



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 2017

No. 71

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 26, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB WOODALL 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.

TRUMP CARE FLEXIBILITY

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, as my Republican colleagues debate TrumpCare amongst themselves, they speak so often of so-called flexibility. But let's be clear about what that wink and nod to insurance companies actually means.

For working families, flexibility is a cold euphemism for less choice; actually, for an impossible choice between caring for a new child or aging parent,

between lifesaving treatment or your life savings, between an inpatient bed or monthly mortgage, desperately needed medication or food on your table, between life, and, yes, for some, death, because the moment essential health benefits become negotiable, they become dispensable.

And while insurance companies might enjoy that newfound flexibility, American families and our loved ones will pay that price.

PHILLIP AND PATRICIA FROST MUSEUM OF SCIENCE GRAND OPENING

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 the Phillip and Patricia Frost Museum of Science for the opening of its new location in downtown Miami in my congressional district on May 8. From its humble beginnings in 1950 as the Junior Museum of Miami, the Frost Museum has enjoyed tremendous success becoming the premier educational attraction for families and children across south Florida.

The nationally recognized after-school programs and summer camps offered at the Frost Museum of Science have provided generations of students the firsthand opportunity to explore science, technology, marine life, and astronomy, undoubtedly contributing to south Florida students' immense interest in STEM careers.

The new location in downtown Miami will provide state-of-the-art facilities and expand the interactive exhibits and demonstrations that keep patrons of the Frost Museum of Science returning year after year.

I would like to invite all of south Florida to come out to the new Phillip and Patricia Frost Museum of Science

on May 8 to celebrate the grand opening of this magnificent new facility.

RECOGNIZING OUR LADY OF LOURDES ACADEMY AND ST. THOMAS THE APOSTLE CATHOLIC SCHOOL

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize two extraordinary schools from my district, Our Lady of Lourdes Academy and St. Thomas the Apostle Catholic School, which have been selected regional winners for the Toshiba 2017 ExploraVision competition.

Their award-winning projects included a unique system for detecting blood clots through the use of sonar, synthetic photosynthesis, and an app to assist individuals with food allergies.

These innovative projects not only demonstrate our students' interest in STEM careers but a greater dedication to create solutions to the problems of today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the participants from Our Lady of Lourdes Academy and St. Thomas the Apostle Catholic School because this latest accomplishment further demonstrates the commitment that students in my district have toward making a better future for all.

Congratulations to the winners at Lourdes and St. Thomas for the Toshiba 2017 ExploraVision competition.

RECOGNIZING DMR CORPORATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize DMR Corporation, which is opening a new medical supply retail store this Friday in my congressional district.

Since its start in 1984, DMR has been working to meet the rising and challenging needs of the disabled community in south Florida and around the world. DMR counts with highly trained staff and with the tools necessary to build appropriate mobility and seating equipment, make accessible home and vehicle modifications, and install pool lifts for recreational activities.

□ 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.

H2851

It is thanks to the vision of the founder, Nella Pardo, and her commitment of service to others that DMR has thrived and has given nearly 12,000 clients the possibilities of better mobility that only a unique, custom-built wheelchair can offer.

DMR has contributed so many thousands of free wheelchairs to the needy disabled in south Florida, and it participates in many events to raise funds that will enable disabled individuals to have the mobility equipment they desperately need. Congrats to all.

CONGRATULATING WILLIAMSON AUTOMOTIVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Williamson Automotive on its significant milestone of 50 years of a highly successful and award-winning dealership.

Williamson Automotive does more than just create jobs and spur the economy of our community, as important as those are, but it has also engaged in various philanthropic ventures to best serve south Florida.

From their work contributing to Habitat for Humanity of Greater Miami to supporting a number of high school sports teams and sponsoring events for Relay For Life, Williamson Automotive never ceases to go above and beyond for south Florida.

Mr. Speaker, Williamson Automotive embodies what many homegrown businesses should, a passion for what you do and the ability to serve your community broadly, and they do just that.

I know that our community joins me in thanking Ed, Carol, and Trae Williamson and their staff for all that they have done and will continue to do to make our tropical paradise an even better place.

Once again, congratulations to Williamson Automotive on celebrating 50 years, and I wish you all the best and many more years of service to south Florida.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S FIRST 100 DAYS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the week, President Trump will reach his 100th day in office. These first 100 days, unfortunately, have been defined by chaos, contradiction, and conflicts of interest, and he has broken campaign promise after campaign promise.

He claimed he would be the greatest jobs President God ever created, yet he has failed to put forward a single jobs bill and is taking credit for jobs that were created or announced long before he took office.

He said he would fight for working families, yet his budget would slash investments that create jobs and opportunities. He said he would drain the swamp, yet he refuses to release his taxes, which would shed light on his own conflict of interest.

Washington is now practically drowning in the swamp President

Trump has rained down on our Capital. He promised to balance the budget in 9 years. It took him, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, less than 30 days to abandon that pledge, and his most recent proposals—tax cuts—would plunge our Nation even more deeply into debt.

But perhaps most emblematic of the failure of this Presidency's first 100 days was his attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act and purportedly to replace it.

The President has promised insurance for everybody—not access, insurance for everybody. He said that over and over again. But TrumpCare would do exactly the opposite, kicking 24 million people off their coverage and precluding millions more from being able to get health insurance.

The President promised coverage that is much less expensive and much better, but TrumpCare would force Americans to pay more for less. Not my observation—the Congressional Budget Office's.

The President promised he wouldn't cut Medicaid, but like so many other broken promises, TrumpCare cuts Medicaid deeply. As was true of the President's campaign, he brought no unity to his attack on America's health, and his plan was not even voted on. Indeed, that has been followed by Republican efforts to make their proposal even more draconian.

The second 100 days looms even worse as the Trump White House continues to be focused on kicking Americans off their coverage and making the rest pay more and getting less, saying it intends to bring an even more draconian version of its TrumpCare bill back.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans control both the House, the Senate, and the administration. They are now, theoretically, the governing party, and whatever happens to our healthcare system on their watch will be their responsibility.

So as this administration reaches its 100th day in office, it has a choice. It can continue to rack up the failures that it has amassed or it can turn the page to constructive cooperation.

The President can, contrary to his promises, keep trying to take health coverage away from the American people and make it more expensive, or he can set partisanship aside and work across the aisle to make sure the Affordable Care Act works for everyone.

We ought to be working together to accomplish that objective. He must start by ensuring that the promised cost-sharing reduction payments under the Affordable Care Act are made. If he does not, millions of people will be deeply hurt, the insurance system will be destabilized, and Americans across this country will find their policies more expensive.

On jobs, he can continue doing nothing or he can finally show the American people a plan to invest in jobs and infrastructure. Send us the legislation you promised, Mr. President. And he can keep hiding his tax returns from

the American people and ducking and weaving when it comes to his ties to Russia, or finally draw the curtain back and show what he has been hiding and support a bipartisan, independent commission to seek the answers Americans deserve and America must have.

Mr. Speaker, in these first 100 days, if they are a prologue of that which is to come, I grieve for us all. America is a great and good nation, an exceptional nation and people. We must not, by demagoguery, irrationality, and negligence, on the wings of a tweet, allow it to be brought low.

THANKING OUR WORLD WAR II VETERANS

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I had the honor of welcoming to Washington, D.C., more than 50 of our Southern Illinois veterans. The visit was put together by the Honor Flight of Southern Illinois, a nonprofit organization that transports veterans to Washington to visit the memorials honoring their service and sacrifice.

According to the VA, an estimated 640 World War II veterans leave us each day. It is time to express our thanks, and that time is running short.

We owe a debt of gratitude to those heroes and those who serve in defense of freedom and liberty. I will never forget the opportunity to welcome them to this Nation's Capital and thank them for all they have done for this country.

RECOGNIZING MCKENDREE UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S BOWLING TEAM

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly also recognize the McKendree University women's bowling team for winning the 2017 NCAA Women's Bowling Championship. These young women made history by becoming the first NCAA Division II program to win that championship.

The Bearcats' 4-0 triumph was also the first sweep in the 14-year history of the event. I extend a heartfelt congratulations to the team members, coaching staff, school officials, and family and friends on this incredible journey. Southern Illinois is proud of you.

Go Bearcats.

□ 1015

POLICY TOWARDS NORTH KOREA NEEDS TO BE CAREFULLY CALIBRATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce two bills to enhance our Nation's security and make the American people safer.

Of all the security challenges that the United States confronts, the most

serious threat, arguably, stems from North Korea, under its dangerous and unpredictable dictator. North Korea, which has the fourth largest military in the world, continues to make progress on its nuclear and ballistic missiles programs in violation of international sanctions.

Since 2006, North Korea has tested a nuclear device five times. The main goal of North Korea's nuclear weapons program is to develop a warhead small enough to be mounted on a ballistic missile. Unfortunately, North Korea has also shown substantial, even startling, progress in its missile programs.

Since 2014, North Korea has conducted nearly 50 test launches of ballistic missiles. North Korea is an imminent threat to our allies South Korea and Japan and the nearly 80,000 U.S. troops serving those two countries. And as its nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles programs advance, North Korea poses a rising threat to the United States homeland itself.

The U.S. policy approach to North Korea must be comprehensive and carefully calibrated. Miscalculation could result in armed conflict, possibly involving the use of nuclear weapons, and cause catastrophic loss of life. To be effective, U.S. strategy must be informed by the best possible intelligence on North Korea's intentions and capabilities.

North Korea is a difficult intelligence target. It is a secretive society where dissent is severely punished. This makes the recruitment of human resources inside the country very challenging, and moreover, high-level defectors from North Korea with intelligence about the regime are rare.

My first bill would require the Director of National Intelligence to create a North Korea-focused integration cell consisting of experts who would streamline, synthesize, and synchronize intelligence on North Korea so that U.S. policymakers have the best possible information upon which to base decisions.

The cell would seek to ensure that the U.S. Government is collecting intelligence on North Korea's nuclear weapons programs, missile programs, weapon sales, and other activities that violate U.N. sanctions. The cell would also work to make certain that this intelligence is efficiently disseminated to the appropriate national security policymakers so that it can inform decisionmaking.

While my first bill is specific to North Korea, my second bill seeks to safeguard Americans by promoting security and stability in the Asia Pacific region more broadly. This region encompasses about 40 countries containing over 60 percent of the world's population, including many of our top import and export partners. The region offers the United States economic opportunities, but also presents security challenges. Indeed, some senior American officials often describe the Asia Pacific as the most consequential region for the future of our country.

Historically, under Presidents of both parties, the U.S. has maintained a strong military and diplomatic presence in the region to reassure allies and deter adversaries. The core of U.S. strategy has been close cooperation with our regional partners. These partnerships are an essential component of our effort to confront aggression by North Korea, judiciously manage the rise of China, dismantle terrorist networks, ensure freedom of navigation in international waters, guarantee the free flow of commerce, respond to humanitarian emergencies, and promote respect for the rule of law.

These partnerships, built on mutual trust, are not self-sustaining. They require U.S. leadership, energy, and resources. To deepen cooperation, my bill would create a commission of U.S. security officials and their counterparts from willing regional partner nations. The commission would aim to increase military readiness, strengthen counterterrorism operations, enhance maritime security, bolster cybersecurity, and improve intelligence coordination.

The commission would send a clear signal to allies and adversaries alike that the U.S. commitment to the Asia Pacific region is intensive and enduring.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support these two bills, which are aimed at addressing the immediate threat posed by North Korea, and strengthening our security alliances with key regional partners.

PAKISTAN IS PLAYING THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when our forces invaded Afghanistan in 2001, the goal was simple: remove the Taliban government that sheltered the plotters of the 9/11 attacks on America, and destroy al-Qaida.

Nearly 16 years later, Afghanistan is still a haven for terrorists who seek to attack and kill Americans. Since then, the Taliban has waged an insurgency in Afghanistan, destabilizing the country, creating perfect conditions for terrorists to exploit.

The Taliban and al-Qaida have launched many of their attacks in Afghanistan from Pakistan. Taliban insurgency is stronger today than at any other point since 2001. Just last week, a Taliban sneak attack killed more than 160 Afghan soldiers, prompting the defense minister and army chief of staff to resign.

But the Taliban don't just stage attacks, they seize territory. The Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction said in January that 172 Afghan districts are controlled, influenced, or contested by the Taliban. Al-Qaida has a long history of loyalty to the Taliban. Osama bin Laden swore his allegiance to the Taliban's leader, Mullah Omar, even before 9/11. When

bin Laden was killed in Pakistan, Ayman al-Zawahiri renewed that oath and cemented ties between al-Qaida and the Taliban. Wherever the Taliban has influence, we can be sure that al-Qaida is not far behind.

Since 2010, U.S. officials have incorrectly claimed that al-Qaida had a small presence in the country limited only to 50 to 100 fighters. Then, in 2015, a shocking U.S. raid in Afghanistan uncovered a massive al-Qaida training camp, rounding up over 150 al-Qaida terrorists. This was more fighters found in one raid than the U.S. officials claimed existed in the entire country. And by the end of last year, U.S. officials announced that 250 al-Qaida terrorists were killed or captured in 2016 alone.

Along with al-Qaida in Afghanistan, we have the other terrorist group, the Haqqani Network. This group is directly linked to al-Qaida and the Taliban. The Haqqani Network is responsible for more American deaths in the region than any other terrorist group. The Haqqani Network attacks inside Afghanistan have been directly traced back to—you guessed it—Pakistan.

In fact, in 2011, Admiral Mike Mullen, then-chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate: "The Haqqani Network acts as a veritable arm of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence Agency."

The truth is that Pakistan has ties to about every terrorist group in Afghanistan. And we know that the Taliban is still based in Pakistan today. It came as no surprise that when the U.S. drone strike killed the leader of the Taliban in 2016, he was—that is right—in Pakistan.

The laundry list of evidence of Pakistan support for terrorists goes on and on. We all remember where al-Qaida leader and America's most wanted terrorist, Osama bin Laden, was found and killed: in Pakistan.

Afghanistan's representative to the U.N. recently told the Security Council that Pakistan maintains ties with more than 20 different terrorist groups.

Mr. Speaker, Pakistan is playing us. Pakistan turns a blind eye to the terrorist allies, the Afghan Taliban and the Haqqani Network fighters in the area. The Pakistan Taliban fighters ended up becoming the leaders of the ISIS affiliate in Afghanistan, known as ISIS Khorasan province. ISIS announced their Afghan affiliate in January 2015, and now has entrenched itself in the eastern part of the country.

For the first time ever, the military dropped its largest non-nuclear bomb, the Massive Ordnance Air Blast Bomb, earlier this month on ISIS targets in Afghanistan. It is no surprise that Afghanistan is a hotbed for terrorist mischief groups, all related to Pakistan. That is what Pakistan has always wanted: a weak and divided Afghanistan that threatens the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we reassess our Pakistan policy so that it matches

Pakistan's behavior in Afghanistan. We need to call Pakistan out. We must reduce aid to the two-faced Pakistan Government. We don't need to pay them to betray us. We must designate Pakistan as a state sponsor of terrorism, and we must remove their major non-NATO ally status. In the war on terror, it is crystal clear Pakistan is not on America's side.

And that is just the way it is.

HEALTH CARE ROUND TWO

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

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, what has changed since the last time the Republicans attempted to repeal or replace the Affordable Care Act?

Absolutely nothing. That is right. Nothing has changed.

Recent polls show that the Affordable Care Act is more popular than ever. Yet, the Republicans still want to get rid of a law that is helping to provide our most vulnerable Americans the affordable care they need and deserve.

In my district, Mr. Speaker, 369,000 people who receive health coverage from their employers could lose their consumer protection. 62,000 people covered by Medicare expansion could lose coverage if the ACA is repealed. These are the numbers of a few weeks back. It could be even worse now.

This Saturday marks President Trump's 100th day in the White House. And this week we have a stacked agenda with tax reform, to pass a spending bill, to prevent government shutdown, to talks of health care being back in the mix.

One may think that health care will get lost in the shuffle, but we have seen how this administration and the Republicans will not back down. They appear committed to getting rid of a law that provides quality, affordable health care to millions of Americans young and old.

The American people elected us to fight an agenda that supports the needs of everyday Americans, hardworking Americans. Instead of cutting programs like SNAP, Meals on Wheels, the Community Development Block Grant program, we should look for ways to grow programs that help build stronger neighborhoods block by block.

Over the weekend, I went to the health fair at Temple University in my district. Temple University Hospital has served the city of Philadelphia for the last 120 years. It is a job creator and a major employer in our community. We should be looking for ways to build up the engines that drive investment and grow our economy, not tear them down.

Let me remind you, Republicans want to vote on the healthcare bill that gets rid of essential health benefits—for example, coverage for emergency rooms, maternity care, and pre-

scription drugs. But because of the people, because of you and all of your phone calls, all of your emails, all of your letters, their attempt to repeal the healthcare bill was stopped.

This just happened. Yes, they still want to vote on a bill that destroys protections for people with preexisting conditions.

I want to tell you a story of a small-business owner in my district named Andrea. Andrea owns a small pet shop, Spot's—The Place for Paws, in Narberth, Pennsylvania. Andrea left her Philadelphia law practice to pursue her dream of owning a small business. Andrea has type 1 diabetes. Without the ACA, she would not be able to get well-priced coverage that covers her health expenses and medication and allows her to keep her shop open.

Andrea's story is like that of so many Americans across the country. We cannot support legislation that makes life harder for those trying the hardest to get ahead.

Last week, I visited another wonderful resident in my district, Sister Mary Scullion. She is truly an inspirational individual who has made it her mission to help the most vulnerable citizens. Sister Scullion made a comment that stuck in my head: "Public housing is the best way to cure and prevent homelessness for the future."

In thinking about how we view our healthcare system, I am reminded of my conversation with Sister Scullion. We need to work together to lift our people out of tough situations. We need to work together to provide everyone in our neighborhoods with the tools and resources they need to succeed.

As I mentioned, this Saturday marks President Trump's 100th day in office. Interestingly enough, the President will be in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania—a place that I have worked for many years.

What do we have to lose under this administration? Well, don't we have to lose a lot?

Affordable housing, Meals on Wheels for our seniors, before- and afterschool programs for our kids, and the list goes on.

Well, we have a lot to lose, Mr. President. We will continue to make our voices heard. The resistance is alive, and the resistance is working.

□ 1030

RECOGNIZING NANCY BILLET

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nancy Billet, the office manager and financial administrator of my Washington, D.C., office. After working for three Members of Congress over a span of 36 years, Nancy will retire on Friday, and she will be missed by all.

Nancy grew up on Maryland's Eastern Shore, and she never thought about

working in politics. After graduating from Chesapeake College, she and a classmate moved to the D.C. suburbs, and Nancy found her way to Capitol Hill.

In 1981, shortly after Ronald Reagan was sworn in as President, Nancy began her career as a staff assistant with Congressman Phil Crane, a Republican from Illinois. She worked for Congressman Crane, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, for almost 14 years as a staff assistant, legislative assistant, and office manager.

She joined a softball team that played on The Mall after work hours, and that is where she would eventually meet her husband, Barry. They got married, had a baby boy, and Nancy continued working, but only part-time. She also continued her education with evening classes at Northern Virginia Community College and proceeded to receive a bachelor's degree from George Mason University.

After the birth of their second son, Nancy would return to the Hill full-time after the 1994 election. In January 1995, Nancy was hired as an office manager for Congressman Phil English, a Republican from Pennsylvania. Nancy worked with Congressman English until his retirement in January of 2009.

When he heard about her retirement, former Congressman Phil English said Nancy was a "fabulous source of stability and good humor in an office where we were always a kite dancing in a hurricane. Your gracious manner and personal generosity made many difficult days tolerable and the cause possible to pursue. You brightened the lives of all you worked with, all you touched."

Congressman English went on to say that Nancy's consistent patience with constituents, interns, and any individual who came through the door was legendary. I couldn't agree more.

