal Aviation Administration.

Airports, obviously, are coming more and more into play with the amount of passenger traffic that we are seeing. The FAA projects that by the year 2029 we could see 1 billion passengers using our airports per year, and that is just not that many years away. So airports will need to continue to have more upgrading, runway extensions, maybe additional runways, the infrastructure in them, the process for getting people through TSA. These are all things that we will be looking at within our committee as well as some of our other committees we partner with here in the House, because passengers are using more and more air service, whether it is urban or the rural airports that are very important to areas like my district, the First District of Northern California. They have equal weight to those that are using them in where they live and where they need to get to.

Obviously, a lot of discussion about infrastructure led by our President, Donald Trump, on highways being a key component of movement of goods and people and everything we need for our economy to be strong and the convenience for our people. Highways are breaking down. Bridges are breaking down.

We just saw the other day, in Georgia here, a fire caused by storage of things underneath that bridge. They are on the fast track trying to get that redone on I-85.

Now, was it a bridge that needed to be maintained?

Not sure. But certainly that is a situation that shows how acute the problem is when you lose one structure like that, what it can do to traffic, an inconvenience for people and commerce in an area like that.

So we have these problems all across the country with our bridges that are in dire need of repair. We need not have more accidents or more things that would endanger the public when they are not properly maintained or upgraded.

Just try driving in the right lane of a lot of our freeways here and with the truck traffic on them who pay weight fees and many other excise taxes, other forms of fees and taxes to be part of the solution. We see much damage to them because of the backlog of work that needs to be done on highways, on freeways, that have this traffic, that have this high flow that is really part of what we would expect for our highways and these systems.

But when we are not doing the work to maintain, when we are not putting the investment in there, when people pay their gas tax, when they pay the tax on diesel, when they pay their weight fees, when all those forms of compensation that are in place to help keep our highways and roads and bridges and all of our transportation structures up, when the money isn't getting there, then we have a real problem.

Again, being from California, we see that some of our highways and road systems are in some of the worst shape in the whole country. Right now, as they contemplate raising taxes on people at the State level, a gas tax increase, a per-car tax increase to get your license plate sticker, people are going to be wondering where are we going to make ends meet on that, because probably at least the average cost to a family would be somewhere around \$500 in new gas and new fees to register a vehicle and get their kids to school and go to work and things that they need to do.

We need to be part of the solution on that. I don't think more taxes, more fees upon working people who are trying to make ends meet—you know, \$500 out of a family's income is a pretty tough deal when we see that the jobs are not coming back as rapidly, especially in the State of California, that they need to for average working families, especially inland, that aren't part of the coast where most of the wealth seems to be centered in California.

We see that the drive in California is still pushing forward on the high-speed rail project, one that was passed all the way back in 2008 just under a \$10 billion bond by the voters of California, and supplemented a few years later by ARA funding, stimulus funding from the Federal Government, about \$3.5 billion.

Well, at this point, here in 2017, they have hardly even done anything on the construction of the high-speed rail, which is probably a blessing, because this a boondoggle of epic proportions. The original cost, as sold to the voters of the State of California, would be \$33 billion to put a high-speed rail system from San Francisco to Los Angeles going through the Central Valley.

Just a couple of years later, the true numbers started coming in on that, and they finally admitted that it was going to cost \$98.5 billion was the estimate, this in the fall of 2011.

So they scurried back, went to the drawing board once again and found a

way to downsize the cost by using local transit, local projects in northern California and the San Francisco Bay Area and in southern California, trying to bring the cost down to then an estimated \$68 billion, which is still double of the original budget—the original cost that was sold to the voters in proposition 1A in 2008.

Much of the funding was supposed to come from private concerns, private investors, because when you add it up, \$10 billion from the State bond, \$3 billion-plus of Federal money, you are only a little over \$13 billion.

And if they are projecting it is a \$68 billion cost, where is the other \$55 billion going to come from?

Where are the private investors that have had nearly 9 years now to line up to be part of this profitable enterprise? They are staying away in droves.

□ 1900

There are no guarantees of income which the State cannot do under proposition 1A which is illegal. There is no subsidizing of the high-speed rail allowed under the proposition 1A bond. Yet it keeps going on and on. We have these infrastructure needs we have all over the country. I don't see any more money coming from Congress, not coming from the Federal level, to help boost this boondoggle in California. We will work hard to make sure that doesn't happen.