Nancy came to work in my office in 2009, and we have been so blessed to have her on staff. I was able to hit the ground running as a freshman Member with such a knowledgeable veteran Hill staffer on my team. Nancy can master the most difficult tasks with ease, but it is her pleasant personality that I will miss most. I have been fortunate to have her on staff, and her shoes will not be easily filled.

Her institutional knowledge is remarkable. Nancy has had a front-row seat to so much change in the Capitol, from using an IBM typewriter with a correctable ribbon to floppy disc computers, to today's laptops, iPads, and smartphones; from busy phone booths in the Longworth Building outside of the Ways and Means Committee to everyone talking on their own personal cell phone in every hallway and every office; from easy access to the buildings to the barriers put in place after the September 11 attacks; and all the administrations to come and go. Nancy was employed for Presidents Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and now under Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, to say we will miss Nancy is an understatement, but I know she is looking forward to spending time with her husband, Barry, and her three sons—Brian, Will, and Robby—and the rest of the family.

Nancy, on behalf of Penny and me and all the staff, we wish you the best for a well-deserved retirement. On behalf of the Congress of the United States, thank you for your nearly four decades of service to the people's House. Thank you for all your dedication to serving the American people.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the Armenian community in commemorating the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

On April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Empire began committing atrocities that would result in the first genocide of the 20th century. Between 1915 and 1923, 1½ million Armenians were systematically deported from their homes and sent to their death on marches through the Syrian Desert. That is a fact.

My district, located in California's San Joaquin Valley, is the land of William Saroyan and the resting place of Soghomon Terlirian, a hero of the Armenian people. It is also home to the only Armenian genocide monument on a college campus in the Nation at Fresno State University, my alma mater. It is a campus that has a storied Armenian Studies program known throughout the country and is a sister university to the American University of Armenia.

The San Joaquin Valley of California is also one of the earliest settling places for thousands of survivors and their families as part of the diaspora as a result of the genocide. Many still live there today and call the valley their home.

I was honored to visit Armenia this past year to meet with its people and leaders. I was truly humbled to visit the Armenian genocide memorial in Yerevan. We have seen religious and civic leaders from all around the world recognize the Armenian genocide and ensure that this tragedy is never ever forgotten.

I am very disappointed and saddened that another year has passed without the President of the United States or the Congress recognizing the events of 1915 as genocide. We cannot move forward free of genocide without recognizing the first genocide of the 20th century. So I ask my colleagues to please join me in recognizing the lives of 1½ million victims and their families.

It is always said that now is not the right time because of our relationship with Turkey as they become, like this country, less democratic as a result of recent elections. I reject that view. If we do not recognize the genocide now, then when?

I stand with Armenians all over the world to say "menk' ch'yenk' morranum." We will not forget.

RECOGNIZING PAUL JAMUSHIAN

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and advocacy of Mr. Paul Jamushian, as the 16th Congressional District's Hero of the Month in California.

As a descendant of both martyrs and survivors of the Armenian genocide, Paul has been an advocate for the Armenian cause and for genocide recognition for over 50 years. As a member of the Armenian National Committee of America, he has led efforts throughout the country to advocate and educate residents and people of the atrocities of 1915.

I have been proud to call Paul a friend and a partner in what has been a mutual commitment to ensure that the Armenian genocide is never forgotten. His efforts have led to the Armenian genocide being formally recognized by numerous cities, counties, and State governing bodies.

While in my district, his efforts, along with those of numerous others in the Armenian community, have led to this beautiful Armenian genocide monument on the campus of Fresno State University as you see here.

Paul is the embodiment of the community of Armenian Americans throughout the country who have not only survived, but have gone on to thrive post-genocide and contribute time and time again to our country. It is my honor to recognize Paul as the Hero of the Month for the 16th Congressional District in California this month, especially during this week of remembrance for the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Let us never ever forget.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC FUNDING IN THE 21ST CENTURY CURES ACT

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services announced the first round of grant funding for the 21st Century Cures Act.

As a cosponsor and supporter of Cures and a Member who represents communities in Pennsylvania directly impacted by the opioid crisis, this was an encouraging and welcomed step toward combating this epidemic. This first round of funding will support prevention and treatment initiatives for those individuals in need.

In particular, these resources will assist our local health centers that serve the uninsured or underinsured and are leading the fight on the front lines against this epidemic. This is one of many steps that will need to take place to combat this crisis.

As the debate here in the House on efforts to improve health care continues, this announcement serves as a

reminder of the positive and good we can do when we work together to deliver solutions that strengthen our communities. Moving forward, I will continue to work with my colleagues to advance and support policies to address addiction prevention and treatment.

CONGRATULATING WINNERS OF 2017 CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate students in Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District.

Yesterday, my office was proud to announce the winners of the 2017 Congressional Art Competition. As a member of the STEAM Caucus and a strong supporter of funding for the arts and humanities, I always encourage students across my district to participate in the competition.

This year, Hannah from Conestoga High School, was awarded first place for her piece, entitled, "Three Cranes"; second place went to Rachel from Henderson High School; third place was awarded to Elizabeth from Conestoga High School; and fourth place was awarded to Juliet from Phoenixville Area High School.

The creativity displayed this year and every year by students from our community shows the depth of hard work and talent of our region's students. I congratulate and thank each student who submitted their work to the competition.

NIH FUNDING

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the recess period, I had the opportunity to host townhalls and meet with constituents to hear about the issues and concerns that matter to them.

One of the recurring topics of concern that I kept hearing was about potential cuts to Federal medical research funding, in particular, NIH cuts from the President's skinny budget.

We made great progress last Congress toward strengthening the NIH, most notably through passage of the 21st Century Cures Act. In addition to increasing funding, we have made positive structural changes to ensure that every dollar invested is being used effectively and efficiently.

The NIH and medical research represent our best hope to find cures, improve care, and solve the diseases and conditions that affect millions of Americans. We should not reduce one penny of NIH funding, not one penny. The work and research of the NIH is simply too valuable.

FENTANYL CRISIS

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, because of the fentanyl crisis we are facing, I have cosponsored the Synthetic Trafficking and Overdose Prevention Act, also known as the STOP Act. The bill aims to prevent synthetic drugs, such as fentanyl, from being shipped to the United States by drug traffickers.

Illicitly produced synthetic opioids have strong associations with countries like China and India, where there

is little to no regulation, and fentanyl and its analogues are manufactured in both small- and large-scale production laboratories.

The STOP Act would require foreign postal operators to send advanced electronic data to the USPS, the Postal Service, for packages imported into the United States. This would enable Customs and Border Protection and other agencies to target high-risk shipments for screening.

This bill also gives the Postal Service more authority to scan arriving mail from places that are currently exempt from CBP protocol, helping to stop these packages from reaching U.S. borders in the first place. It is a vigilant Federal response, including the STOP Act, which is crucial to reversing the tide of addiction, helping to save lives in our community and across the country.

BURN PITS

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, burn pits, which are found on military bases, create substances that can be toxic. Tires, batteries, human waste, medical waste, and other garbage items are put into pits and set on fire, sometimes after being soaked with jet fuel. Burn pits were regularly used in Iraq and Afghanistan, so veterans of these wars are particularly at risk.

My colleagues and I have introduced legislation that says, if a veteran does not have visible wounds, it is often difficult to provide the proof that VA needs to process a claim—but it shouldn't be that burdensome for a veteran who has sacrificed so much for our country—to get the treatment they need when they come home. There are many reports of veterans who believe their illness was caused by their exposure to burn pits who have not been able to get the VA to provide them with coverage.

This epidemic is being compared to the major problem veterans who were exposed to Agent Orange had when they returned home from the Vietnam war, and we cannot let that happen again. So we have introduced legislation because veterans who are exposed to burn pits and subsequently have complications need to have the right diagnosis and treatment as soon as possible.

This bill would create a Center of Excellence at the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, which would provide research to be able to properly address the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of these veterans. It is important the men and women who dedicate their lives to protecting our country can access the care they need when they return home.

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 43 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Michael D. Gutierrez, St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, Baldwin Park, California, offered the following prayer:

God, source of goodness and mercy, today we pray that You touch the minds and hearts of the Members of Congress.

Grant them wisdom and insight to make effective decisions that benefit the common good of our Nation, respecting all ethnicities, genders, and faith traditions.

We pray, Lord, that our Representatives may listen to one another so that they may seek what is good and true for all people. We ask You, Lord, to guide them and grant them courage to act in peace and justice so that other nations may see the goodness of our Nation and our leaders.

God, may this day be a continual exchange of ideas and prosperous debate, that people may see that our Representatives are being guided by You, God, and that Your wisdom be reflected in their decisions.

We lift up this prayer in Your holy name.

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.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BEATTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING FATHER MICHAEL D. GUTIERREZ

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce to the House and bid welcome to Father Mike Gutierrez today. He is the pastor at St. John the Baptist Catholic Church and school in the city of Baldwin Park in California. Thank you, Father, for coming from Baldwin Park and for the wonderful prayer.

Father Mike, as he is known—he doesn't use Gutierrez—leads a parish of 10,000 families with a focus on Filipino and Hispanic communities. He has increased participation in religious and educational programs, youth and family ministry, and allows the church to bring attention and encourage activism on issues impacting the area.

He is an integral part of the 32nd District's, my district, annual immigration clinic event and is known for his joviality and smiling consistently.

Since my move to the California 32nd, he has been helpful in many issues and events that I have put forth, recognized by the California State Legislature and the Archdiocese of Los Angeles for support of social issues.

Father, thank you. Thank you for today's blessing and for the work you do to spread and promote Gospel throughout the San Gabriel Valley.

May God continue to bless you and your ministry.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

AN ADMINISTRATION MARKED BY STRENGTH

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday marks 100 days in office for President Donald Trump, an important milestone for Congress and this administration.

Since being sworn in, President Trump has stood strong, upholding his pledge to protect the American people in the face of world threats. He has stood up to the dangerous regime in North Korea by supporting our allies in the region and deploying the THAAD missile defense system. He took swift, decisive action against the dictatorship in Syria by using military force and economic sanctions after the brutal dictatorship executed a chemical attack murdering innocent civilians.

Additionally, the President has taken strong action to win the global war on terrorism by destroying ISIL-controlled tunnels in Afghanistan.

I appreciate President Trump for being a strong President and a model of Ronald Reagan, promoting peace through strength. Congratulations to him on a remarkable first 100 days in office.

I look forward to continuing to work with the President to protect American families while successfully creating jobs.

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

PRESIDENT TRUMP PROMISES

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Presidential campaign, Donald Trump promised to create good-paying manufacturing jobs, but nearly 100 days into his administration, we are learning that this is just another broken promise.

Since taking office, President Trump has failed to use American steel for the Keystone pipeline, proposed \$2.5 billion in cuts in the Labor Department, which will reduce funding for critical job training in advanced manufacturing, and proposed complete elimination of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, a Federal initiative that provides critical matching grants to support regional manufacturing economies.

If President Trump were serious about putting working people first, he would work with Democrats to pass bills we have already introduced to strengthen manufacturing, bills like Make It In America Manufacturing Communities Act that I have introduced to revitalize manufacturing economies and legislation to modernize and strengthen Buy America provisions.

If Donald Trump wants to keep the promises he made to working people, then he needs to start working with Democrats to deliver results. We are ready to go. We have introduced bills to strengthen American manufacturing. All we need now is a real partner in the White House, a President who is more concerned with results than TV ratings.

CONGRATULATING CONGRESSMAN STEVE STIVERS ON HIS PROMOTION

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues in the Ohio delegation, to congratulate Congressman STEVE STIVERS on his promotion from colonel to brigadier general of the Ohio National Guard.

Ohio is a State rich in history and a long list of American leaders who call

it home. STEVE's promotion marks another milestone in our great State's history.

STEVE STIVERS, a native of Ripley, Ohio, and proud Ohio State Buckeye, is the first brigadier general since Rutherford B. Hayes to represent Ohio in Congress.

Rutherford B. Hayes represented my district, the Second District of Ohio, from 1865 to 1867, before going on to serve as Governor of Ohio and then President of the United States.

On behalf of the Ohio delegation, we offer congratulations and our gratitude for STEVE's service.

Mr. Speaker, STEVE STIVERS' leadership adds to our State's storied legacy of servant leaders and citizen soldiers. Our State and our Nation are fortunate that STEVE STIVERS has dedicated his life to defending the cause of freedom both in the ranks of the National Guard and in the Halls of Congress.

CONGRATULATING CONGRESSMAN STEVE STIVERS ON HIS PROMOTION

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my Ohio colleagues to congratulate Congressman STEVE STIVERS on his promotion from colonel to brigadier general of the Ohio Army National Guard.

His promotion comes after more than 30 years in the National Guard. He is now one of the highest ranking National Guard members to also serve as a Member of Congress. Congressman STIVERS served the United States overseas during Operation Iraqi Freedom in Kuwait, Iraq, and Djibouti where he was awarded the Bronze Star for leadership throughout the deployment.

We are proud to have him leading the National Guard soldiers who protect us at home and abroad.

Congressman STIVERS, on behalf of the Ohio delegation and the citizens we represent, congratulations on this distinguished honor. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call STEVE a colleague and Ohioan and a friend.

CONGRATULATING CONGRESSMAN STEVE STIVERS ON HIS PROMOTION

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in congratulating STEVE STIVERS on his promotion to brigadier general. I served for 26½ years in the United States Air Force, and I can tell you that every officer who puts on the uniform, in the quiet moments of their own minds, they dream of the day that maybe someday they might aspire to become a flag officer or to attain the rank of general officer.

I can tell you that, from my perspective, it is a lot easier to get elected to

the House of Representatives than it is to earn the rank of general—at least that is what my experience shows. I can tell you, I never served under STEVE STIVERS and his command, but if his military leadership and performance is anything like his performance here in the House, he is going to represent the State of Ohio and our Nation very well.

Congratulations to my colleague, STEVE STIVERS. God bless you, and thank you for your service to our country.

NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN AN EXPENSIVE WALL

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, while the President continues to drone on about his southern border wall, a wall that he told America Mexico would pay for—which, of course, they will not—a wall that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology reports will cost Americans \$40 billion, there is no discussion of a promised \$1 trillion infrastructure bill.

This week, a Reuters report named my hometown of Buffalo, New York, as among the most dangerous lead hotspots in America. The lead waterlines in places like Buffalo, New York, and Flint, Michigan, are more than 100 years old, and they need to be replaced. Forty percent of kids in lead hotspots could suffer from cognitive delays and other neurological problems.

Mr. Speaker, the President needs to stop talking about an expensive and ineffective wall and start taking action on removing the toxic levels of lead from our Nation's drinking water systems, particularly in places like Buffalo, New York, and Flint, Michigan.

CONGRATULATING CONGRESSMAN STEVE STIVERS ON HIS PROMOTION

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

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, today I want to congratulate my colleague, my friend, and fellow Buckeye, Congressman STEVE STIVERS, on his promotion to brigadier general. I am thankful to be joined by my colleagues in the House and our Senators, Senator BROWN and Senator PORTMAN, as we applaud our colleague.

He is the first Ohio National Guard officer in more than 100 years to concurrently serve as a Member of Congress and one of the few people in U.S. history to have held both positions simultaneously. Congressman STIVERS joined the National Guard in 1985, and has served for over 30 years.

I, and many other Ohioans, appreciate his years of service, both in the military and in the United States Congress.

Congratulations, Brigadier General STIVERS, and thank you for your service.

EXTEND CONRAD 30 WAIVER PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conrad 30 Waiver program set to expire at the end of this week. This program helps match medically underserved communities, both rural and urban, with much-needed doctors. Currently, foreign medical students studying here using J-1 visas must return to their home country and wait 2 years before they can apply to work in the United States. This makes no sense.

The American medical education system attracts the best and the brightest and produces the best medical graduates in the world. When so many of our communities are struggling to attract medical professionals, we should be creating incentives for these newly trained doctors to stay.

Through the Conrad 30 program, a limited number of new physicians can stay if they can commit to work 3 years in underserved communities. Continuing the Conrad 30 Waiver program is a commonsense step towards helping underserved Americans. I am proud to introduce H.R. 2141 with Congressman ISSA of California to extend and expand this program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATING CONGRESSMAN STIVERS ON HIS PROMOTION

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my Ohio colleagues to congratulate our colleague STEVE STIVERS on this great momentous occasion of being promoted to brigadier general.

I have known my friend since our days in the Ohio General Assembly. I remember when he was deployed for his service that he so unselfishly gave to his Nation in uniform.

With STEVE, you can go back in history. It was 242 years ago last week, on April 18, 1775, that Paul Revere, Dawes, and Prescott rode across the countryside and said that the regulars were out.

It was on the morning of April 19 that men left their shops, left their plows, and went to that call. It was that citizen soldier that went out there to make sure that this Nation attained the freedom that we have today.

From the National Guard and all of our men and women that are serving in

uniform across all the services, it is because of them that we have the right to stand here today.

I applaud Congressman STIVERS on his promotion to brigadier. And we, along with our colleagues in the Senate, congratulate him. Mr. Speaker, I thank him very much for his service.

RESOLUTION HONORING EARTH DAY

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the proud sponsor of the resolution honoring Earth Day.

For more than 40 years, people have come together on Earth Day to support protections for our air, water, and land, and to increase appreciation for Mother Earth.

But every day, not just on Earth Day, we must renew our commitment to preserving our planet.

One way to do this is by continuing to build upon the Paris Agreement and other efforts. That is why countless Americans marched last week for science, and that is why even more will turn out for this weekend's Climate March.

It is also the reason why tomorrow I will co-announce the creation of the United for Climate Task Force, a voice in Congress for communities of color, low-income communities, and other marginalized groups disproportionately impacted by environmental injustice.

Alongside my colleagues Congresswoman JAYAPAL and Congresswoman BARRAGAN, we will promote a Federal agenda that stands for environmental justice.

The task force will strive to protect the rights of all to clean air, safe water, healthy communities, equal protection from the environmental and health hazards, and guaranteed access to the decisionmaking process.

Like those who celebrated Earth Day in 1970, we have a shared responsibility to ensure that future generations inherit a livable, sustainable, and ecologically rich planet.

CONGRATULATING CONGRESSMAN STIVERS AND CONGRESSMAN WENSTRUP ON THEIR PROMOTIONS

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two Members of our congressional delegation, and two of my friends, Congressman STEVE STIVERS and Congressman BRAD WENSTRUP, upon their military promotions.

Now Brigadier General STIVERS in the Ohio National Guard, and Colonel BRAD WENSTRUP in the United States Army Reserve, they both have served their country beyond the boundaries of their district.

Today I am humbled and honored to join my colleagues in congratulating

them on their distinguished public and military careers.

Congressman STIVERS, 30 years ago as a young Buckeye, assumed the title—one very important to him and to us—as citizen soldier.

In 1998, Congressman WENSTRUP joined the U.S. Army Reserve after already establishing himself as a doctor in the Cincinnati area.

To Congressman STIVERS and Congressman WENSTRUP, as faithful Representatives to your constituents, as members of our military, and veterans of the Iraq war and recipients of the Bronze Star, you have always put service to our country first.

Thank you from a grateful Congress and a grateful nation. Congratulations on your respective promotions.

PRESIDENT TRUMP AND HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are, 100 days into President Trump's Presidency, and all we have seen is this President break the promises that he made when he campaigned for President.

He promised, for example, that we would have "everyone covered with health care." Everyone. Then as President, he broke that promise.

Last month we saw him put forth his failed and terrible healthcare bill, TrumpCare, which would kick 24 million people off their health care. And even for those who would receive health care, they would pay more for less coverage: higher deductibles, higher prescription costs, no guarantee of hospitalization coverage or other essential benefits.

He is not looking out for the middle class. TrumpCare 2.0 is even worse, taking away a guarantee that a person with a preexisting condition can get essential lifesaving health care.

President Trump, I just have one message: Stop it. Stop. Turn back from this terrible path you are taking us on. Ensure that all Americans have health care. Work with Democrats and Republicans to fix the problems we see in the Affordable Care Act, but stop this terrible path that you are taking this country on.

IN MEMORY OF DAN COBORN

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Minnesota's very own Dan Coborn.

Dan Coborn, a native son of the St. Cloud community, recently passed, but his memory will live on.

Dan will be remembered as an executive who helped his family's business grow and succeed. He will be remembered as a loving husband and father whose wife and five children meant the world to him.

Perhaps most importantly, Dan Coborn will be remembered for his charity and generosity. Over the span of his life, Dan Coborn gave back to a number of charities that included the St. Cloud Area Family YMCA, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Minnesota, and the Boys and Girls Clubs of Central Minnesota.

In addition to financially giving back to these charities, he also gave his time by serving as a board member of the St. Cloud Hospital and the Sauk Rapids-Rice Schools, in addition to serving as a founding member of the United Way of Central Minnesota.

Dan Coborn was a hero in our community, and his passing is a massive loss to us all. I wish his family peace during this difficult time, and I promise his life's work will not be forgotten.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S 100 DAYS AND HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, across the board, the President's first 100 days have been marked by nothing but broken promises.

Instead of creating jobs, he has made it a priority to repeatedly push for a TrumpCare bill that will increase costs for families and rip away care from more than 24 million people.

The American people have made it clear time and time again that TrumpCare is a bad bill, but the President refuses to listen.

He and congressional Republicans remain intent on pushing through legislation that undermines the care of people, like a social worker in my district in Sacramento who before the Affordable Care Act, went into debt in order to pay for a few routine medical tests.

The President should spend some time thinking about our country's future instead of taking reckless actions that put the health and well-being of American families on the line.

THE IRAN DEAL

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, after more than a year, the Obama administration's Iran nuclear deal remains deeply unpopular.

At the time of the agreement, the American people believed they had given up too much, and they were right. We already knew the administration had paid cash in exchange for American prisoners, but this week we learned from an investigation by Politico that the Obama administration was also not truthful about the Iranian prisoners we released.

These prisoners were not "civilians accused of trade violations," as the administration had claimed. They were

men who posed a threat to our national security, accused of supplying Iran with materials for their weapons program.

It had taken hundreds of hours for our law enforcement and intelligence services to track down and build cases against these men, and the Obama administration was willing to undo all of that to use these men as a bargaining chip.

Undermining our national security is not in the best interest of our country, nor is being dishonest with the American people.

As we move forward, we must be clear-eyed and vigilant with the Iranian regime and its intentions while supporting and strengthening our intelligence community. That is a path towards a nuclear-free Iran.

THE IMPACT OF STOPGAP SPENDING BILLS ON STATES AND LOCALITIES

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, it looks like Congress has avoided another government shutdown for now. We will probably pass another short-term spending bill or two before this latest stopgap bill runs out, threatening to bring us to the brink once again.

This is no way to govern. As a former mayor and State legislator, I know that our States and cities need to be able to plan ahead. They can't do that if Federal funding is up in the air and subject to the latest political tug of war.

If we expect 50 States to pass a budget every year, there is no reason Congress can't do the same. It is time for Congress and the White House to stop playing games and to do the job that we were sent to Washington to do.

RECOGNIZING WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DAY

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of World Intellectual Property Day.

Strong intellectual property protections are grounded in the Constitution and have never been more critical to our economic success and culture of innovation than they are today.

IP industries contribute more than \$6 trillion to our economy annually and support more than 45 million American jobs.

In my home State of Georgia, there are an estimated 1.9 million IP-related jobs that contribute \$30 billion per year in manufacturing exports.

IP protections undergird our economy by promoting competitiveness, ensuring good-paying jobs, and rewarding ideas that have value.

In Georgia, which is now the third largest State for film production in the

Nation, as well as the home to software companies, "payment processor alley," musicians, and video game designers, strong intellectual property rights mean that our State can continue to grow and thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues today to join me in recognizing World IP Day and the importance of intellectual property protections at home and abroad.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S FIRST 100 DAYS AND HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, for 7 years, Republicans have talked about repealing the Affordable Care Act and replacing it with something better.

And then in the first 100 days of the Trump administration, Republicans offered a plan that would have raised premiums, raised deductibles, and taken away health care from 24 million Americans.

The Trump-Republican proposal was a cowardly cynical effort to lower taxes on the richest Americans, strip away insurance protections from hard-working families, and to dismantle Medicare and Medicaid. Their plan would make Americans pay more to get much less.

When this horrible deal failed, President Trump did what he does best: he lashed out. He lashed out at the American people, threatening to stop critical cost-sharing health insurance subsidies that ensure the sickest and some of the poorest Americans can afford health care.

Health care, Mr. Speaker, is not a game. It is a matter of life and death for millions of Americans. On health care and every other issue, President Trump's first 100 days have been nothing more than a string of broken promises, empty words, and extravagant lies.

PRESIDENT TRUMP AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing President Trump attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act, both breaking his own promises and making it worse for American families.

He promised to protect Americans with preexisting conditions, but any State could allow insurers to raise premiums for Americans with preexisting conditions and make their insurance too expensive to afford. Any State could jeopardize access to mental health, emergency, maternal, and prescription drug coverage. And any State could charge older workers an age tax that would devastate middle class families.

The proposals will steal \$1 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid in exchange for giveaways to the very wealthy and corporations.

The President and Republicans are turning their backs both on their own rhetoric and the real needs and lives of American families.

□ 1230

BIG TALK AND BROKEN PROMISES

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, big talk and broken promises, that is what we have seen.

As Trump's first 100 days come to a close, we see desperate times are leading to desperate measures. First, there is a push to revive TrumpCare. Really? Twenty-four million Americans would be kicked off health insurance in the first year, and there would be 15 to 20 percent increases in premiums according to the Congressional Budget Office. The big change to get a compromise is taking away essential benefits and pre-existing conditions, the foundation of making sure Americans have health care.

Second, we see Trump's threats to defund the subsidies. This is a blatant violation of law. Seven million Americans would lose health care immediately if that happened.

Third, we see Trump's threats to cut Medicaid and Medicare by \$1 trillion. Block grants will mean cuts to senior's health care, cuts to children's health care.

With these 100 days coming to a close, we see Trump as the least popular, least productive President in modern history.

While Trump is breaking his promises, our constituents are depending on us to keep ours.

REJECT ATTEMPTS TO FEARMONGER

(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, every day, we wake up and we have a choice of how we can look at the world: through the murkiness of fear or through the clarity of truth. I challenge you to choose clarity, choose a perspective that is grounded in truth and in love.

Today, President Trump announced the opening of the Victims of Immigration Crime Engagement Office, or VOICE, an office that will spew propaganda highlighting crimes committed by immigrants as opposed to equally harmful crimes committed by non-immigrants. It is a waste of taxpayer money that will manipulate law enforcement data in an attempt to play on fears and anxieties.

I am countering the opening of VOICE with the Saved By American

Immigrants National Task Force, SAINT. The SAINT task force will collect and share stories of the countless immigrants who have saved Americans lives through heroic acts.

I am calling for stories like the story of Maytham Alshadood, a Coloradan who grew up in Baghdad. He aspired to be veterinarian and began his studies, worked with the American Army as a translator, and had to leave because of the increase in violence. He came under a special immigrant visa. He started school in America. He is now a registered nurse, saving and transforming lives in America every day, including those of veterans.

Let us reject attempts to fearmonger and tear apart American families, families that are just like ours, families that are ours.

FIX THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, 53 percent of Americans disapprove of President Trump's service to this Nation in this first 100 days. I didn't say Members of Congress. I didn't say party. I said 53 percent of Americans disagree, and I understand why: a healthcare promise that did not come to fruition; families are now looking, with his potential bill, to higher healthcare costs for our working families; 24 million more Americans are off of insurance.

What about the age tax for hard-working Americans? Americans 50 to 64 years old will be paying upwards of \$12,000 to \$14,000 for their premium.

The last insult is to those hard-working Americans who now receive Medicare by deleting, depleting, taking away, and destroying \$100 million from the Medicare trust fund.

There is no other answer. There is no other answer than disapproval, because why would anyone who leads this Nation destroy the very health care, the very arm of opportunity and rest that Americans have when they become sick?

I think the disapproval is probably too low. Let us fix the healthcare system. Let us not destroy it.

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 26, 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 mes-

sage from the Secretary of the Senate on April 26, 2017, at 9:16 a.m.:

Appointments:
Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff
Commission on Native Children.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1695, REGISTER OF COPY- RIGHTS SELECTION AND AC- COUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 275

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 1695) to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide additional responsibilities for the Register of Copyrights, 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 the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-13. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 254 is laid on the table.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. 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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 275, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1695, the Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act of 2017.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit and makes in order amendments by Representatives DEUTCH and CHU.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to hear from Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS. Their testimony reflected the strong bipartisan support for this legislation and the work both Members have invested in moving it forward.

I personally thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, and the Judiciary Committee staff on both the majority and minority side for their work on this legislation.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I had the opportunity to participate in the committee markup where we debated numerous amendments and enjoyed a thorough discussion of this bill. The Judiciary Committee ultimately adopted an amendment by my colleague from Texas, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, to strengthen the bill. H.R. 1695 passed the Judiciary Committee in a show of overwhelming bipartisan support by a vote of 27-1.

The Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act is supported by numerous outside groups, including the American Conservative Union, SAG-AFTRA, the AFL-CIO, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, CreativeFuture, the Motion Picture Association of America, the Gospel Music Association, the American Chemical Society, the Church Music Publishers Association, Oracle, and many, many others. These groups represent only a sampling of the broad support behind this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as you can tell, H.R. 1695 has brought together many groups of people who don't traditionally have similar interests. From creators to

labor organizations to conservative groups, the diversity of support behind this legislation speaks to its significance in the copyright industry and to our economy as a whole.

H.R. 1695 also enjoys the public support of our two former Registers of Copyright, individuals who filled the very position this bill seeks to address. Former Registers Marybeth Peters and Ralph Oman have both made clear their belief in the importance of an "independent copyright advice straight and true from the expert agency" to Congress.

These former Registers correctly point out that this bill addresses a "structural, not personal or political" issue between the Library of Congress and the Copyright Office. Despite what some may say, this is what the bill simply does.

H.R. 1695 is a necessary first step toward any larger efforts toward modernizing the Copyright Office. It helps ensure that the Register can implement policy and advise Congress effectively, and this legislation will ultimately help strengthen our copyright system. This is particularly relevant today, as today is World Intellectual Property Day.

As I discussed earlier today in this Chamber, the importance of strong IP protections, including a strong copyright system, is clearer than ever. In fact, the copyright system in our country is so critical that our Nation's Founders sought to recognize it in the Constitution. Article I, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

While robust intellectual property protections have always been a foundational principle of our Nation, today such protections are also a major economic driver creating and fueling the American Dream. In fact, core copyright industries in the United States are now responsible for \$1.2 trillion in GDP, representing nearly 7 percent of our economy and employing more than 5.5 million people. In my home State of Georgia alone, more than 19,000 copyrights are registered annually to State residents.

Yet the head of the Copyright Office, which oversees such a massive sector of our economy, is unilaterally selected by the Librarian of Congress. This is the case, despite the fact that the Copyright Office is statutorily designed as Congress' adviser and the massive role that copyright plays in our economy and our society.

I want to be clear. I think the role of the Library is a critical one, and the Librarian performs many important duties. Historically, however, the Librarian has not been an expert in copyright and isn't expected to be, Mr. Speaker.

Does it make sense, then, to make the Librarian—any Librarian—to be

solely responsible for the selection of the person responsible for overseeing the Nation's copyright policy? I don't think it does. In fact, the current selection is more an accident of history than an example of carefully conceived policy.

By way of historical background, in 1870, the Library of Congress believed it would make sense for copyrighted works to be placed in the Library as a means to grow the collection. While this made sense at that point in history and while the collections are still an important function of the Library, this provision neither requires nor justifies the role of the Register of Copyrights to be subordinate to the Librarian.

Today, with the major role that the Copyright Office plays in our culture and our economy, we can no longer justify the head of the Copyright Office—and Congress' designated expert adviser—being hired under the umbrella of the Library of Congress. Currently, the Register is hired according to the same unilateral process as much more junior positions are filled. Under today's system, the Register can serve for an unlimited duration without review or removal, despite the importance of this position.

And finally, the Register is not Presidentially appointed, and there have been questions in the courts regarding the authority of the Copyright Office to conduct rulemaking.

We need a copyright system for the 21st century. We need a system that will take us into the future by protecting and promoting innovation. Copyright is the foundation of innovation, and innovation is the force that drives our economy. A strong copyright system allows the millions of kids and young adults throughout our 50 States to make their dreams a reality, to build a career out of what they produce in their minds and imaginations. Today's rule provides for an underlying bill that will help ensure that our copyright system is equipped to rise to the challenges of the future and to support Americans as they strive to make their hopes, dreams, and ambitions into reality.

The underlying bill promotes American innovation by recognizing the importance of the Register of Copyrights position. This bill would create a selection committee composed by bipartisan, bicameral congressional leadership and the Librarian of Congress to recommend candidates to the President for nomination. The bill would establish a Senate confirmation process for the position and establish a 10-year term for the Register of Copyrights position.

This legislation represents the product of more than 4 years of bipartisan collaboration. It reflects the consensus view that the Copyright Office is better positioned to serve the public if the Register is no longer treated like a subordinate official within the Library, but as the seat of expertise and property protection that it is, regardless of

who the Librarian or who the President may be.

To reiterate, this issue has been under discussion since before anyone knew the former Librarian would be leaving or a new Librarian would be taking over.

□ 1245

When these discussions began, there was a Democrat in the White House, and it was clear that our next President would be, possibly, a Democrat as well. Yet both Republicans and Democrats have supported the reality that undergirds this bill, and we have supported what is good for American innovation and our creators and our dreamers, rather than worry about what specific President may make the next appointment to this Office.

The legislation is the first step in the Judiciary Committee's work to modernize the Copyright Office, which is now needed more than ever. As the vice-chair of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee, I will continue to push that effort forward, to look at ways to promote better infrastructure and technology at the Copyright Office, and to work to update our music licensing laws.

H.R. 1695 is the beginning, rather than the end, and our commitment to copyright modernization and the support of these ideas underpinning it continue to receive broad support.

The rule provides for a bill that is, simply put, good policy. The opportunity before us is not about one individual but establishing the right process for selecting the Copyright Register and future Registers. The bill would increase accountability within the Copyright Office and take the first steps toward making sure our Copyright Office works for this century.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that I thank the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee, BOB GOODLATTE, and the ranking member, JOHN CONYERS, for their hard work on this; and also a special commendation to Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE of Texas, who sponsored an amendment that actually strengthened this bill and provided a process moving forward that will help and, I think, bring all parties some semblance of structure and form as we move forward in this process, a beginning, as I said, the first step in a modernization of our Copyright Office.

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

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

I want to begin by wishing my colleague from Georgia a happy International Copyright Day, right up there with Thanksgiving and Christmas as great American holidays.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. Look, first of all, 60 hours; we have less than 60 hours before the Federal Government of the United States will shut down, and here we are filling time with a bill. Of course, the concept deserves

to be debated and fleshed out, but is it really what we should be talking about when we are 60 hours away from the shutdown of our Federal Government?

Now, it feels like we have been here before. Now, sometimes it is because, unfortunately, we have been brought to the brink of economic disaster, just as Republicans seem to do every time government funding or the debt ceiling is about to expire. We know it has happened before. We know it will happen again.

Maybe it is time for a short-term CR; maybe it is an omnibus, but, look, that is what we should be doing right now. There will be plenty of time, plenty of time to figure out the intricacies of copyright and the oversight of the Office after we make sure that the basic functions of government are able to continue after 60 hours.

And even if we do keep the government open, all we are doing is kicking the can down the road and not allowing American businesses or individuals to plan for the future.

Can you imagine if your family didn't know if you would have a job or what salary it would be at every few months?

Now, look, congressional salaries, they are exempt from government shutdowns, of course. If they weren't, perhaps we would be discussing the government shutdown with 60 hours to go until other Federal workers are prevented from coming to work.

Even at this moment, we don't have a full-year appropriations bill. We have a continuing resolution that expires midnight on Friday. Those are the priority issues that the American people want us to focus on. When we deal with what is urgent, that will allow us the time and the space for thoughtful consideration of Copyright Office oversight.

We need to get past this bitter partisanship and this brinksmanship. Even the rule we are considering today is problematic and partisan, which is why I am in staunch opposition. It doesn't allow all the amendments to come to the floor, including one from my colleague, Ms. LOFGREN, that I tried to amend the rule to allow, and it was turned down in Rules Committee by a partisan vote.

We don't have an open rule, as Speaker RYAN promised to provide as we got back to what was called regular order, allowing our Democratic and Republican colleagues to improve and enhance bills, offer their ideas up for consideration. If a majority adopt them, they can be included in the overall bill.

Instead, we are considering a rule that effectively stops debate on important amendments that were omitted and brings forward a politically motivated bill about the head of the Copyright Office.

Simply put, this bill would take the authority of hiring and firing the Copyright Register, who is the head of the Copyright Office, from the Librarian of Congress, and give it to the President,

with Senate approval. It effectively politicizes the Office of the head of the Copyright Office.

Now, it sounds innocuous, but what it means is that special interests will be involved with picking the person to make decisions over who receives a copyright. Yet, again, through this bill, Congress is choosing the big, powerful interests over the consumers, over innovation, and over the little guy.

As the Electronic Frontier Foundation said: this bill is "designed to . . . allow powerful incumbent interests to use their lobbying power to control this increasingly politicized Office. And while the Librarian of Congress still oversees the Copyright Office, the Librarian of Congress would not be able to remove the Register no matter how poorly they perform their job."

Under this bill, the position of Register of Copyrights will be yet another political position and will, frankly, stall one of the great projects they are embarking on, the modernization effort that is desperately needed at the Copyright Office. The last thing we need is political cronyism in the Copyright Office.

Let's talk a little bit about the history of the position of the head of the Copyright Office. Most of the first century of America, U.S. District Court clerks processed copyright applications themselves. Now, that was obviously inefficient to foist on the judicial branch, and, in 1870, Congress centralized the power of copyrights at the Library of Congress. Seven years later, the Copyright Office was created as a separate department within the Library, and the Register of Copyrights was established as the head of that Office.

Why depart from history so radically now? Why give in to increasing executive authority in a time when many of us are concerned about the growing powers of the Presidency? Frankly, some of this seems to be about the personal dislike of the Librarian, Dr. Carla Hayden, or the general situation with the most recent Register who departed last October, Maria Pallante.

It appears that some believe that Dr. Hayden should not have reassigned Ms. Pallante, so there is a micromanaging of particular personnel issues, but an inspector general's report stated that Ms. Pallante was clearly deficient in her duties, especially around those of modernization of the Office.

As just one example, the inspector general discovered that the Copyright Office wasted 6 years and nearly \$12 million attempting to implement an Electronic Licensing System. Based on the IG report, it would seem that the Librarian had a valid reason to reassign the Copyright Register last October, and she definitely had every right to do so, as the head of the Library. The last thing we want is politically motivated decisionmaking in a personnel process around performance at the Library of Congress.

Since the Librarian of Congress, Dr. Carla Hayden, was appointed in 2015, she has been pulling the Library of Congress and the Copyright Office into the 21st century. And if we move the appointment into the hands of the President, we are taking away the ability for the Librarian to supervise the Office of Copyright and continue to do this work. We are going to stop progress dead in its tracks.

With hundreds of Presidential appointees who haven't even been nominated, no less approved, and the glacial pace of Congress, it could be years before a Librarian is confirmed under this new scheme.

Look, we all understand and agree that there are problems that we need to work on together with regard to the copyright process to bring it into the 21st century. Again, with 60 hours away from a government shutdown, now might be a time to focus on keeping government open and perhaps having a more thoughtful debate, removing the passions around the personnel involved after we continue to keep government open.