Unfortunately, when they seek new funds for other things such as electrification of the rail in the bay area, they were seeking \$647 million of brand new money from a different pot federally to electrify the existing train route they have in the bay area that is run by diesel trains presently. So it is not like they don't have train service for commuting in the bay area, indeed, one of the richest areas of the country. They come to Congress here and ask for \$647 million of new money maybe to electrify but mostly to help facilitate the high-speed rail boondoggle as part of that.

We need not be part of that. They can go to the funding they have already set aside within the bond or the \$3.5 billion that we don't seem to be able to capture back from the stimulus package. Go to those sources of money if you want to electrify the rail.

That said, part of the problem with building the high-speed rail is people don't really want to cooperate. When the first segment was being contemplated, it was going to go from San Francisco halfway down into the valley or L.A. halfway up to the valley. One of the reasons they chose to start building in the valley was that was the cheapest area to build one, the most wide open. One of the quotes at the time from one of the spokesmen for the authority was they would find the least amount of resistance to build the rail in the valley because there are not that many people there compared to the cities.

Well, there is plenty of resistance there, too, because, at this point, I

don't know exact statistics, but they have less than half of the parcels even in their control that they would need to lay the route out through the valley because people are resisting. They don't want this thing coming through their neighborhoods, knocking out their farms, and cutting up their property in sections into little triangles and little bits that they can no longer farm or even transport their livestock or equipment to because it is going to be cut off by this rail that will be fenced on both sides because you have got a 220-mile-per-hour train supposedly running through it. So there will be a lot of damage to the economy and the fabric of the Central Valley.

The people in the urban areas aren't that excited about it either. In the high-value properties in the south bay area, they are not really excited about having this causeway 20 feet above their neighborhoods there. So they are talking, put this thing underground. So they are doing that part last. In the meantime, they are going to try and electrify the commuter train they have, which is a low-speed rail and doesn't fulfill the goals of a high-speed rail which is just required from San Francisco to Los Angeles. As well in southern California, they want to take over part of the system there to use that commuter rail as fulfilling part of the obligation to have a high-speed rail system that is electrified from one end to the other.

Now, they haven't even really contemplated what it is going to cost as they talk about drilling a hole, drilling a bore, through the Tehachapis down there in southern California, to the tunes of billions and billions of dollars that isn't really comprehended in the cost of doing the system.

So this is an issue, this is a dream, and this is a project that really needs to be scrapped. Where is the money going to come from? It is not coming from the Federal Government, and it is not coming from investors. The cap-and-trade dollars that they were counting on in the State of California from auctioning off CO₂ allotments to large businesses, that has withered as well. They are not getting the billions they were hoping to get from auctioning off this new commodity created by government in California of CO₂ allotments to large businesses that produce CO₂.

So the funding isn't available anywhere. Still they hold on to this dream of building this high-speed rail project that is at least \$55 billion, probably a lot more than \$55 billion short of being completed.

Do you know what? This isn't even a priority for most people. Are they going to be able to afford to ride that rail? Are they going to be able to afford to ride that train and afford the ticket? Because if it is not going to be a subsidized ticket, it is probably going to be close to \$200 or \$300, not the \$80 that they projected 9 years ago.

Then should that really be the priority? Now, California, until this year,

we were blessed with so much rain and snow pack—there is an incredible amount of snow pack up on the mountains that I just flew over yesterday in my commute to Washington. We had suffered about 5 years of drought previously to that. We didn't have the infrastructure in place to store water that we should have with a State of 40 million people that, in the good old days, we used to plan for with the Central Valley Project built in the thirties and forties, the State water project built in the fifties and sixties.

Why have we been sitting all these decades since not really doing the things to stay forward and stay ahead of the curve on a population, on the needs of an economy of agriculture and municipalities of people? Instead, we are chasing these utter boondoggles like high-speed rail.

Our water infrastructure still has a lot of needs. Our rivers, when we have the high flows, many of our levees are in danger of not holding up in really high flows. We see that issue on the Feather River on the south end of my district and the adjacent district to the south of there with the levee systems in Yuba County and Sutter County, which a lot of folks have worked really hard in recent years on, and they are trying to locally upgrade these levees and keep it going.