This bill, unfortunately, does not solve the problems with copyrights. It makes the situation worse because it slows down a desperately needed modernization indefinitely and would hurt the public and consumers.

The last thing we need is a more autonomous Copyright Office. After the obscene wasting of taxpayer dollars, do we really want to provide for more politically motivated decisionmaking within the Office of the Copyright? I think the answer is no; that is why I oppose the rule. I oppose the bill.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will have more time to discuss especially the IG report and what it may say here in just a moment. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), another strong advocate in our protections of copyright and others in this intellectual property debate.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1695, the Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act.

I am an original cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation. It was introduced by Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS, making this Register of Copyrights a position nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It was passed out of the House Judiciary Committee by a vote of 27-1. It is completely appropriate that we bring this provision to the floor.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Songwriters Caucus, and a Representative of middle Tennessee, which is the Nashville area, it is home to many content producers and creators, in particular, to songwriters. Creators deserve to know that they will have a Register who will do a couple of things really well: is accountable to the peo-

ple through their elected Representatives, and will provide independent and expert advice to Congress.

According to a report prepared by the International Intellectual Property Alliance: the total copyright industries employed nearly 11.4 million workers in 2015, accounting for 7.95 percent of all U.S. employment, 9.39 percent of all private employment in the U.S. The average annual compensation paid to employees of the total copyright industries in 2015, per employee, \$82,117, exceeds the average annual wage by about 21 percent.

Intellectual property must be protected. Copyrights must be protected. Congress has a role in making certain that these constitutional provisions are held and, also, making certain that the Office is responsible to Congress. I urge the House to move forward on this commonsense measure.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished ranking member on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that should be opposed, and I agree with Mr. POLIS that it is unfortunate it is being rushed because this may be one of the more significant votes we will take about our economy in this Congress.

I have heard a lot of rhetoric that this isn't about the Librarian. I am sorry, it is about the Librarian. Dr. Carla Hayden is probably the most qualified Librarian of Congress who has ever served. She has done more in the last 6 months to advance modernization in the Library and the Copyright Office than her predecessor did in the prior 2 decades. If we prevent her from appointing a new Register, that effort will be stalled, and I think that would be tragic.

It has been mentioned that somehow, by making this a political position, it would be more accountable. I beg to differ. Mr. POLIS has mentioned the view of the Electronic Frontier Foundation that this would enhance special interests. What they have actually said, and I think it is very pertinent, is that the bill would allow powerful incumbent interests to use their lobbying power to control this increasingly politicized Office.

No President is going to select an appointee who will be shot down by the special interests. That is quite different than the Librarian who removed the prior Register because of, I believe, the inspector general's scathing report about the failure to computerize that office, essentially wasting \$12 million, while misrepresenting that fact to the Librarian and to Congress.

The national library groups, including the national Copyright Alliance, the American Library Association, and the like, say this:

It's difficult to understand how the public or Congress itself would benefit from politicization of the Register of Copyrights'

position by making it subject to Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation as this legislation proposes. Such politicization of the position necessarily would result in a Register more actively engaged in policy development than in competent management and modernization.

That is what we want out of a Register. We don't want a partisan for one side of the issue. We want somebody who can run, in an efficient way, the Copyright Office.

Now, a word about the amendment that has been bandied about as somehow giving Congress a greater say. I value the friendship of my colleague, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who I have served with for so long, but I fear her amendment does not accomplish what she said because the President's power to appoint is limited only by Senate confirmation.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LOFGREN. It is limited only by Senate confirmation. It cannot be limited by a list prepared by Congress.

□ 1300

I would just say, finally, that if there is a conflict of interest, as has been suggested, the Librarian cares only about the public interests. It is Donald Trump who has the 30 copyrights, and I don't think we should ask President Trump to take this position with that conflict of interest, something that all of us have been concerned about.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, this is about policy. This is about moving forward in the modernization process. I believe that Ms. Hayden is fully qualified to be Librarian of Congress. I think the issue comes in the Copyright Register's Office, not the Librarian herself.

There are some issues also. It has been interesting because I have been involved in this now my whole time in Congress, and this issue of copyright protection and intellectual property, I have to say Electronic Frontier Foundation are good folks, but we disagree, many of us in the content community and also the intellectual property, with the views of a more open or less inhibited copyright protection, which we believe is the very heartbeat of the innovative system. It is protecting the copyright as we go forward.

So just simply to have somebody saying that they are looking out for the big guy, I am looking out for the single songwriter. I'm looking out for the person right now in their home pecking out their first novel, working on their first articles. These are the kinds of things that need protecting. This is the little guy we are talking about. This is making this modernization happen, and we are going to continue to move forward.

We have differences of opinion. That is fine. But I think in looking at this

big picture, we are talking about a Register's Office that has so much work in our economy as a whole, we are just simply looking toward the first step of modernization.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE.)

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation, and I urge my colleagues to take a step back and consider the unintended consequences of this legislation.

As a former member of the Judiciary Committee, I had the opportunity to hear firsthand from a very diverse range of stakeholders on their experiences in dealing with the Copyright Office, and one of the most common refrains I heard was the dire need for modernizing the Office and updating their IT systems to be more user-friendly. So I was very disturbed to learn recently that 6 years and nearly \$12 million were wasted on yet another failed government IT project, this time at the Copyright Office. This waste of taxpayer dollars is unacceptable, and any legislation to reform the Office ought to have successful modernization as its primary goal. This legislation fails that test.

H.R. 1695 sets back the clock on considerable progress that has been made already under the leadership of the new Librarian of Congress, Dr. Carla Hayden. The bill puts the power to appoint the head of the Copyright Office in the hands of a President who, as of February, still had around 2,000 appointments sitting empty. This kind of delay will set back the Office when it is finally on the right track.

And to what end?

It seems that this bill is just another solution in search of a problem.

A vote for this bill is a vote to stop progress, a vote to continue to waste tax dollars, and a vote to add one more person to the list of positions that President Trump seems to have no interest in filling. I am very concerned that this is a misguided experiment without a clear purpose and that taxpayers will be the ones who foot the bill when it doesn't succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee of Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying legislation, which I view as a great step forward.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard about the misdeeds alleged of the prior Register of Copyrights, and we have heard

what a wonderful Librarian Carla Hayden is; and I agree, she is a wonderful Librarian. But this bill is not about individuals. It is not about whether the last Register was a good or bad Register. It is not about whether she knew what she was doing on modernization or not. This bill is an institutional bill. This bill is against politicizing. This bill is for strengthening and enhancing the stature of the Office of Register of Copyrights.

The committee held 4 years of hearings on the Copyright Act. There are many contentious issues that we will be bringing to the floor over the next couple of years on that. This was not one of them. This issue had broad support.

Everybody agrees that the Office of Copyright must be modernized. What this bill does is to take it and give it a little more independence from the Library of Congress. The Librarian of Congress is an interested stakeholder. There are many stakeholders in Copyright. Librarians are stakeholders, tech people are stakeholders, content creators, movie studios, authors, and editors—there are lots of different stakeholders. No stakeholder should be in a controlling position.

The Librarian of Congress is in a controlling position, and there is a consensus that that ought to be reduced. I, personally, and a lot of other people think the Register's Office should be taken out of the Library entirely. But this bill is a compromise. It doesn't do that. It simply enhances the stature of the Copyright Office by making this a Presidentially appointed office for a 10-year term.

You talk about politicizing? Right now, President Trump could, if he wished, fire the Librarian tomorrow. The Librarian serves at his pleasure, and the Register of Copyrights serves at her pleasure. So the President totally controls the Librarian of Congress and the Register at any time.

This bill would say that the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, would appoint the Register who would have a 10-year term. That gives her or him more independence, obviously, and it enables them to undertake the proper modernization.

One of the problems we saw was that the modernization requirements of the Library of Congress are very different from the modernization requirements of the Copyright Office, and one seemed to take precedence over the other, which is not surprising when one is subject to the other and part of it.

So this bill would increase the stature of the Copyright Office. It would make it less political by giving the incumbent a 10-year tenure during good behavior. There are powerful interests who have an interest, and they would be one step further removed because of the 10-year tenure.

This is a bill that has broad bipartisan support. Almost every interest group that deals with the Copyright Office is in favor of this, from the authors

to the directors, to the songwriters, to the motion picture people, you name it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, but I am opposed to the rule.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, thank goodness, hopefully, we will get this rule passed and we will get to this bill so the gentleman can be in support of it, that is as we move forward.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today President Trump plans to unveil a tax cut proposal that would vastly reduce the business tax rate for international corporations and even for his own real estate empire. We have no way of knowing how many millions he personally might save through this so-called Trump loophole—no idea—unless he releases his tax returns. Democrats have been calling on the President to release his tax returns for this reason and so many others. We cannot allow the White House to be used as a tool to enrich the President and his family.

Up until now, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed his tax return information. These returns have provided a basic level of transparency to help to ensure the public's interest is placed first. The American people deserve the same level of disclosure from this administration. If they continue to refuse to provide it, then we, as the people's elected Representatives, should hold the executive branch accountable.

If not us, who?

Mr. Speaker, when we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative ESHOO's bill, which would require Presidents and major party nominees for the Presidency to simply release their tax returns.

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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our excellent proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for his leadership and for yielding me time.

Here I am again. I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that my bipartisan—this is both Republicans and Democrats—this bipartisan legislation, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act, can be made in order for debate and a vote.

The Presidential Tax Transparency Act is very simple. It would require this President, all future Presidents,

and Presidential nominees from both major parties to publicly disclose their tax returns. Until recently, most Americans thought this disclosure was required by law, but it actually has been a tradition. It has been a voluntary disclosure by every President of both parties since Watergate.

This long disclosure tradition exists because, A, the American people demand a baseline level of transparency from the highest officeholder in the land, and each one of the Presidents wanted the American people to know that their first and top priority was the American people's interest and not their own financial interests. This last Saturday, April 15, thousands of Americans in 125 cities across the country participated in tax marches calling for the President to release his tax returns.

Now, why did they do this on holy Saturday?

Because they care and they are deeply concerned about the President's conflicts of interests and his foreign business entanglements.

The President's refusal to release his tax returns is just one example of his administration's historic lack of transparency as we near the 100-day mark of the administration. As questions about his associates' ties to Russia continue to swirl, yesterday, the White House refused to provide information about General Flynn's Russia contacts to the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. Just before the Easter holiday, the White House also announced that it will break with precedent and will not make its visitor logs public. This is added to the fact that the President's meetings and golf outings at his properties in Florida, New Jersey, and elsewhere—where he has so far spent one-third of his Presidency, according to *The Washington Post*—are also off the books.

Who is the President meeting with? Who does he listen to? Do his personal financial interests come first, or do the interests of the country come first?

The President's business empire makes him more susceptible to conflicts of interest than any President in our history, yet he has done less to address these conflicts than any President in modern history. Since 1978, every President has placed their assets in a real blind trust. Instead of following this tradition, the President has turned his business over to his sons in an arrangement that the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics called "meaningless from a conflict of interest perspective." It was later revealed that the President can draw profits from this trust at any time, and his son acknowledged that he will provide his father with periodic reports about the state of his family's businesses.

This is not right. This simply does not pass muster for anyone in the country. This is not Republican or Democratic. This is not partisan. The President should release his tax returns.

Now, as the gentleman said previously, this is, again, critically important because it is reported that the President is going to come out with a tax plan today and reportedly cut the tax rate on pass-through entities.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and all of these conflicts of interest, it is why the President needs to reveal his tax returns, it is why we have bipartisan legislation.

We should defeat the previous question and sign on to the discharge petition so that this bipartisan legislation can come before the full House to ensure that the President provides transparency to the American people now and in the future.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. 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.

What I really think this bill is about is President Trump wanting to put a Big Business friend in charge of an office that can do personal favors for him and his family. We know that the President and his family have, or are seeking, dozens of copyrights. Here is a great one—here is a copyright on his book, "Trump: The Best Golf Advice I Ever Received." Now, don't get me wrong, he probably deserved a copyright. I am sure a ghostwriter wrote it for him and he had a strong contract with that ghostwriter. Since it seems that all the President spends his weekends and our taxpayer dollars doing is golf, the last thing we want is want him to put one of his golfing buddies in charge of the Copyright Office.

Who is to say the next copyright application from Donald Trump won't be disputed?

Placing his friends, business associates, and, yes, golfing partners in high places could help tip the scales in his favor, providing profits for him and his family at the expense of the American people.

I would like to take a moment to speak to a few of the defenses I have heard about the need for this bill. There is the one stating the President would pick the Register from a list of experts provided by a group, including the Librarian.

But guess what?

That list is nonbinding, so the President can easily ignore the recommendations and do whatever he wants, which is what this President usually does anyway.

□ 1315

I have also heard the argument that the Register will be more accountable and somehow transparent as a Presidential appointee. Hogwash. That is the opposite of the truth. There is as much transparency for a non-Presidential appointee once in their posi-

tion; and it is much less likely that a President is going to demand the resignation of the Register than the Librarian is going to reassign them, as the Librarian did last year when the Register was failing, as confirmed by the inspector general report.

Finally, there seems to be the argument that there were a large number of hearings in the committee on this issue and that somehow this is the work product of those hearings. Well, if you look at the record, there was not one hearing on this bill. There were hearings about general copyright reform. There was no hearing on how this bill might have a devastating impact on the need to modernize the Copyright Office, creating huge delays for important efforts. There was no hearing on whether this bill could profit the President and his family at the expense of the American people.

This is a problematic bill under a problematic rule that doesn't allow good ideas to come forward and be debated. We aren't even able to debate helpful amendments.

I know of at least one important amendment that isn't being allowed to be debated on the floor, which is Representative LOFGREN's amendment that would allow the current Librarian to fill the existing vacancy at the Copyright Office, and when that Register leaves, the new process would then apply. It seems like a commonsense transition process. Why can't we get a simple vote on that amendment?

I say again, this bill is a solution in search of a problem. Frankly, this bill makes the problem worse by giving the President the chance to put his business associate and golf buddies in charge of his own copyrights.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the President's personality is perfectly charming. I certainly wouldn't disparage his personality. What I am talking about is him putting a golf buddy or a business associate in charge of an office that he receives a direct profit from. That is called conflict of interest. That is what we are debating here today. It is not about the President's personality. Obviously, he is perfectly charming in person. I would be happy to have dinner with him. I am still waiting for the invitation.

The Copyright Office has an important function. In order to fulfill that function of registering copyrights, it needs to be a neutral arbiter. By making the head of the Copyright Office a political advocate, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, it will increasingly politicize copyrights, the basic protection Americans

rely on regarding the tradeoff between payoffs for innovation and the right of consumers for dissemination. There is no chance a political appointee will be neutral, by nature of them being a political appointee.

A political appointee will likely be the puppet of big corporations and the administration in their decisions around registration of copyrights. That doesn't help the budding author, it doesn't help the budding musician in a dispute, and it certainly doesn't help anyone trying to navigate an outdated and archaic system that needs to be modernized. This bill will indefinitely delay the modernization process.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and "no" on the bill. The last thing we need is President Trump's golf buddies to be in charge of his own copyrights to further profit the President and the First Family, who have pleasant personalities.

Do we really want to give more power to the administration so they can do favors for themselves and their own business interests? I hope not. Let's vote "no."

We should be considering a funding bill to keep the government open instead of waiting until the absolute last second, hurting businesses and Americans with the huge amount of uncertainty created.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, "no" on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, regardless of the last discussion, there are things about this bill that I have talked about when we first started, and doing this actually brings us into a position of modernizing the Copyright Office, which has been discussed a long time.

I do want to address, just briefly, that there has been some discussion about an IG report. There has been discussion about, especially, the former Register of Copyrights.

As I made clear in the conference, this has nothing to do with that being brought up. Implying things that were out of this IG report was basically attempting a character assassination of the former Register of Copyrights.

I think in doing so, it has to be understood that, even in that IG report that is discussed, one of the Library's own responses back to the concerns of the IG report was that, in 2015, the inspector general found that the Copyright Office was compliant with all library methodology. With respect to its primary software applications, the Electronic Copyright Office and Copyright Imaging System, which support registration and recordation functions and are managed by the CTO, were all in compliance. I think that is really interesting as we look at this.

But also what this IG report actually did say was that there were a lot of other problems. In fact, the GAO report

in 2015 said the Library does not have the leadership to address IT management. That is why the Copyright Office was having to look at this because, also, in August 2015, of the Library's poor response and modernization, which are things that we are looking toward and how much this affects our economy. Because of the Library's problems, the electronic licensing system went down; and for 10 days, no one could register a copyright.

In fairness, you may not like this bill, you may not like the current structure, and that is fine; but when we discuss the Library, there are a lot of issues that I am sure will be addressed in the relevant committees in their oversight on this IG report. That is what they are designed to do.

What we are designed to do here is also not take and pick and choose and cherry-pick what parts of the report we want to talk about because we are trying to justify the current Librarian's decision last fall. When we understand this, we will begin to move forward on the Copyright Modernization Act.

Let's get back to the real functionality of what this is, not who we appoint or how they are appointed, but the fact that this matters to millions of people and also accounts for trillions of dollars in our industries across the world.

The Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act is an important and bipartisan step. I repeat again, it came out with a vote of 27-1 in the Judiciary Committee. Mr. Speaker, I serve on that committee. That is not a usual vote on legislation that is making a positive, large, lasting impact that we are seeing on this. It is the first step rather than the last step in modernization.

As we look forward to this, I will simply say this is a good bill. It has been perfected by both Republicans and Democrats. As I have said before, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the Congresswoman from Texas, was very helpful putting this package together, along with the chairman and ranking member on both sides of the aisle, as we come forward with this.

It is sort of a shame that, when we come to this bill, we diverge into rabbit trails away from the real issue. The real issue is let's help those folks who depend on the Copyright Office. Let's make modernize it. Let's make it the tool it is supposed to be, and that is the adviser of the expert in these issues for Congress. When we do so, at that point in time our economy continues to flourish, we get aside from the theatrics, and we get back to the real importance of the bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 275 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 3. 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. 305) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes. 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 among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform. 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 305.

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. COLLINS of Georgia. 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 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 adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 191, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—234

Abraham, Aderholt, Allen, Amash, Amodoi, Arrington, Babin, Bacon, Banks (IN), Barletta, Barr, Barton, Bergman, Biggs, Bilirakis, Bishop (MI), Bishop (UT), Blackburn, Blum, Bost, Brady (TX), Brat, Bridenstine, 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, Culbertson, Curbelo (FL), Davidson, Davis, Rodney, Denham, Dent, DeSantis, DesJarlais, Diaz-Balart, Donovan, Duffy, Duncan (SC), Duncan (TN), Dunn, Emmer, Estes (KS), Farenthold, Faso, Ferguson, Fitzpatrick, Fleischmann, Flores, Fortenberry, Foxx, Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Gaetz, Gallagher, Garrett, Gibbs, Gohmert, Goodlatte, Gosar, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (GA), Graves (LA), Graves (MO), Griffith, Grothman, Guthrie, Hensarling, Herrera Beutler, Hice, Jody B. Higgins (LA), Hill, Holding, Hollingsworth, Hudson, Huizenga, Hultgren, Hunter, Hurd, Issa, Jenkins (KS), Jenkins (WV), Johnson (LA), Johnson (OH), Johnson, Sam, 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, Marshall, Massie, Mast, Adams, Aguilar, Barragan, Bass, Beatty, Bera, Beyer, Bishop (GA), Blumenauer, Blunt Rochester, Bonamici, Boyle, Brendan, Brady (PA), Brown (MD), Brownley (CA), Bustos, Butterfield, Capuano, Byrne, Calvert, Cardenas, Carson (IN), Cartwright, Castor (FL), Castro (TX), Chu, Judy, Cicilline, Clark (MA), Clarke (NY), Clay, Clyburn, Cohen, Connolly, Conyers, Cooper, Correa, Costa, Courtney, Crist, Crowley, Culler, Cummings, Davis (CA), Davis, Denny, DeFazio, DeGette, Delaney, DeLauro, DelBene, Demings, DeSaulnier, Deutch, Dingell, Doggett, Doyle, Michael, F., Ellison, Engel, Eshoo, Espaillat, Esty (CT), Evans, Foster, Frankel (FL), Fudge, Gabbard, Gallego, Garamendi, Gonzalez (TX), Gottheimer, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Grijalva, Gutierrez, Hanabusa, Hastings, Heck, Higgins (NY), Himes, Hoyer, Huffman, Jackson Lee, Jayapal, Jeffries, Johnson (GA), Johnson, E. B., Jones, Kaptur, Keating, Kelly (IL), Kennedy, Khanna, Kihuen, Kildeer, Kilmer, Kind, Krishnamoorthi, Kuster (NH), Langevin, Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), Lawrence, Lawson (FL), Lee, Levin, Lewis (GA), Lieu, Ted, Lipinski, Loeb sack, Lofgren, Lowenthal, Lowey, Lujan Grisham, M., Lujan, Ben Ray, Lynch, Maloney, Carolyn B., Maloney, Sean, Matsui, McCollum, McEachin, McGovern, McMerney, Meeks, Meng, Moore, Moulton, Murphy (FL), Nadler, Napolitano, Neal, Nolan, Norcross, O'Halleran, O'Rourke, Pallone, Panetta, Pascrell, Payne, Pelosi, Perlmutter, Peters, Peterson, Abraham, Aderholt, Allen, Amash, Amodoi, Arrington, Babin, Bacon, Banks (IN), Barletta, Barr, Barton, Bergman, Biggs, Bilirakis, Bishop (MI), Bishop (UT), Blackburn, Blum, Bost, Brady (TX), Brat, Bridenstine, Brooks (AL), Brooks (IN), Buchanan, Buck, Bueshon, Budd, Collins (GA), Collins (NY), Comer, Comstock, Conaway, Cook, Costello (PA), Cramer, Crawford, Culbertson, Curbelo (FL), Davidson, Davis, Rodney, Denham, Dent, DeSantis, DesJarlais, Diaz-Balart, Donovan, Duffy, Gohmert, Goodlatte, Gosar, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (GA), Graves (LA), Graves (MO), Griffith, Grothman, Guthrie, Hensarling, Herrera Beutler, Hice, Jody B. Higgins (LA), Hill, Holding, Hollingsworth, Hudson, Huizenga, Hultgren, Hunter, Hurd, Issa, Jenkins (KS), Jenkins (WV), Johnson (LA), Johnson (OH), Johnson, Sam, Jordan, Joyce (OH), Katko, Kelly (MS), Kelly (PA), Gohmert, Goodlatte, Gosar, Gottheimer, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (LA), Graves (MO), Griffith, Grothman, Guthrie, Hensarling, Herrera Beutler, Hice, Jody B. Higgins (LA), Hill, Holding, Hollingsworth, Hudson, Huizenga, Hultgren, Hunter, Hurd, Issa, Jenkins (KS), Jenkins (WV), Johnson (LA), Johnson (OH), Johnson, Sam, Jordan, Joyce (OH), Katko, Kelly (MS), Kelly (PA)

Harper, Harris, Hartzler, Hensarling, Herrera Beutler, Hice, Jody B. Higgins (LA), Hill, Holding, Hollingsworth, Hudson, Huizenga, Hultgren, Hunter, Hurd, Issa, Jenkins (KS), Jenkins (WV), Johnson (LA), Johnson (OH), Johnson, Sam, 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, Marshall, Massie, Mast, McCarthy, McCaul, McClintock, McHenry, McKinley, McMorris, Rodgers, McSally, Meadows, Meehan, Messer, Mitchell, Moolenaar, Mooney (WV), Mullin, Murphy (PA), Noem, Nunes, Olson, Palazzo, Palmer, Paulsen, Pearce, Perry, Pittenger, Poe (TX), Poliquin, Posey, Ratcliffe, Reed, Reichert, Renacci, Rice (SC), Roby, Roe (TN), Rogers (AL), 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, Cleaver, Marino, Newhouse, Schlaugter, Tonko

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1345

Mses. JACKSON LEE, BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Messrs. GOTTHEIMER, and COURTNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for: Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 225.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayeas 237, noes 186, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

AYES—237

Abraham, Aderholt, Allen, Amash, Amodoi, Arrington, Babin, Bacon, Banks (IN), Barletta, Barr, Barton, Bergman, Biggs, Bilirakis, Bishop (MI), Bishop (UT), Blackburn, Blum, Bost, Brady (TX), Brat, Bridenstine, Brooks (AL), Brooks (IN), Buchanan, Buck, Bueshon, Budd, Burgess, Byrne, Calvert, Carter (GA), Carter (TX), Chabot, Chaffetz, Cheney, Coffman, Collins (GA), Collins (NY), Comer, Comstock, Conaway, Cook, Costello (PA), Cramer, Crawford, Crist, Culbertson, Curbelo (FL), Davidson, Davis, Rodney, Denham, Dent, DeSantis, DesJarlais, Diaz-Balart, Donovan, Duffy, Duncan (SC), Dunn, Emmer, Estes (KS), Farenthold, Faso, Ferguson, Fitzpatrick, Fleischmann, Flores, Fortenberry, Foxx, Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Gaetz, Gallagher, Garrett, Gibbs, Gohmert, Goodlatte, Gosar, Gottheimer, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (LA), Graves (MO), Griffith, Grothman, Guthrie, Harper, Harris, Hartzler, Hensarling, Herrera Beutler, Hice, Jody B. Higgins (LA), Hill, Holding, Hollingsworth, Hudson, Huizenga, Hultgren, Hunter, Hurd, Issa, Jenkins (KS), Jenkins (WV), Johnson (LA), Johnson (OH), Johnson, Sam, Jordan, Joyce (OH), Katko, Kelly (MS), Kelly (PA)

King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes

Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster

NOES—186

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.

Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray

Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suo zzi
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

Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Cole
Duncan (TN)
Marchant

Marino
Newhouse
Slaughter

Tonko

□ 1353

Mr. RUSH 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.

REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS SELECTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1695.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 275 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1695.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1356

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1695) to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide additional responsibilities for the Register of Copyrights, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Intellectual property is a critical and growing part of our Nation's economy, and the Register of Copyrights has a crucial role in the numerous copyright policy issues that impact it.

Four years ago, the Judiciary Committee began considering how to modernize our Nation's copyright laws, including how the Copyright Office is structured. Making the Register posi-

tion subject to the nomination and consent process with potential candidates identified by a congressional selection panel was among the many issues considered by the House Judiciary Committee.

Because the Director of the Patent and Trademark Office, who has an equally important voice on patent and trademark issues, is already subject to the nomination and consent process, it provided a precedent for this approach.

However, unlike the Patent and Trademark Office, the Copyright Office is part of the legislative branch. Thus, it is appropriate to also follow the precedent set for other legislative branch agencies, which gives Congress a greater say in selecting candidates for the heads of legislative branch entities to ensure those agencies are more accountable to Congress.

Because the Register position is now vacant, filled on an acting capacity by a well-regarded Acting Register, Ranking Member CONYERS and I introduced this bipartisan legislation to update the Register selection process. To mirror a recent change to the Librarian of Congress position that is now subject to a 10-year term limit, the legislation also makes the Register of Copyrights position subject to a 10-year term limit.

The selection panel would be bipartisan and would consist of leaders of the majorities and minorities of the House and Senate, and would also include the Librarian of Congress.

In the past, the authority of the Register of Copyrights to issue rulemakings has not been challenged in the courts because the Register is not subject to the nomination and consent process.

□ 1400

This legislation would remedy that question, once and for all. H.R. 1695 was reported by the House Judiciary Committee by a bipartisan vote of 27-1. In addition to strong support from traditional copyright groups, such as the Copyright Alliance, and the publishing, movie, music, and software industries, the bill has been supported by a wide range of diverse groups, such as the American Conservative Union; the AFL-CIO; Heritage Foundation scholars; the Directors Guild of America; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; MANA, A National Latina Organization; Americans for Tax Reform; and the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste.

With such strong support from a wide range of over 70 groups and a vacancy at the Register of Copyrights that needs to be quickly filled under the new process created by this legislation, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1695.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, April 19, 2017.
Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: I write to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on House Administration in H.R. 1695, the Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act of 2017. The bill, as reported from the Committee on the Judiciary on March 29, 2017, contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, I will waive Committee consideration of provisions that fall within the Committee's jurisdiction. However, agreeing to waive jurisdiction over these provisions should not be construed as waiving, reducing, or affecting the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration.

Additionally, the Committee on House Administration expressly reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provision within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this, or any similar legislation. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee for conferees on H.R. 1695 for provisions within the Committee's jurisdiction.

I ask a copy of this letter and your response be placed in the Congressional Record during any floor consideration of H.R. 1695.

I look forward to working with you on matters of mutual concern.

Sincerely,

GREGG HARPER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, April 20, 2017.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HARPER: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on the Judiciary and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1695, the "Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act," so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your foregoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1695 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1695, the Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act. As lead Democratic cosponsor of this bipartisan, bicameral legislation, I am pleased that this bill passed out of our Judiciary Committee—thanks to Chairman GOODLATTE and many others—by a vote of 27-1.

This legislation represents sound public policy that will strengthen the copyright system. To begin with, it has evolved directly from the bipartisan copyright review process that Chairman GOODLATTE initiated way back in 2013. Over the course of that highly deliberative process, the Judiciary Committee held no less than 20 hearings and heard from over 100 witnesses on how to update the copyright laws for the 21st century.

H.R. 1695 is the product of more than 4 years of outreach efforts with a wide range of interested parties who very much want to see, like all of us, a Copyright Office that is responsible to all stakeholders in the copyright ecosystem.

This bill is also the product of bicameral collaboration with our Senate colleagues, including the Judiciary Committee Chairman GRASSLEY, the Ranking Member FEINSTEIN, and Senator LEAHY. As a result of this inclusive process, the strong bipartisan consensus emerged from the Copyright Office that needs to be more accountable to Congress, and that it should have greater independence.

That Office has a long and distinguished history of serving as an adviser to Congress on copyright measures, and it is only reasonable that Congress play a significant role in deciding who leads that important agency.

H.R. 1695 also elevates the stature of the Register and makes the position directly accountable to Congress, which will help ensure a strong and vibrant copyright system that fuels our economy, creates jobs, and promotes a diverse range of views.

Today, core copyright businesses annually contribute more than \$1.2 trillion to our Nation's economy and generate foreign sales of almost \$180 billion. These businesses are also tremendous job creators, creating more than 5 million workers.

That is why the bill is strongly supported by several unions, including the AFL-CIO, the Screen Actors Guild, the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, as well as the Directors Guild of America.

H.R. 1695 is also supported by a broad range of other stakeholders, including: the American Intellectual Property Law Association; the Intellectual Property Owners Association; and various coalitions of creators, such as the Content Creators Coalition (c3), CreativeFuture, and the Copyright Alliance.

Individual creators like Jeff Friday, the founder and CEO of Film Life and the producer of the American Black Film Festival also are in strong support of the bill.

Finally, H.R. 1695 will enable Congress to ensure that the Copyright Office is led by a well-qualified individual by requiring the Register to be confirmed by the Senate. This individual must be responsive to the Congress and the public, as well as all the stakeholders in the copyright community.

In fact, an amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), that was accepted during the Judiciary Committee markup of the bill, will further strengthen the selection process by establishing an even larger role for Congress in choosing candidates for the position.

Accordingly, I urge total support for H.R. 1695, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the committee who has done an amazing job.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1695. This legislation would strengthen the Copyright Office and make it more accountable to Congress by turning the Register of Copyrights into a Senate-confirmed position.

Since 2013, under the bipartisan leadership of Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS, the Judiciary Committee has undertaken a comprehensive review of the copyright laws and the Copyright Office. Over the course of 20 hearings with 100 witnesses, as well as listening sessions across the country, and individual meetings with a broad range of stakeholders, we have heard one consistent message: that the Copyright Office must be modernized to meet the needs of the public in the copyright community.

This bill is an important first step in that process, and it is appropriate that we consider it today on World Intellectual Property Day when we recognize the tremendous contribution that intellectual property laws, including copyright, make to our economy and to our creativity. But maintaining this vibrant copyright ecosystem depends on having an effective Copyright Office to oversee it. Throughout the copyright review process, it became evident that the current structure of the Office has hindered its ability to serve the public and the copyright community effectively.

For historical reasons, the Copyright Office is located in the Library of Congress, and the Register of Copyrights answers solely to the Librarian of Congress. As an institutional matter, this creates a conflict. Libraries are a key stakeholder in the copyright community, but they are one among many stakeholders, each with different priorities and interests. To place the Copyright Office in the hands of one interested party does a disservice to the copyright system it is charged with administering.

H.R. 1695 would remedy this problem by making the Register of Copyrights a Presidential appointment subject to Senate confirmation. It would establish an open and transparent process for publicly vetting a nominee for Register and would allow the broad range

of copyright stakeholders to provide input through their elected Representatives.

It would also strengthen the ability of Congress to provide meaningful oversight of the Copyright Office, and, by establishing a 10-year term for the Register, it would insulate the Office from any improper political influence.

It is particularly important that Congress have the final say in who serves as Register because, by statute, the Copyright Office serves as an expert adviser to Congress on copyright matters. The Office has played an invaluable role throughout the Judiciary Committee's copyright review process, and this bill would ensure that we continue to rely on independent advice from the Register as we make further reforms to the copyright laws.

Under current law, the selection of the Register is left entirely to the Librarian. And since the Librarian serves at the pleasure of the President, it is really the President who can dictate the choice of Register if the Librarian wishes to keep her job. And the Register can be dismissed at any time by the Librarian, possibly at the direction of the President.

This bill serves as an important check on the President's power by removing his unfettered ability to name a Register, by requiring Senate confirmation of the position instead, and by giving the Register a fixed 10-year term.

The role of Congress is further solidified by an important amendment that was added during the committee's markup by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Under her amendment, which is now in the bill, a panel of congressional leaders, along with the Librarian of Congress, would develop a list of candidates from which the President would choose a nominee. This strengthens congressional input and preserves an important role in the process for the Librarian as well.

The Jackson Lee amendment strikes a good balance between respecting the roles of Congress, the President, and the Librarian in selecting the Register, and I appreciate the contribution she made to the bill.

The Copyright Office serves a vital function, but its current structure does not reflect the importance of the Office. H.R. 1695 elevates the status and the stature of the Register, and treats the position like other Federal officials with similarly significant responsibilities—like the Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. This would make the Copyright Office more responsive and accountable to Congress, and it is the first step to its providing the Office with the flexibility and independence it needs to serve all members of the copyright community effectively.

This legislation is independent of any evaluation of the fitness of the current Librarian—who is excellent in my opinion—of the fitness of the prior Register. This legislation has been devel-

oped over a period of years, and the importance is institutional, not reflecting the personalities of the current occupants.

This legislation is supported by a broad range of stakeholders, including the AFL-CIO and several other major unions, and it passed the Judiciary Committee by a nearly unanimous vote of 27-1.

It deserves similar support by the full House, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY), ranking member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for whom I have the utmost respect for. But unfortunately, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Dr. Carla Hayden, appointed by President Obama, has been on the job less than a year and deserves the opportunity to complete the IT modernization of the Copyright Office before this authority is taken away from her. As ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, I know that Dr. Hayden has made excellent progress in reforming the Copyright Office, knocking 2 years off the estimated time to complete its modernization. This bill is a solution in search of a problem.

This measure not only impedes the progress Dr. Hayden is currently making but will also undo the strides that have already been made. Simply put, this bill does nothing to improve the operations of the Copyright Office.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to stay with Dr. Hayden and vote "no" on this bill.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

□ 1415

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, despite all the rhetoric, this bill does really just one thing: it takes the appointment of the Register away from Dr. Carla Hayden, the most qualified Librarian we have ever had at the Library of Congress, and gives it to President Trump.

Now, the policy excuses for this are simply unpersuasive. Proponents say that this would give greater transparency to the Congress and the operation of the Copyright Office. I think this is a ridiculous statement.

Once a Presidential appointment is confirmed, there is no greater attention to the desires of Congress or transparency than for any other non-Presidential appointment. The conflicts that the Republican Congress had with President Obama's Environmental Protection Agency and IRS appointees are testimony to that truth.

There are vague claims of elevating the Register and modernizing the Office, but, in fact, the Library is finally making progress on modernizing the Office. This bill would actually disrupt that progress.

When you talk about conflicts, the Library doesn't have a conflict with this, but who does have a conflict is President Trump. He holds 30 copyrights. So I don't think the idea of President Trump being a superior selector of the Register because of his elevation or his expertise as a writer really holds any weight.

I would like to mention the amendment that our colleague SHEILA JACKSON LEE had offered. I am extremely fond of my friend SHEILA JACKSON LEE, but the amendment does nothing because you cannot limit Presidential appointment power through statute. The President is limited only by the advice and consent of the Senate.

Finally, I would like to say that the potential for empowering special interests in this bill is very high. We ought to say "no" to this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate all the great work that my colleague, Congressman CONYERS, has done not only on this issue, for the many years you have served distinguishably in this Congress, but thank you so much for yielding some time.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1695, the Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act of 2017.

I represent the San Fernando Valley, which is in the Los Angeles area. For my constituents, for the families in my district, copyright protections are not an abstract philosophical issue, ladies and gentlemen. The families in my district depend on strong copyright protections in order to earn a living, to feed their family. They work in film and television studios and in music publishing. They are artists, set designers, producers, union drivers; they work on lots, and they work in every aspect supporting this incredible industry.

There are 127,000 film and television production jobs in Los Angeles County. According to a recent report, the core copyright industries—film, television, music, video games, and publishing—make possible 5.5 million jobs and bring in \$1.2 trillion of gross domestic product to the American economy.

Good copyright laws and regulations mean jobs and whether or not a family can put food on the table and a roof over their heads. We need to give the Copyright Office the respect and authority it deserves as the overseer of 5.5 million American jobs.

I have heard from my constituents for years about the need to empower the Copyright Office to keep up with

the industry and the technology changes. This is not a new debate, ladies and gentlemen.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and to continue to stand up for American copyright jobs.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member, and I appreciate his work. I appreciate the chairman's work on this bill.

I believe that this proposal is ill-timed, and that is why I rise in opposition to it.

Today, World Intellectual Property Day, the protection of our Nation's intellectual property and, specifically, our copyrights is too important to take lightly.

The system for the appointment of the Register of Copyrights has long been in place, and selection of the head of the Office of Copyrights has been within the purview of the Librarian of Congress, this Nation's top librarian.

The system is not broken, but the entire system, including the Library of Congress, is in need of congressional attention and upgrade. What is needed is modernization, which requires more funding. Our first order of business should be to fund adequately the operations of the Library of Congress as well as the Office of Copyrights. But in these days where we are trying to keep the government from closing, you see what we are dealing with in that regard. It is fitting that this decision remain with the Librarian, as she has an interest in protecting copyrighted materials as head librarian.

The nomination and consent process has been politicized, with the recent theft from President Obama of a United States Supreme Court appointment serving as Exhibit A.

The Library has been well underfunded for many years, and separating the Register's Office would not help with the comprehensive modernization of the Library or the Copyright Office. Instead, it would subject the newly independent Office to the appropriations process, which, as I stated, is already failing.

The Library of Congress is the premiere stakeholder in the smooth and efficient operations of the Office of Copyrights. The Librarian of Congress is in the best position to monitor the operations of the Copyright Office much more than the Office of the President.

Modernization of the Library has been discussed for the past 10 years. Let's do it comprehensively. Let's not start off with this proposal which, quite frankly, doesn't pass the smell test at this time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend, the ranking member from Michigan, for the time, and I appreciate the opportunity to join the majority of my committee colleagues as a cosponsor of this bill. It reflects the general consensus that Congress needs to step in to increase the autonomy of the Copyright Office, while still respecting its historic connection to the Library.