This year, they had to spend a lot of dollars on upgrading the levees just to get through the season by laying gravel and mat down so that the boils that would be potentially coming through the levees wouldn't give out and have a blowout in those areas. What is going on with that? The money has been put aside, and the work is ready to go, but delays have cost the ability to get more miles of those levees done during the good weather last year so that we would ensure the safety of these areas, whether it is south Butte County, Yuba and Sutter Counties, and many other areas in the north State leading all the way down to Sacramento and the delta.

We need to be getting that work done immediately. Why should we endanger our communities by not getting the work we know we need to get done, the funding has been more or less put aside for, yet needless delay and bureaucratic red tape have caused delays in endangered places like that? Or like Hamilton City up in my area that I share in western Butte County and Glenn County.

This is the type of infrastructure that produces jobs—but even more importantly, after the jobs are done, the safety to a community, the ability to invest there, to build homes there, and to have that 200-year flood protection on the levees that is necessary to be insurable and, again, ensure the public safety. So this is part of the water infrastructure we desperately need in California and many of our other States, too, as well.

So serving on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, we could advance these. We can have this debate.

We can have this discussion and hold accountable the agencies that are supposed to be getting it done and not looking for more ways to delay it with paperwork sitting on the desk for projects that could be going out this year that might be delayed yet another year.

Coming back to dams, that is one of our most important components in flood control because we can control the water as it comes down from the higher elevations and have that ability to store water at the level we decide to let it out of the dam instead of whatever might be coming in uncontrolled with the high flows you can sometimes get from a massive amount of rain like we saw in the Sierras this year and the snow pack that is still sitting up there.

Lake Oroville, which many people have heard about across the country in recent weeks, is right in my district, right in my backyard. It has been a great project. It is a jewel of the State water project in California, built primarily in the sixties. Well, there was a big problem with the spillway. It gave way in early February, and so they had to assess what was going on with that and temporarily shut it down, in case of so much—an amazing amount of rain coming in during some of those same days actually caused the lake to top out and some of the water to start coming over the emergency spillway, which became another issue requiring an evacuation because erosion happening underneath that emergency spillway structure was unpredictable. Nobody knew what would happen as the dirt field below that eroded.

Why is it still a dirt field? That will be an interesting thing for us to hear about in hearings that are going to be going on at the State level as well as at the Federal level here. Why was it allowed to stay that way? A dirt field. The erosion nearly came up. Who knows what the effect might have been on that emergency spillway structure. Thankfully nothing happened. The dam structure is sound, the emergency spillway structure is sound. The main spillway needs much work, and a Herculean effort since then has cleared the river channel so the river can properly flow from the power plant, which is an important regulator of State level, the water that can run through that power plant. So a really good effort was done to do that after this emergency has occurred.

The evacuation really worried deeply many people in the north State. 180,000 people were evacuated. It was the right call by our Butte County sheriff to do so because of the unpredictability of that situation. So Sheriff Honea deserves much kudos for making the correct call on that and making people safe, keeping people safe.

But, nonetheless, we have this infrastructure issue we need to come back to and is being contemplated right now with a plan to replace the spillway. Can it be done in 1 year? It doesn't look like it. But measures will be

taken to upgrade that and make it work. It can be a long-term structure that will be durable for many decades. That is what we need. We need that predictability so the lake can be regulated and water stored properly in a fashion that provides for flood control during the high rain season and high snow pack season, as well as storing water for those drought years that we hopefully didn't let too much water get away from. We still have an obligation to meet water contracts and grow agricultural products and meet the needs for municipalities as well as all the environmental needs that are being demanded these days as well.

So we need to rebuild our spillway at Lake Oroville soon. That project will soon be underway. In the meantime, we still have a massive snow pack up there that has to be modeled and watched and carefully contemplated as to what the releases from the lake will be in the interim until the point where they can know what the predictability is of the amount of snow, the amount of rain, and the amount of water that can come down from the Sierras and affect the river system all the way down basically to where it meets up near Sacramento.

We need to have that predictability for people to be secure in their homes, at the same time finding that balance of storing the water that is needed to make a State run because we never know what the next drought year will be. Will it be next year? Or will we get a massive amount of rain this coming year? So we need to find that balance to make sure that we are keeping those communities safe, modeling very carefully what is up on the slopes still in snow pack and storing water for California's long-term needs this coming year and following years.