This bill is an important first step in reforming the Copyright Office, but it can't be the only step. Through the hearings this committee has held over the past few years, we have learned how truly behind the curve the Copyright Office is.

I have worked with colleagues to find a bipartisan and consensus-driven set of reforms for the Copyright Office that would go beyond just this step in the process of selecting a Register, as have the chairman and Ranking Member CONYERS and others on the committee.

It should be obvious that, to bring the Office into the 21st century, we need to do more than just change the selection process for the Register of Copyrights. It requires a massive overhaul of the IT system of the Office to create both a smoother process for creators seeking to protect their work and a system to enable the public to search the broad catalog of American creativity.

It requires increased accountability and consultation with both the creative and the user communities so that we ensure that the improvements and investments meet the needs of all those who rely on the Copyright Office to do its job well.

Establishing the Register of Copyrights with authority outside of the Library of Congress is not a reflection on the Librarian of Congress. It is a recognition of the reality that the Library and the Copyright Office have two fundamentally different missions, and they deserve to be empowered to pursue those missions. It is a recognition that success for both of these important entities means allowing them to maintain their historic connection but operate on a day-to-day basis with greater autonomy.

I am glad that the chairman has taken up this first step, and I look forward to working with him and Ranking Member CONYERS and others on the next steps as well.

This piece of legislation supports strong copyright laws in our country. Having strong copyright means the ability for creators to be able to do their work. It means the creation of jobs.

The reason that this piece of legislation has such strong bipartisan support, the reason that it is supported by the thousands and thousands of people who earn their living every day as a result of the creativity that strong copy-

right laws protect, the reason they are supporting this legislation is because it is an important first step.

I am glad to participate in this debate, and I look forward to passing this bill, H.R. 1695, in order to take that first step to promote stronger copyright, to provide the kind of autonomy that the Copyright Office needs so that it can move forward rapidly with modernization, and, most importantly, at this moment in our Nation's history, to ensure that we have the strongest possible avenue to create even more good jobs, well-paying jobs. That is what this legislation is about.

Mr. Chair, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chair, this is a bill that is critical for us to pass. It is the result of more than 3 years of hearings, listening tours, and dozens of conversations with a wide range of stakeholders.

Under the leadership of Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, the Judiciary Committee members sat through hours of hearings and even traveled to different cities around the country to hear from all the stakeholders that are impacted by our copyright policies.

It is clear that we need a change in the Copyright Office. We need to protect our Copyright Office. We can do that with a Presidential appointee of the Register. That is why this bill is supported by a wide range of stakeholders, including the AFL-CIO; the Screen Actors Guild-American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, SAG-AFTRA; the Directors Guild; the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, or IATSE; the American Federation of Musicians; the Motion Picture Association of America; the Recording Industry Association of America; the GRAMMYS; the National Association of Broadcasters; Software and Information Industry Association; the American Intellectual Property Law Association; and the Intellectual Property Owners Association, amongst many.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues, for the sake of our future and the protection of copyright, to support this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), one of the most influential members of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan and all of my colleagues that have spoken on this job-creating legislation and recognition of how great America is with all of the creative talent that

we have mustered, the music that you enjoy, the songwriters and others who created both the visual and musical arts. This is what this is about.

Now, I have listened to some of my colleagues from California. I am not from California. I am from Houston, Texas. But we know that creative artists and writers and those who invent and those who write wonderful stories are all part of the arena of what America is great about. They generate genius and they create jobs. The Copyright Office is that protector that ensures that those jobs will be protected.

We, over a series of years in the Judiciary Committee, have looked at reforming the copyright system. We have had hearings even with the former Copyright Register, who indicated that putting her position in a Senate confirmation would be the right thing to do. But it has taken 4 years.

So today we have come not to be out of order and not doing other major aspects of reform. In fact, I want to congratulate the Librarian of Congress who, now, is engaged in modernization. I applaud her. Her appointment has been significant. She is innovative and is already working to make sure that the Library and the creative arts and assets and property of those of great talent is protected.

□ 1430

Today we address an aspect of that work, and that is we want to continue to see the progress that our Librarian has made. We want to be able to make on an equal status that individual that is dealing with copyright just as the director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office status as a Presidential appointee does not compromise that person's ability to execute their duties as head of the USPTO, nor should it compromise or interfere with the responsibilities of cooperation, collaboration, jurisdictional compromise, and work between the Librarian of Congress and the Register of Copyrights.

To the Librarian of Congress, my view is keep working, keep doing the modernization work. I believe that as we move forward, regardless of who at this point is in the Office of President, that we can ensure that Congress has insight and oversight over this important position.

Let me also suggest to my colleagues that the Library of Congress is an important part of the work of Congress, and I think all of us should be interested stakeholders in the work that it does and should be supporters of that.

We encourage the Library of Congress to work with America's constituency by having programs and letting them know of the wonderful artifacts that are there, that are held, that tell the history of this great Nation. It is always important to be able to do research there and to see the storied history.

Now, we come to this bill that does nothing to undermine that storied history or the Librarian of Congress.

What it does, as I have indicated, is it helps us create jobs.

Now, in order to recognize the importance of the Librarian of Congress, in this instance, Dr. Carla Hayden, I am very grateful that my colleagues accepted an amendment that I have that, in fact, does do something, and it does a very important action. It respects and recognizes the value of Congress' insight on putting forth nominees or names that will be selected from to become the Register of Copyrights, not to have limited input, but to actually produce the names.

Ultimately, I hope that an amendment going forward after this bill, working with the Senate, can be that there is a limit to the names being put forward and that those names are the names that are put forward to the President of the United States. I think that is an element that should be included.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. In the amendment, it has that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, the majority leader of the Senate, minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Librarian of Congress will be, in fact, the deciders of who gets nominated to be the Register of Copyrights.

As we well know, the AFL-CIO has provided a letter of support, along with the American Federation of Musicians, the Authors Guild, the Directors Guild of America, the Graphic Artists Guild, the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, and Screen Actors Guild. All of these create jobs and all of these unions have representatives all around the Nation.

Finally, I would say it is extremely important that the musicians and artists of color have indicated that they see no bias in this particular legislation against the present Librarian and have written a letter indicating that they believe that there is no bias.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So I ask my colleagues to work together and to pass H.R. 1695 to continue the process of modernization of the Copyright Office and continue the collaborative work between the Librarian of Congress and the Register of Copyrights. There is no difference in the cooperation of decades before and, as well, there is no indication that that will not occur in the future. Both of them will have 10-year terms, and I believe that we will move forward on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the rule under consideration for H.R. 1695, the "Register of

Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act of 2017," as amended to include the Jackson Lee Amendment.

H.R. 1695, the "Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act of 2017," if enacted, would change the selection process for the Register of Copyrights, who is the Director of the United States Copyright Office, which is housed in the Library of Congress.

The Librarian of Congress, an appointed position subject to Senate confirmation since 1987, is currently tasked with modernizing the Library of Congress.

This legislation is not about taking power away from any individual.

In fact, Dr. Carla Hayden, the current Librarian of Congress, is by all accounts serving the various needs of the Library of Congress very well.

This legislation and the Jackson Lee Amendment only further the Library's efforts to effectively modernize its copyright selection and approval process.

Just as the Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office's status as a Presidential appointee does not compromise her ability execute her duties as head of the USPTO, the Copyright Register will not be compromised by the fact he or she is a Presidential appointee.

Dr. Hayden is an exceptional administrator and the bill before us in no way reflects adversely upon her.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, accepted during markup with bipartisan support by the members of the Judiciary Committee to improve the bill, recognizes the dual role of the Library of Congress as both a legislative and a national institution, militating against giving President carte blanche in nominating the Register of Copyrights.

Specifically, the bill's amended provision establishes a 7-person panel to recommend a list of at least three (3) individuals to the President for appointment as the Register of Copyrights.

The amendment provides that the panel membership shall be as follows:

1. Speaker of the House of Representatives;
2. President pro tempore of the Senate;
3. Majority Leader of the House of Representatives;
4. Majority Leader of the Senate;
5. Minority Leader of the House of Representatives;
6. Minority Leader of the Senate; and the
7. Librarian of Congress.

This bill is the product of years of bipartisan deliberation, and reflects the collective and considered judgment of Members of Congress that the Copyright Office would be strengthened as an institution were the Register to be selected through the advise and consent process, regardless of which political party occupied the Oval Office or controlled majorities in Congress.

The essential role of government is to protect life, liberty and property.

That is why a fundamental bulwark of the core values demonstrated by our constitution is property rights—a notion understood by the Founders at the dawn of the Republic.

For precisely that reason, the Founding Fathers recognized the importance of IP in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: "To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

This clause, articulated by the Founders, is rooted in the notion that the best way to encourage creation and dissemination of new inventions and creative works to the benefit of both the public good and individual liberty is to recognize one's right to his or her intellectual property.

On November 12, 1975, at the investiture of Daniel J. Boorstin as the 12th Librarian of Congress, Congressman Lucien N. Nedzi of Michigan, the Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, stated:

As its name reveals, the Library is the Library of Congress—a fact in which the Congress of the United States takes great pride—and, of equal importance, if not more so, it is a national library that serves all of the people of the United States.

H.R. 1695, balanced by the Jackson Lee Amendment, strikes the proper balance and harmonizes these dual interests.

The national interest and character of the institution is preserved by elevating the office of the Register of Copyrights and vesting in the President the authority to nominate the Register of Copyrights.

The legislative interest is protected by constraining the President to select for appointment 1 of 3 persons recommended by panel that represents the institutional interests of Congress in the Library and its subdivisions—the joint congressional leadership and the Librarian of Congress.

The panel only possesses the power to recommend candidates to the President; it cannot dictate the President's choice.

Moreover, this arrangement complies with Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which provides:

[The President] shall . . . nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.]

The Founder's wisdom is manifest in today's creative economy, which contributes more than \$1.2 trillion to GDP and supports 5.5 million jobs.

Yet in a quirk of history, without this legislation, Congress has no role in the selection of the Register of Copyrights, even though the Register is Congress' statutorily designated expert advisor on copyright policy and the head of the Copyright Office.

What is no accident is that Congress can fix this problem by passing H.R. 1695, on World IP Day, Wednesday, April 26, 2017.

This would increase accountability to Congress as well as transparency by giving all Americans a voice in the selection of the Register through their elected representatives.

We can think of no better way to recognize the contributions of copyright to the economy than by finally ascribing to the position of Register an importance commensurate with the sector it oversees.

I urge my support for the rule, as well as the underlying legislation as amended.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have no speakers remaining, and I am prepared to close when Ranking Member CONYERS concludes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Ladies and gentlemen, in closing, I want to point out that it is particu-

larly appropriate that we are considering H.R. 1695 on World Intellectual Property Day, a day dedicated to acknowledging the critical role that intellectual property rights play in encouraging creativity and innovation.

First established in 2001, World Intellectual Property Day encourages engagement among governments, private industry, and the public about the importance of intellectual property promotion and protection.

H.R. 1695 goes a long way in achieving those goals. Accordingly, I thank my colleagues for their support, and I urge that this bill be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Content Creators Coalition, dated April 25, 2017, in support of this legislation.

APRIL 25, 2017.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS MEMBER: On behalf of the Content Creators Coalition, we write in support of H.R. 1695, the Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act, which would modernize and provide greater transparency to the process of selecting the Register of the Copyright Office.

This is vital legislation that will strengthen the Copyright Office. We believe this selection process should be granted a similar import, rigor, and transparency as the processes of selecting other organizations, such as the U.S. Patent and Trademark office, that oversee large industries: Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation. In light of the specialized knowledge required to lead this office, we also support the appointment of an advisory group to suggest candidates for consideration.

This legislation would place the Copyright Office on equal footing as other economically and culturally vital agencies. It has wide bipartisan support and was passed out of the typically polarized House Judiciary Committee on a vote of 27-1.

As artists of color, we find it deeply offensive that opponents of this bill have attempted to recast their anti-creators' rights goals into a smear campaign against its sponsors and supporters, insinuating that the legislation is about the race and gender of the current Librarian of Congress. The Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act is co-authored by the Dean of the House and the Congressional Black Caucus, Judiciary Ranking Member John Conyers, and supported by Congressman John Lewis. Their lifelong and unshakable commitment to civil rights is a historical fact and should be honored and respected, not opportunistically and baselessly questioned just to score a few empty political points.

We would be the first to speak out against prejudice or bias anywhere—in business, culture, the arts, or politics. But here, we know these charges are false. The bill has nothing to do with the current Librarian at all—in fact, these reform proposals pre-date her appointment.

Nor does this bill have anything to do with the former Register of Copyrights. We are grateful for her tireless efforts and advocacy on behalf of working musicians and find it appalling that some have engaged in efforts to drag her record through the mud to defeat these reforms.

And certainly the bill has nothing to do with the current President—once again, these proposals to modernize the Copyright Office long pre-date his election. It is the

height of cynicism for bill opponents to attempt to ride on the powerful coattails of the "RESIST" movement by falsely wrapping this bipartisan pro-artist, pro-creator legislation in the controversies surrounding the President, especially in light of his proposal for massive cuts to funding for the arts. In our view, misleading the President's critics by leveraging fear into opposition for a non-controversial proposal like this ultimately undermines and disrespects our movement.

The need for this legislation is plain. The current system in which the Librarian of Congress selects the Register is the result of a unique moment in history and outdated concerns: in 1870, the Librarian of Congress asked Congress to give him the authority to appoint the Register in order to deal with a massive influx of new works and the need to quickly grow the Library's collection.

Nearly 150 years later, the functions of the Copyright Office have changed. It is no mere registry of creative works, but has become the most trusted advisor on Copyright law and its interpretation for the United States Congress. The process of selecting a leader to this office should reflect the importance of copyright to the U.S. economy.

Congress is reviewing and revising copyright laws to ensure they continue to protect all music creators in a time of rapid transition online. It deserves the best advice it can get, and reform of the Register selection process is long overdue.

Thank you for consideration of our views,
 MELVIN GIBBS.
 NONA HENDRYX.
 ERNIE ISLEY.
 RAMSEY JONES.
 DARRELL McNEILL.
 V JEFFERY SMITH.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I thank Ranking Member CONYERS and many other Members across the aisle, as well as the subcommittee chair and the subcommittee vice chair of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet—Mr. ISSA and Mr. COLLINS—for their hard work in support of this legislation, which is urgently needed. It is very straightforward. It has very broad bipartisan support here in the House.

It is also strongly supported in a bipartisan fashion in the Senate. A wide array of outside organizations—virtually every copyright organization in the country—as well as a number of other organizations concerned about the importance of intellectual property protection and particularly copyright law want to see the status of the Register of Copyrights elevated by Presidential appointment with input from six leaders in the House and the Senate and the Librarian of Congress to select the next Register of Copyrights and have a 10-year term, which is compatible with terms of other important legislative branch positions.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, today I voted against H.R. 1695, the Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act. As the founder and co-chair of the Congressional Library of Congress Caucus, I care deeply

about the services and the mission of the Library, including the U.S. Copyright Office. It's past time to bring the Library and the Copyright Office into the 21st Century, and I strongly support efforts to modernize and reform existing practices. H.R. 1695, however, might unnecessarily politicize the Copyright Office and the position of the Register and could make its work less transparent and less neutral to all parties. We should allow Dr. Carla Hayden to continue to guide the modernization process by selecting a Register, a decision enjoyed by all of her predecessors to hold the office of Librarian. While it is unclear that H.R. 1695 would do more good than harm, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of aisle on future efforts to reform and modernize the Library of Congress the copyright system.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-13. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1695

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 "Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 701 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "(a) All administrative" and inserting the following:

"(a) REGISTER AND DIRECTOR.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—All administrative";

(B) by striking "director" and inserting "Director";

(C) by inserting after the first sentence the following: "The Register of Copyrights shall be a citizen of the United States with a professional background and experience in copyright law and shall be appointed by the President from the individuals recommended under paragraph (6), by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."; and

(D) in the last sentence, by striking "shall be appointed" and all that follows through "and shall act" and inserting "shall act";

(2) in subsection (b), by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(3) by redesignating subsection (b) as paragraph (2), and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(4) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by inserting "DUTIES.—" before "In addition";

(5) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) OATH.—The Register of Copyrights shall, before taking office, take an oath to discharge faithfully the duties of the Copyright Office described in paragraph (2).

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Register of Copyrights may be removed from office by the President.

"(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall provide notification to both Houses of Congress of a removal under subparagraph (A).

"(5) TERM OF OFFICE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Register of Copyrights—

"(i) shall be appointed for a term of 10 years; and

"(ii) may serve until a successor is appointed, confirmed, and taken the oath of office.

"(B) LIMITATION.—The Register of Copyrights may not continue to serve after the date on which Congress adjourns sine die after the date on which the 10-year period described in subparagraph (A)(i) ends.

"(C) REAPPOINTMENT.—An individual appointed to the position of Register of Copyrights, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may be reappointed to that position in accordance with the requirements of this section.

"(6) PANEL FOR REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS RECOMMENDATIONS.—There is established a panel to recommend a list of at least 3 individuals to the President for appointment as the Register of Copyrights. The panel shall be composed of the following:

"(A) The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(B) The President pro tempore of the Senate.

"(C) The majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

"(D) The Librarian of Congress.";

(6) by redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (b) through (e), respectively;

(7) in subsection (b), as so redesignated, by inserting "SEAL.—" before "The Register";

(8) in subsection (c), as so redesignated, by inserting "ANNUAL REPORT.—" before "The Register";

(9) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by inserting "APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 5.—" before "Except as provided"; and

(10) in subsection (e), as so redesignated, by inserting "COMPENSATION.—" before "The Register".

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any vacancy for the Register of Copyrights after January 1, 2017. If a Register of Copyrights is appointed during the period beginning on January 1, 2017 and ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, that Register shall meet the requirements of the amendments made by this Act or shall be replaced in accordance with such amendments.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-95. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-95.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 18, insert after "law" the following: ", shall be capable of identifying and

supervising a Chief Information Officer or other similar official responsible for managing modern information technology systems.".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 275, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will place a much-needed priority on advancing the technological capabilities of the U.S. Copyright Office.

I support the underlying bill to make the selection of the Register of Copyrights more open and more transparent. I also support the additional congressional oversight that will be necessary to ensure that the Register is accountable to the American people.

I agree with Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, and my other colleagues on the Judiciary Committee that it is important that this bill move forward now. Making this improvement to the selection process for the next Register is an important first step before the committee advances broader Copyright Office modernization.

Even as we take this initial modest step to improve the appointment process, we can do more to strengthen the Copyright Office for today's economy. The Copyright Office's mission is to administer our Nation's copyright laws for the public good.

Securing Americans' rights to their intellectual property fosters creativity and benefits all Americans by advancing the arts and the sciences. In recent decades, this mission has been undermined by comically outdated information technology systems at the Copyright Office.

My amendment makes a simple change to the underlying bill to ensure that technology is always a part of the equation when selecting a new Register of Copyrights. My amendment would require the Register of Copyrights to be capable of identifying and supervising a chief information officer.

The CIO or a similar official would be responsible for managing information technology systems to advance the Copyright Office's capabilities and keep pace with our 21st century economy. One would assume that any qualified candidate for the Register of Copyrights has the skills and experiences necessary to guide the Office's technology office.

Why leave this vital aspect of the Copyright Office to assumptions?

Requiring the head of the Copyright Office to be ready to make this vital selection is not an overly burdensome obligation. For practical purposes, this capability is a necessity, and that is why my amendment would make technology an explicit part of the selection process.

My amendment merely requires that the person who will serve as the Register be capable of supervising the Office's chief information officer. Whatever happens next as we move forward with modernization, IT systems of the Copyright Office must keep pace with new advancements in technology. If Congress expects real progress toward improving the Copyright Office's technology, we must ensure that the leaders we select are prepared for the job.

I thank my Judiciary Committee colleague, Ms. LOFGREN. She made this point in committee during the markup of this bill, and the language in this amendment takes her suggestion a step further. It is a small change to the underlying bill, but it sends a much-needed signal that the work of the Copyright Office must include a focus on improving its IT systems.

This is only the beginning of Congress' work to modernize the Copyright Office. H.R. 1695 is a good first step, and I strongly support the underlying bill, but any step forward toward modernization must have IT improvements at the front of mind. I hope my colleagues also support this change. I think it is a commonsense step.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the amendment offered by Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. DEUTCH has been a strong supporter of intellectual property as well as the modernization of the Copyright Office during the House Judiciary Committee's copyright review.

□ 1445

The needs of a modern copyright registration system require advanced information technology systems, so it is critical that all future Registers have a strong base of information technology knowledge within the Office to lead such efforts. By requiring all future Registers to have the skills necessary to identify and hire a chief information officer or other similar official to lead such efforts within the Office, the Deutch amendment ensures a strong Copyright Office. I want to thank the gentleman for making this important contribution to the legislation.

I neglected to mention earlier—I don't see him here now—but I also want to thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), for the important contributions he has made to this legislation as well.

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I just want everyone to know that I rise in support of this amendment. As we discovered through the Judiciary Committee's comprehensive copyright review process, the Copyright Office needs significant upgrades to its technology; so the gentleman's amendment would ensure that the Register has someone on her staff with the knowledge and skills necessary to bring the Copyright Office information technology system into the 21st century.

It is a useful amendment. It will help modernize the Copyright Office, and I appreciate the gentleman from Florida for offering it. I urge total support for the amendment.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Michigan. I appreciate the strong support from Chairman GOODLATTE, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this good amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. JUDY CHU OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-95.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to impact the mandatory deposit requirements in title 17, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 275, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1695 and the amendment that I offer. This is a simple amendment that specifies that the mandatory deposit requirement of the Library of Congress will not be affected in any way by the underlying bill.

Currently, applicants for copyright registration are required to submit two deposit copies to the Copyright Office. After the Office reviews the material to determine whether it qualifies for copyright protection, it makes the cop-

ies available for the Library for its use in its permanent collection.

In fact, that is a large reason that the Copyright Office is located in the Library of Congress to begin with. In 1870, Librarian Ainsworth Rand Spofford convinced Congress that placing the Copyright Office in the Library would help build its collection through deposits of registered works, which it has done successfully.

In the digital age, many argue that the mandatory deposit requirement should be modified in some way to better balance the needs of creators and the Library. My amendment states that H.R. 1695 may not be construed to impact the mandatory deposit requirement, and it makes clear that this issue is for another day. Passing this amendment will allow us to focus instead on the many benefits in turning the Register into a Presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed position.

The underlying bill is a result of more than 3 years of hearings, listening tours, and dozens of conversations with a wide range of stakeholders. The Judiciary Committee Members, led by Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, all sat through hours of hearings, and even traveled to different cities around the country to hear from all of our stakeholders who are impacted by our copyright policies.

As the Judiciary Committee finished its thorough review of the Copyright Act, there was broad consensus that the Copyright Office should be modernized and restructured so that it is more accountable to Congress and to the public.

This is why I, along with Congressman TOM MARINO, introduced a bipartisan bill to carry out these changes. Our bill, the Copyright Office for the Digital Economy Act, the CODE Act, would also put in place a system similar to the one in H.R. 1695 to elevate the Register. We introduced this bill 2 years ago, before the new Librarian was sworn in and when President Obama was still in office. This has been a bipartisan issue grounded on sound policy considerations.

I believe the changes proposed in H.R. 1695 will help improve the functionality of the Copyright Office, which members of the public rely on to protect their works or properly use copyrighted works. The core copyright industries are now responsible for \$1.2 trillion of our GDP, which represents 7 percent of the economy. These industries also employ 5.5 million people.

We need to make sure the Copyright Office can modernize to meet the demands of the growing industries in our country, and its leadership that is accountable to Congress, which will help it move toward that direction. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Ms. JUDY CHU. She has been a strong advocate for the protection of intellectual property as well as the modernization of the Copyright Office during the House Judiciary Committee's copyright review, and we miss her on the committee.

One of the issues that has been raised while we have discussed updates to our Nation's copyright laws is the importance of preserving our mandatory deposit system. The mandatory deposit system that exists in our Nation's copyright law has resulted in numerous copyrighted works being added to the collections of the Library of Congress at no charge to taxpayers. Without the mandatory deposit system, the Library's collections would be vastly smaller, without a significant increase in taxpayer funding in order to buy these copyrighted works that are now provided free to the Library.

Ms. JUDY CHU's amendment ensures that this system is not disrupted as the Register position is made subject to the nomination and consent process, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

This amendment makes clear that nothing in the bill would impact the Library of Congress' mandatory deposit requirement. For over 100 years, the Library has built its world-class collection, in large part, through the mandatory deposit requirement.

So H.R. 1695 is a very narrow bill that only changes how the Register of Copyrights is selected. I think it is helpful, and I congratulate the gentlewoman for this very creative amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 410, noes 14, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

AYES—410

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

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

NOES—14

Amash	Duncan (SC)	Lofgren
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Richmond
Capuano	Gaetz	Rokita
Doyle, Michael	Gallagher	Rush
F.	Grothman	Thompson (MS)

NOT VOTING—6

Carson (IN)	Marino	Pascrell
Jeffries	Newhouse	Slaughter

□ 1522

Ms. SANCHEZ, Messrs. GRAVES of Georgia, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, SESSIONS, PALAZZO, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, WILSON of South Carolina, and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1695) to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide

additional responsibilities for the Register of Copyrights, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 275, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 48, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]
YEAS—378

Abraham Carter (GA) Diaz-Balart
Aderholt Carter (TX) Dingell
Aguilar Castor (FL) Doggett
Allen Castro (TX) Donovan
Amash Chabot
Amodei Chaffetz Duncan (SC)
Arrington Cheney Duncan (TN)
Babin Chu, Judy
Bacon Cicilline
Banks (IN) Clark (MA)
Barletta Clarke (NY)
Barr Clay
Barragán Cleaver Estes (KS)
Barton Coffman Esty (CT)
Bass Cohen
Bera Cole
Bergman Collins (GA)
Beyer Collins (NY)
Biggs Comer
Bilirakis Comstock
Bishop (MI) Conaway
Bishop (UT) Conyers
Black Cook
Blackburn Cooper
Blum Costa
Blunt Rochester Costello (PA)
Bonamici Courtney
Bost Cramer
Brady (TX) Crawford
Brat Crist
Bridenstine Crowley
Brooks (AL) Cuellar
Brooks (IN) Culberson
Brown (MD) Curbelo (FL)
Brownley (CA) Davidson
Buchanan Davis, Danny
Buck Davis, Rodney
Bucshon Delaney
Budd DeLauro
Burgess Demings
Bustos Denham
Byrne Dent
Calvert DeSantis
Cárdenas DesJarlais
Carson (IN) Deutch

Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas

Adams
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cartwright
Clyburn
Connolly
Correa

NAYS—48

Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard

Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeBene
DeSaunier
Doyle, Michael
F.
Eshoo
Fudge
Huffman
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Lofgren

Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Viscosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)

Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
Norcross
Payne
Pelosi
Polis
Price (NC)
Richmond
Rosen
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Shea-Porter
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Watson Coleman
NOT VOTING—4
Marino
Newhouse
Pascrell
Slaughter
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.
□ 1532
So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WOMACK. 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 237, nays 161, answered "present" 2, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]
YEAS—237

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Correa
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Hartzler
Heck
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Guthrie
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Garrett
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Green, Al
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris

Maloney,	Price (NC)	Smucker
Carolyn B.	Richmond	Speier
Marshall	Roby	Stefanik
Massie	Roe (TN)	Stewart
McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Suozi
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Takano
McClintock	Rokita	Taylor
McCollum	Rooney, Francis	Tenney
McHenry	Roskam	Thornberry
McMorris	Ross	Titus
Rodgers	Rothfus	Torres
McNerney	Royce (CA)	Trott
Meadows	Ruiz	Tsongas
Meeks	Ruppersberger	Veasey
Meng	Rutherford	Vela
Mitchell	Sanford	Velázquez
Mooney (WV)	Scalise	Wagner
Moulton	Schiff	Walden
Mullin	Schneider	Walker
Murphy (FL)	Schweikert	Walters, Mimi
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Walz
Napolitano	Scott, Austin	Wasserman
Noem	Scott, David	Schultz
Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Waters, Maxine
O'Rourke	Serrano	Welch
Olson	Sessions	Wenstrup
Palazzo	Shea-Porter	Westerman
Palmer	Sherman	Williams
Panetta	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Payne	Shuster	Wittman
Perlmutter	Sinema	Womack
Pingree	Smith (NE)	Yarmuth
Pocan	Smith (NJ)	Young (IA)
Polis	Smith (TX)	Zeldin
Posey	Smith (WA)	

NAYS—161

Aguilar	Gaetz	Murphy (PA)
Amash	Gallagher	Neal
Babin	Gallego	Norcross
Barr	Gibbs	O'Halleran
Barragán	Gottheimer	Pallone
Bass	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Beatty	Graves (LA)	Pearce
Bera	Graves (MO)	Pelosi
Bergman	Green, Gene	Perry
Beyer	Grothman	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Peterson
Bishop (MI)	Hastings	Pittenger
Blum	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Poliquin
Boyle, Brendan	Hill	Raskin
F.	Hoyer	Ratcliffe
Brady (PA)	Hudson	Reed
Brownley (CA)	Huizenga	Reichert
Buck	Jackson Lee	Hurd
Bucshon	Jayapal	Renacci
Burgess	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carbajal	Johnson (OH)	Rosen
Cárdenas	Jordan	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Keating	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kilmer	Sánchez
Clyburn	Kind	Sarbanes
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Schakowsky
Comer	Knight	Schrader
Conaway	LaHood	Sewell (AL)
Cannolly	Lance	Sires
Costa	Langevin	Smith (MO)
Costello (PA)	Lawrence	Soto
Crist	Lee	Stivers
Cummings	Levin	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Rodney	Lewis (GA)	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lewis (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Thompson (PA)
Denham	LoBiondo	Tiberi
DeSantis	Loeb	Tipton
DeSaulnier	Loeb	Turner
Deutch	Loeb	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Loeb	Valadao
Doyle, Michael	Loeb	Vargas
F.	Loeb	Visclosky
Duffy	Loeb	Walberg
Evans	Loeb	Watson Coleman
Faso	Loeb	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Loeb	Wilson (FL)
Flores	Loeb	Woodall
Foxx	Loeb	Yoder
Franks (AZ)	Loeb	Young (AK)
Fudge	Loeb	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Rice (SC)	Tonko
-----------	-------

NOT VOTING—30

Calvert	Coffman	Demings
Cartwright	Cramer	Ellison

Emmer	Marino	Rooney, Thomas
Gabbard	Messer	J.
Garamendi	Moore	Russell
Gohmert	Newhouse	Simpson
Hensarling	Nolan	Slaughter
Holding	Pascrell	Walorski
Jenkins (WV)	Quigley	Webster (FL)
Lowey	Rohrabacher	Yoho
Marchant		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1540

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on April 25, 2017 and April 26, 2017 due to a family medical issue. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

"Yea" for rollcall vote 222.

"Yea" for rollcall vote 223.

"Yea" for rollcall vote 224.

"Yea" for rollcall vote 225.

"Yea" for rollcall vote 226.

"Yea" for rollcall vote 227.

"Yea" for rollcall vote 228.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 50

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 50 in order to emphasize my support of term limits under H.J. Res. 6.

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

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JAY DICKEY

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of former Congressman Jay Dickey, who represented the Fourth District of Arkansas for 8 years. In the days since Congressman Dickey's death last week at the age of 77, tributes have poured in, with many noting his sense of civic duty, his love of family, and, most of all, his faith in God.

If you spent much time with Jay, you likely reached a point in the conversation where he would pause and ask a pointed question: When you die, where will you spend eternity?

I remember Jay asking me that question, and when I quickly responded "Heaven," he didn't let me off easy, as he followed up with: How do you know? After which, we had a long discussion sharing our common faith in Christ.

There are current Members of this House who served with Jay, the first Republican to represent Arkansas' Fourth Congressional District. Regard-

less of political party, he was a representative of all Arkansans, and he genuinely cared about people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of the House to join me and the Members of the Arkansas congressional delegation in observing a moment of silence in remembrance of Congressman Jay Dickey.

100 DAYS OF BROKEN PROMISES

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday marks 100 days of broken promises made to the American worker by the Trump administration. On the campaign trail, he promised to fight for the American worker and create jobs right here at home. Since he has taken office, he has done the opposite.

During the first few weeks of his administration, the President signed an executive order to raise mortgage rates for new homeowners. The administration also killed worker protections for individual workers in this country, and then they also have done nothing, absolutely nothing to deal with Davis-Bacon and prevailing wages, which guarantees American workers the right to earn more money. Finally, the administration gutted another protection that would have made it harder for companies to secure Federal contracts if they have a history of labor law violations.

It is more than clear that this administration does not plan to fight for the American worker, the American man and woman out there making it every day in America. Instead, they are doing everything they can to help the President's billionaire buddies and to promote golf courses and other businesses that they own.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we will continue to stand up to the administration when it turns its back on working class Americans.

□ 1545

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the Days of Remembrance and pay tribute to all those who were affected by the enormity, the calamity, and the horrors of the Holocaust.

On April 11, 1945, at 3 p.m. in the afternoon, General Patton's Third Army liberated Buchenwald concentration camp, with the help of my father-in-law, Bill McKenzie, then a young 22-year-old U.S. Army officer, fresh from the corps at Texas A&M University.

Bill said of that day: "I will not describe the horrible sight of our entry into Buchenwald, but I will tell you this—that the crematorium was still

burning, dead were stacked like cordwood on large trailers, and the living dead were starving.”

Some 65 years later, I would deliver the eulogy at Bill's funeral and read a condolence letter sent to our family from the nephew of a survivor he rescued that day.

As a member of the Greatest Generation, Bill will always be remembered by us as a hero, and his role liberating innocent people from the Nazi Germany death camps is a proud distinction for our family. His story serves as a reminder that these atrocities have no place in our world.

NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

(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 mark the National Day of Silence, which took place last Friday, April 21. That is a day when young people come together to raise awareness about the issues faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students. In fact, it is the only day that highlights issues affecting our LGBT youth. It is that type of day that will lead to more acceptance and inclusiveness in our society.

Isa Moreno is a student from my district, in the town of Watsonville. She remained silent on that day. After, she said: “Now, more than ever, we as a nation must understand the importance of unity and solidarity.”

I couldn't agree more. As a member of the LGBT Equality Caucus, we work to ensure inclusiveness in our country by fighting for policies that support our LGBT youth in our communities.

Many students like Isa took a vow of silence last Friday. So now we, as leaders, must take responsibility to speak out, to speak up, and to step up for all Americans living in fear because of who they love and who they are.

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

(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 week we observe the Days of Remembrance, the Nation's annual commemoration of the Holocaust. The Holocaust was a systematic, government-sponsored persecution and murder of 6 million Jews by the Nazi regime and its collaborators.

Congress established the Days of Remembrance in 1980. Each year, State and local governments, military bases, workplaces, schools, religious organizations, and civic centers host remembrance activities for their communities.

The Holocaust is an unthinkable scar on humanity, and, for this reason, we gather annually to mourn the loss of so many lives and honor those who survived.

We also remember those who risked their lives to rescue and protect their friends and neighbors. We remember the American soldiers who fought in World War II to liberate many from concentration camps and to defend the defenseless.

And we remember, because, as Miriam Oster said so eloquently: “Education and remembrance are the only cures for hatred and bigotry.”

We will not be silent. We cannot be indifferent to the suffering of others. May we always remember and always pledge: Never again.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, as vice chair of the Seniors Task Force, I rise in strong defense of Social Security. Recent reports that the White House is considering defunding Social Security and cutting Social Security disability benefits are troubling, to say the least.

Nearly 61 million retirees, veterans, disabled workers, widows, and children rely on their Social Security, including over 186,000 in my district in Florida alone. On their behalf, I have a simple message: Hands off their Social Security.

President Trump promised the American people he would not cut Social Security. That is a promise we are going to help him keep.

Hands off Social Security.

SECURING THE BORDER AND THE HEROIN EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, one of the big issues in last year's Presidential campaign was border security. As we mark 100 days of the Trump administration, we should acknowledge how President Trump has restored confidence and morale among our Border Patrol agents. They now know that our President will back them as they work to enforce our Nation's immigration laws.

The agents told me personally about their renewed ability to do their job during my recent trip to inspect the southern border. What was remarkable was that I heard the same thing from every agent, man or woman, regardless of ethnic background.

President Trump understands that we have an urgent and solemn responsibility to stop the flood of heroin and other narcotics pouring across our southern border, poisoning our communities.

We must secure our border and end this scourge for the sake of mothers like the one in my district who lost her beloved son to a heroin overdose and asked God to “damn heroin.” I look

forward to more action in the next 100 days as we continue to work to secure our border.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH FUNDING

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, Rotary International recognized champions who have worked to eradicate polio around the world. Rotary International has done a great job, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has, too.

But as one of two congressional Members who were purple hearts of the polio years, I wish to thank them, but also say how dreadful it is—and awful—that the budget that is being proposed will reduce funding by almost 20 percent to the National Institutes of Health and also to the CDC.

The CDC and the National Institutes of Health protect us from health scourges and look for cures and treatments that can protect people in the future. The National Institutes of Health needs to have more funding, not less, and so does the CDC.

CONVICTED CRIMINAL ALIENS KEEP COMING TO AMERICA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 40-year-old Mexican national Oscar Perez Rangel had already been deported twice. He left the United States with a host of felony convictions, including attempted robbery by firearms and illegal reentry. But holes in the U.S. border allowed the outlaw to sneak back into the U.S. a third time.

Here in the U.S., Rangel's girlfriend ran a daycare center. It was there that he set his sights on a next victim—an unsuspecting 12-year-old girl. For 3 months, he molested and raped her.

Finally, he was caught and charged. Eventually, he will be turned over to ICE and deported again.

Mr. Speaker, we must have the moral will to secure the border. Criminals who violently assault, rape, and pillage America are slipping back into the country under the radar. We must prevent criminal aliens like Rangel from reentering our country after they are legally deported.

Secure the southern border. Do it now, or there will be more 12-year-old victims.

And that is just the way it is.

WHAT COMES AROUND GOES AROUND

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are talking about criminals, but I

want to point out one that potentially has been in the White House. He was a general. He spoke at the national convention of the Republican Party. He said, "Lock her up."

But when he filled out his disclosure form to work in the White House, he conveniently left out that he received money from two foreign governments. A former general who defended this Nation did not fill out that he received this money. He sat next to Vladimir Putin for dinner, but did not fill this form out properly.

Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned about Mike Flynn. It is obvious that we in the House of Representatives do something to point out when we see something that is illegal going on.

Mr. Speaker, what comes around goes around. He said, "Lock her up." Well, it looks like he might get locked up.

And that is the way it is gonna be.

REMEMBERING JAY DICKEY

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, we just had the Arkansas delegation. My colleagues may have noticed that I was with them. Alaska and Arkansas have a great deal of similarity, both starting with an A.

I served with Jay Dickey. I can tell you that he was my friend.

To his family, even the other day when I heard that he had passed away, I tried to call his cell phone hoping that they would answer it, and it was Jay's voice. Here is a gentleman in this body that was a great basketball player, a good coach, tennis player, and a fine athlete. But more than that, he was a friend to many Congressmen in these Halls.

As was mentioned, he tried to save us all. Some he succeeded with and some he did not. He worked with me for many years and finally accomplished his goal, and I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

I know the Lord is taking care of him because he was a true American. He was a person that cherished his job, served his district well, and was an ally and a friend for those that believed.