So with the repairs to Oroville that will soon be underway, I think people can be confident that that system will be sound. The dam is sound, the emergency spillway is sound, and the repairs that will be going underneath the base of that should make—if it is ever needed—which the goal is to never use the emergency spillway, but, should it be needed, it would be a sound piece of that infrastructure. And with a new spillway that will be built at Oroville within 1 to 2 years, that will be sound as well. People need to have that confidence.

I was speaking with people around the Oroville area, several of the businesses there that are concerned that having to move in an evacuation obviously is a horrendous expense, but also it is a concern for those others that they do business with, maybe outside of the area, that they can continue to supply the things that they produce for the contracts they would have. Indeed, that was expressed to me at a meeting a few weeks ago that maybe they are vendors for others in other parts of the State or the country that if they have the perception they can't rely upon them to keep producing those compo-

nents that go into other assemblies, then they may not do business with them anymore.

We need to ensure those folks that Oroville is going to stay, is in business to stay, and that those manufacturers can count on those components to be produced and made available to them because we will keep working to make sure that that infrastructure is sound with the water storage and the levee flood control system that we have. In just a few short weeks, we will see that, with the snow pack properly accounted for and that flood season past us, in the rebuilding of that infrastructure, then we can assure everyone that Oroville is strongly here to stay and here for business.

□ 1915

We have the operations of the lake. Indeed, there are a lot of things to balance with this infrastructure: recreation, electricity generation, agricultural and municipal as well as environmental waters. These are all things that have to be balanced. But, indeed, balance needs to be brought to it so that no one side is pushing too far the other so that we don't meet all these goals that are needed.

Energy is an important component of that as well. Generating that with hydroelectric power helps meet a reliable baseline load for electricity generated in California. It is much more reliable than solar or wind power. Why hydro-power isn't seen as an even more important component of the renewal energy portfolio is kind of silly and arbitrary to me, but it is, indeed, very, very valuable.

As we wind through all the different needs we have for infrastructure in this country—some of these examples in my own backyard—they are also needed elsewhere. Folks in all parts of the country have needs for a strong infrastructure, whether you are riding the train from New York to Washington, D.C., which I have a couple of times—that is a very important part of that infrastructure for those folks. We need to support them as well and make sure it is as modern and as safe as it can be. It affects everybody, the highway system that goes from the East Coast to the West Coast or North to South. It is a positive for all of us.

We need to stay ahead of the curve. President Trump has a very ambitious plan for rebuilding and adding to our infrastructure. It isn't all just about ribbon cuttings on new infrastructure. It is, indeed, the less glamorous that is a very important part of rebuilding what we have: upgrading our bridges, repaving those lanes, adding additional lanes to our freeways. That helps make it more convenient for all of us, better for commerce, better for safety.

With so much consternation in Washington, D.C., about what we are doing, these are some of the positives that we can point to in moving forward on infrastructure that everybody can use. It will be positive for the jobs in construction while it is being built and,

longer term, for the type of commerce that will make the United States a place to locate factories once again and have that manufacturing and that predictability of energy sources, water sources, safety of the infrastructure, and the ability to move these goods down our freeways to our ports, wherever they need to go.

With that, I will be looking forward to what we can do in California to have better infrastructure that is something people can actually use, actually access, and certainly afford without being hit with more taxes, more gas tax, more vehicle fees, and more ideas for taxes that may come from the Federal Government.

I don't see that happening here, but the people pay enough. As it is, it is already difficult enough for middle-income families to make ends meet if they have dreams of buying a home, paying off college debt, or sending their own kids to college a little later and maybe even, once in a while, going on a vacation that they would like to save up for. People need to have these choices. We are here at the Federal level to help be part of facilitating their ability to have those choices.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all the folks in northern California to hang in there. We are going to get through this season here. To the people of Oroville, we will make sure our systems are very sound. I think already, with steps that are taken, we will weather this difficult winter with a sound dam and infrastructure that will be able to have predictability and the assurance that, when you go to sleep at night, these systems are going to be serving us well and providing for our safety. I think we are well onto that track already.

Mr. 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 after 4 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker on Thursday, March 30, 2017:

H.J. Res. 43. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to compliance with title X requirements by project recipients in selecting subrecipients.

H.J. Res. 67. Joint Resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by qualified State political subdivisions for non-governmental employees.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 5, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

973. Under clause 2 of rule XIV, a letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 653. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal Government from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 702. A bill to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal anti-discrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal Government, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. PALONE, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1868. A bill to provide that providers of broadband Internet access service shall be subject to the privacy rules adopted by the Federal Communications Commission on October 27, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New

York, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KIND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. BEATY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VELA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BASS, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CLAY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. CORREA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. NEAL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. THOMPSON of

Mississippi, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1869. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 1870. A bill to require that States receiving Byrne JAG funds to require sensitivity training for law enforcement officers of that State and to incentivize States to enact laws requiring the independent investigation and prosecution of the use of deadly force by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASO (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. REED, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 1871. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to reduce Federal financial participation for certain States that require political subdivisions to contribute towards the non-Federal share of Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. STEWART, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KEATING, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1872. A bill to promote access for United States officials, journalists, and other citizens to Tibetan areas of the People's Republic of China, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 1873. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1874. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate overpayments of tax as contributions and to make additional contributions to the Homeless Veterans Assistance Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BERA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 1876. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster; 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. TONKO (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 1877. A bill to establish a research, development, and technology demonstration program to improve the efficiency of gas turbines used in combined cycle and simple cycle power generation systems; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 1878. A bill to prohibit any hiring freeze from affecting the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 1879. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for an exception from

infringement for certain component parts of motor vehicles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 1880. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act to ensure College for All; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. RENACCI, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1881. A bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BASS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 1882. A bill to provide for an effective HIV/AIDS program in Federal prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1883. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to take certain actions to increase diversity of ownership in the broadcasting industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1884. A bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of such employee's duty; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1885. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to eliminate the use of valid court orders to secure lockup of status offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 1886. A bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 1887. A bill to amend the Billfish Conservation Act of 2012 to clarify an exemption for traditional fisheries and markets; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 1888. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to provide incentives for the reallocation of Federal Government spectrum for commercial use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. GALLEGRO):

H.R. 1889. A bill to preserve the Arctic coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, as wilderness in recognition of its extraordinary natural ecosystems and for the permanent good of present and future generations of Americans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa):

H.R. 1890. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen equal pay requirements; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BOST, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1891. A bill to amend the Plant Protection Act with respect to authorized uses of methyl bromide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1892. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1893. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to create an electronic database of research and information on the causes of, and corrective actions being taken with regard to, algal blooms in the Great Lakes, their tributaries, and other surface fresh waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. LONG:

H.R. 1894. A bill to facilitate construction of a bridge on certain property in Christian County, Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr.

WEBSTER of Florida, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 1895. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from conducting or supporting any research involving human fetal tissue that is obtained pursuant to an induced abortion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with disabilities to save additional amounts in their ABLE accounts above the current annual maximum contribution if they work and earn income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rollovers from 529 programs to ABLE accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1898. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a minimum payment amount under such part for bone mass measurement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 1899. A bill to ensure the digital contents of electronic equipment and online accounts belonging to or in the possession of United States persons entering or exiting the United States are adequately protected at the border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. STIVERS (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TURNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1900. A bill to designate the Veterans Memorial and Museum in Columbus, Ohio, as the National Veterans Memorial and Museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1901. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and

Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution providing official recognition of the massacre of 11 African-American soldiers of the 333rd Field Artillery Battalion of the United States Army who had been captured in Wereth, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge on December 17, 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SPIER, Ms. LEE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KIND, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CORREA, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of Equal Pay Day to illustrate the disparity between wages paid to men and women; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. JONES, Mr. YOHO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRIST, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. UPTON, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who served in the bays, harbors, and territorial seas of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, should be presumed to have served in the Republic of Vietnam for all purposes under the Agent Orange Act of 1991; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. SCHRAEDER, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the designation of a "National Purebred Dog Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. LEE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BASS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H. Res. 246. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s "Beyond Vietnam: A Time to Break Silence" sermon condemning the Vietnam War and calling for a true revolution of values in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. VARGAS):

H. Res. 247. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. CLYBURN):

H. Res. 248. A resolution commending the University of South Carolina women's basketball team for winning the 2017 NCAA National Championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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 Ms. ROSEN:

H.R. 1868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. That provision gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 1871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 1872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 1873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 1874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 1875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 1876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 1878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 8, "to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Rights to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 1882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution, and Amendment VIII to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CÁRBAJAL:

H.R. 1884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 1885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 1886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 1887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 1890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 1891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 1893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 1894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