I want to thank Jay Dickey for his efforts to make this country better.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

APRIL 25, 2017.

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

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to section 4003(e) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Pub. L. 114-255), I am pleased to appoint Dr. Steven Lane of Palo Alto, California to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

□ 1600

REMOVAL OF DAVID PULPHUS' PAINTING FROM THE CANNON TUNNEL

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, 10 months ago, I was pleased to welcome David Pulphus, a young talented young constituent of mine from St. Louis, to the U.S. Capitol complex, as we unveiled his painting entitled, *Untitled #1*, which you see here tonight.

David's work was a unanimous first-place winner in the annual Congressional Art Competition in Missouri's First Congressional District. I have been pleased to sponsor this competition in St. Louis for the last 16 years without interruption and incident.

For those of you who may not know, many other Members of Congress conduct this contest in their districts as well. In fact, this painting was one of more than 400 student entries from across the Nation that were reviewed, accepted, and approved last June for public display in the Cannon tunnel by the Architect of the Capitol. Members of Congress do not select the artists. We do not approve or disapprove of any of the artistic concepts, and we have no role in judging the competition.

We simply provide a public forum for the most talented young artists in our districts to display their winning artwork in the U.S. Capitol complex. Yet, without cause or reasonable process and after being viewed repeatedly by Members of Congress, congressional staffers, and thousands of visitors without incident or concern, my constituent's winning entry was removed in an act of politically motivated, unconstitutional, retroactive censorship.

That injustice was initiated by pressure from certain alternative-right bloggers and Mr. Eric Bolling, a host on FOX News channel, who created a mean-spirited and factually inaccurate media campaign to improve his ratings on the back of a young man, and to ultimately force the painting to be removed by the Architect of the Capitol.

After repeated acts of petty theft by renegade Members of Congress who re-

moved the painting without any authorization and after a storm of rightwing media pressure, the Speaker of the House forced the Architect of the Capitol to trample on the rights of my constituent by ruling that this painting, which he had already approved 10 months ago, was retroactively disqualified.

This unwarranted, arbitrary, and unconstitutional act of censorship will not stand. Now, let me be clear: I do not approve or disapprove of this painting. I did not approve or disapprove the concept of the artwork. I did not judge the competition, but the Architect of the Capitol reviewed, approved, and accepted this student's artwork for public display without incident, comment, or concern, just like every other entry that is displayed in this public exhibition.

Only after the most hateful, intolerant, and reckless media campaign, combined with enormous political pressure from the Speaker and other Members, the Architect of the Capitol miraculously traveled back in time to disqualify the very same painting that he had approved 10 months ago.

Perhaps we should advise the National Academy of Sciences of the Architect of the Capitol's newfound ability to bend the space-time continuum in order to retroactively respond to the most extreme voices in the majority so that they could more easily suppress the rights of my young constituent. It did great harm to an innocent young man who tried to do the right thing.

Because of this outrageous act of censorship, David Pulphus has been subjected to the most vile, racist, and hateful attacks on social media and on talk radio. He has also been deprived of the honor of listing his first place victory in the Congressional Art Competition on his resume. He has even been attacked by the Speaker of the House who called his award winning work "disgusting."

So on top of depriving David of his First Amendment rights, the majority and the Architect of the Capitol have placed a terrible personal burden on this bright, talented young man. David does not deserve that. That is wrong. That is totally unacceptable, and the Speaker and the Architect of the Capitol should be ashamed of themselves.

This shameful decision also sent a chilling message to young Americans. It told young Americans that their views are not valued. Their voices are not respected. Their creativity and passions are not welcome, and that is, sadly, here, in the people's House, their First Amendment rights are no longer protected. That is a terrible precedent to set for future generations who look to us to defend their freedoms.

So my friends, this is really not about a student art competition anymore. It is about defending the Constitution. It is just pathetic that some Republican Members and rightwing media types who constantly refer to

themselves as constitutional conservatives don't think that that same document protects the fundamental free speech rights of my young constituent.

You can be certain that I will fight to defend this young man's right to express himself because his artwork is true for him, and he is entitled to that protection under the law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. CLAY for his discussion here. I think it is courageous and necessary. To begin with, the painting's removal by the Architect of the Capitol was an infringement on the free speech rights of the artist and on the Congressman, yourself, Mr. CLAY, from Missouri.

The First Amendment of the United States Constitution provides that: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech. . . ." And it is undisputed that the First Amendment's free speech guarantee extends to artistic expression, including visual arts. This is true even when such expression may be offensive to many people or to some people.

While Members who removed the artist's painting may have acted based on their belief that the artwork's viewpoint was offensive, that belief cannot trump the free-speech rights of the artist and of you, yourself, Congressman CLAY. I congratulate you for putting this discussion into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker. This past January within the very confines of the Capitol complex, we witnessed a direct assault against the First Amendment when several Republican Members of Congress unilaterally removed a painting by high school senior David Pulphus from the 2016 Congressional Art Competition display in the Cannon Tunnel.

The painting, sponsored by our colleague—Representative WILLIAM LACY CLAY—had been displayed in the Cannon Tunnel along with more than 400 winners of the Art Competition for nearly 7 months without incident or comment.

And, rather than upholding the artist's right to free expression and Representative CLAY's prerogative to sponsor student artwork from his district, the Architect of the Capitol capitulated to political pressure generated by the right-wing media outlets and ratified these Members' acts of vigilante censorship by having the painting permanently removed from the Congressional Art Competition display in the Cannon Tunnel.

This artwork, seemingly inspired by the events in Ferguson, Missouri in 2014 and other incidents that sparked tension between police and minority communities, depicts a protest, with two police officers and a young man facing each other in a standoff, all of three which have animalistic features.

In the background, protesters look on and a young man of color appears to be depicted in a crucifixion tableau.

Whatever message one draws from this painting, several things are quite clear.

To begin with, the painting's removal by the Architect of the Capitol was an infringement on the free speech rights of Mr. Pulphus and Representative CLAY.

The First Amendment of the United States Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech."

And, it is undisputed that the First Amendment's free speech guarantee extends to artistic expression, including visual art.

This is true even when such expression may be deeply offensive to many people.

As the Supreme Court recognized in *F.C.C. v. Pacifica Foundation*, the "fact that society may find speech offensive is not a sufficient reason for suppressing it. Indeed, if it is the speaker's opinion that gives offense, that consequence is a reason for according it constitutional protection."

While the Members who removed Mr. Pulphus's painting may have acted based on their belief that the artwork's viewpoint was offensive, that belief cannot trump the free speech rights of the artist and Representative CLAY.

Nor does it justify the Architect's removal of the painting in response to pressure from these and other Members who found the painting offensive.

Once the House established the Congressional Art Competition and opened the Cannon Tunnel to display artwork sponsored by each individual Member office, it created a limited public forum.

Having created such a forum, individual House Members and the Architect cannot then constitutionally discriminate against expression within that forum based on the viewpoint expressed.

Yet, that is precisely what happened here. Unfortunately, the painting's removal was part of a broader pattern of behavior by the Majority to undermine the fundamental right of free expression in the House.

For instance, in January the House adopted an unconstitutional gag rule that would allow the imposition of fines of up to \$2,500 on a Member for using an electronic device to record, post, or live-stream activity on the House floor.

This rule was a thinly-veiled response to the protest undertaken last year by Democratic Members on the House floor with regard to the Majority's failure to consider comprehensive gun reform.

The rule is a direct attack against the Minority's right to political expression and it is clearly intended to stifle the American public's ability to access that expression.

While it is easy to think that these matters concern only one young artist or a group of House Members, every American should be deeply concerned about such kinds of censorship.

Tyranny starts in small ways. Censor a painting here, a poem there. Ban photos in some instances, videos in others.

When such seemingly minor acts go unanswered, it invites more oppressive conduct in the future.

Ensuring freedom requires vigilance and a willingness to push back vigorously against every instance of censorship.

This is why I applaud the federal lawsuit filed by Mr. Pulphus and Representative CLAY seeking to vindicate their free speech rights though it is shameful that they were forced to go to court at all.

And, while the trial court incorrectly concluded that the First Amendment does not protect Mr. Pulphus and Representative CLAY, I

am confident this conclusion will be overturned on appeal.

All Americans must be free to speak truth to power.

Therefore, it is imperative that we draw a line in the sand now, lest we encourage further and even more troubling acts of censorship in the future.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan, the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), my friend, an art education Ph.D., a gallery owner and artist, and member of the Congressional Arts Caucus.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, thank my colleague from Missouri, Representative CLAY, for his concern, for his courage, for standing up and speaking up to ensure that his constituents' and others' First Amendment rights are protected by this Congress, and for organizing this Special Order hour this evening.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to join Representative CLAY, and I proudly stand with him and my other colleagues to speak in defense of the First Amendment rights afforded to citizens of the Constitution of the United States.

As the 12th District Representative from North Carolina, as a practicing professional artist and art educator, as a curator, as a retired 40-year college arts professor, I am pleased to join with Representative CLAY in expressing my support for freedom of visual expression and creativity, especially when it comes to supporting talented young students.

I have learned through my professional arts education and management careers that, yes, the arts are nice, but, beyond being nice, they are absolutely necessary and essential in helping enrich our lives. The arts are unique to our being, and they are what make us human.

Artists connect the past to the present, they convey our unique experiences, and they are presented in many forms—sometimes familiar, other times unfamiliar. The arts are a universal language that speak to people everywhere to help them to understand diversity, cultures, and some of the most complicated of issues. Therefore, having the freedom to make art is essential to creative expression.

Freedom of expression is everyone's freedom. And our Founding Fathers enshrined the expressions of freedom of speech in all forms—in music, in written and spoken word, in theater, and through visual imagery and composition—in the Bill of Rights.

Under the First Amendment, all art forms and all artistic expressions are constitutionally protected. Our Founding Fathers who created our country and launched our Nation as the world's role model in democracy believed that freedom of speech and freedom of the press were important enough to guarantee protection in our country's

founding documents. If our Founding Fathers, the brightest minds of that generation, thought that artistic expression was important enough to protect in our Bill of Rights, then what right do we have to take this away and censor the artistic community?

The ACLU said: “. . . a free society is based on the principle that each and every individual has the right to decide what art or entertainment he or she wants—or does not want—to receive or create. Once you allow the government to censor someone else, you cede to it the power to censor you, or something you like. Censorship is like poison gas: A powerful weapon that can harm you when the wind shifts.”

As a nation, we face many threats, both internally and externally. We are a Nation of diverse thought, diverse people, and strong diverse principles. However, when we stand by and allow our artistic community to be censored or allow threats to silence our press, we become our own greatest threat. And when we reject facts and censor artistic expression just because it makes us uncomfortable or because we don't like it, we are becoming the tyrants that our Founding Fathers risked their lives to protect and escape from.

So the question of what is appropriate art is not a new question. Since the beginning of our country, our citizens have wrestled with what to do when they are offended by a work or art in any form. Court case after court case has tested governmental censorship of artistic expression, and the Supreme Court has continued to uphold our founding principles of freedom of expression and speech.

In the 1931 case, *Stromberg v. California*, the Supreme Court ruled that symbolic speech is protected by the First Amendment. The ruling ensured that all art forms, music, paintings, plays, and other artistic expressions are protected by the First Amendment.

In the 1982 decision, the Board of Education v. Pico, the Supreme Court ruled that local school boards may not remove books from school library shelves simply because they disliked the ideas contained in those books. Like the removal of the books from libraries, the removal of Mr. Pulphus' painting was a blatant violation of his First Amendment rights.

The First Amendment guarantees that our government cannot make substantive decisions about the content of a work of art. Expression can only be limited if, and only if, that expression will cause direct and imminent harm such as yelling “fire” in a crowded theater.

□ 1615

Our government's role is not to censor but to ensure that artists are able to freely express themselves without fear of censorship. Our government did not protect this young man's First Amendment rights. Instead, it acted as a retroactive censor on his work.

Here is an example of our government making a decision based on con-

tent they disapproved of and preventing this work because of its subject and because some legislators weren't knowledgeable enough about it to understand it from being displayed in a public place.

Justice Louis Brandeis, in his defense of free speech, wrote:

It is hazardous to discourage thought and hope and imagination; that fear breeds repression, and that repression breeds hate, and that hate menaces stable government. The path to safety lies in the opportunity to discuss freely supposed grievances and proposed remedies.

Justice Brandeis' words were written in 1927, 90 years ago, almost a century, but they still echo true today. Censorship out of fear, out of misunderstanding or pain or dislike of a work is fundamentally anti-American and unconstitutional.

For more than 4 decades as a visual arts professor, I taught my students that you are going to see a lot of art throughout your lifetime. Some images you will like and some you won't especially like. And some will be disturbing and some confusing. But I reminded my students that their responsibility as viewers was to make every attempt to be able to say that you don't like it because you at least understand it.

Mr. Speaker, knowledge is power. Mr. Pulphus' work did not create direct or imminent harm, but his work did depict an uncomfortable reality that is pervasive across our country.

Unfortunately, violence is a way of life in many communities throughout America. As a matter of fact, it is too prevalent. But for this young man, violence in his community was a life that he knew most of his life. It was a life he was intrinsically as an artist compelled to visually talk about on his canvases.

As a matter of fact, he had a right to talk about it, and, in reality, he needed to talk about it. I admire him for his courage. As a teacher, I can tell you that, visually, his utilization of compositional elements and principles and forms showed an extraordinary talent.

In my estimation, we failed as viewers to do our part, and we didn't make an effort to really see, but we just merely looked at the work. But most especially, we didn't seize the opportunity to learn so that we could enhance our capacity to build and reinforce positive relationships in our community.

This painting offered us a chance to have a real conversation about race and police and community violence and institutional racism. But instead of seizing this opportunity, we have to continue to fight to protect this young artist's First Amendment rights.

Heated debate and discussion is the hallmark of our democracy. However, when arguments are censored, when the artists are told what they are able to produce, when expression is silenced, our democracy is then threatened.

And since this incident, as you have heard, the Congressional Institute has

changed the rules for the Congressional Art Competition. Work submitted to the competition depicting contemporary political controversy or sensationalist or gruesome nature are not allowed.

But I am not here to criticize the work of the Congressional Institute, but as a professional artist myself, only to ask this question: What benefit can come from limiting our young artists from creating?

A democracy works when people stay engaged, when people participate. But by censoring what is in our public spaces, we are creating barriers for political discourse and we are creating fear of retaliation.

Artists are visual storytellers and we are entrusted with a unique responsibility to use the power of the arts to inform, to educate, and to empower our communities.

Noted African-American artist and scholar Dr. Samella Lewis of California said that “African-American artists have a primary obligation to community, to understand, and to use the elements of their cultural heritage to produce an art that is diverse, reflecting our diverse interests, materials techniques, and to communicate those messages to the audiences we want to reach.”

Removing this young man's work was a degrading and insensitive action, which signaled to this young, aspiring, gifted student that his work is valueless, that his story is not worthy to be told. But most especially, it put into question the right and the responsibility that he has as an artist to express himself in visual imagery and symbolic competition.

It is not up to the government to decide what work has value or whose story should be told. The removal of Mr. Pulphus' work sets a dangerous precedent. Congress is now making content decisions on works displayed in the U.S. Capitol and is limiting what types of art will be exhibited. To some, this issue may not seem important, but the scope of the actions that have taken place in the U.S. Capitol is tremendous.

Just because somebody's sensibility is offended doesn't give that person the right to ban or censor a work. In fact, the First Amendment prevents that.

However, as this gross overreach of power in removing his work proves, just because the Constitution prevents something doesn't always mean that it won't happen. But it is our duty to hold our government responsible for protecting the sanctity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

That is why I am honored, as a 40-year arts educator, as a member of the Congressional Art Caucus, and as a professional artist to join Representative CLAY and all of my colleagues in speaking today about the importance of the First Amendment as it relates to the creative and the professional obligations and rights of the visual artist.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for

her thoughts, her words, as well as her expertise in the field of art. She is probably the only qualified art critic serving in Congress today. So thank I thank her so much.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), my friend, an attorney and former legal adviser to the Memphis Police Department.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I, indeed, also enjoyed the remarks that just preceded me and that Mr. CONYERS made and Mr. CLAY made concerning this issue.

I rise today in support of art, freedom of expression, freedom of speech, but also Black Lives Matter and police officers who follow the rules, which 98 percent or more do, who treat citizens appropriately and risk their lives to keep us safe. And I mourn each officer that loses their life or is injured in protecting us and having ordered liberty.

But I rise in opposition to censorship, which is anathema to me, and police officers who go beyond the law—that percentage that do—and soil the badge they wear and use deadly force inappropriately, which has occurred too many times sometimes because they just don't react properly in the heat of battle, sometimes for other reasons, too often upon Black people, which does tend to indicate a prejudice that exists in certain people's minds. Black lives do matter, and people haven't recognized that, and we need to.

The removal of David Pulphus' painting from the Cannon tunnel is troubling on many levels. It raises serious questions about Congress' commitment to the First Amendment, which guarantees the freedom of expression. We take an oath to support the Constitution and should do so in our actions as well as our words, as well as in our oath.

Benjamin Franklin warned us that freedom of speech is a principal pillar of a free government. When this support is taken away, the constitution of a free society is dissolved.

Secondly, it raises serious questions about censorship. Unfortunately, in my hometown of Memphis, we have a history that is sometimes not so good on particular cases of race and free expression.

That long history of artistic censorship oftentimes related to race as well as sex, and for nearly 3 decades, in the early part of the 20th century, Memphis had a censor, a public censor, appointed by the government named Lloyd T. Binford. He served as the chairman of the Memphis Board of Censors. They banned movies. They banned movies like "Curley" in the 1940s because it showed White and Black children in school together.

He prevented Memphians from seeing major celebrities like Lena Horne, Duke Ellington, Nat King Cole, Cab Calloway in our local movie theaters. He was a racist. "Binfordizing" became a word. Artistic words that were wrong and Congress must be ever mindful of the slippery slope of censorship.

Thirdly, and perhaps most important, this painting raises serious questions about public policy. Congress should be debating questions of public policy, not banning expressions of them.

The events that took place in Ferguson, Missouri, which are well expressed by this painting, were a wake-up call to many in our Nation about police use of deadly force, injustice in our inner cities, and turmoil rising in our inner cities.

Sobering questions about the fairness of our criminal justice system and about race were raised. And a painting such as this that reflects those issues is most appropriate for display in the hallway where these paintings and artworks are shown because it is representative of a major slice of America in that year.

That, more than most other paintings and artworks there, show something that is relevant to what is happening today and has occupied the news in a major way.

For too long, justice has seemed too lacking, and we saw it in Ferguson. Mr. CLAY and I have worked together for display of this artwork. I questioned some professors on another issue, lawyers that specialize in First Amendment issues, speech issues in the Judiciary Committee, and to a one they said it appeared to be censorship and was wrong and was violative.

Of course there is some talk that, well, it is government speech and maybe that is different. But you know some of the same people that have opposed this painting are the same people that say the rules should apply to Congress. Whatever laws we pass should apply to Congressmen the same as they apply to other people, and we shouldn't have special privileges. But those people decided on their own to exempt a painting they found distasteful which wouldn't have been prohibited anywhere else because of free speech. They violated their own precepts; the same precepts they may be violating today in other rooms where they are discussing a health bill that will exempt them from the health bill sanctions or requirements and not require them, if they live in a State, to not have the essential benefits of the Affordable Care Act.

So I rise today to commend Congressman CLAY for his work, to thank him for his work with me and Senator DUCKWORTH on the Police Training and Independent Review Act, which the need for is expressed here in this artwork. That is why it is so important.

This communicates a story. Beauty is wonderful, and a lot of the artwork is photographs and beauty. Nice. Fine. Places, fine. Content and ideas are more important. It is always more important to have artwork that challenges your mind and makes you think: What is this about?

As I look at this painting and I think about it, sure, there are a couple of police officers—two police officers in par-

ticular—in a certain manner of being displayed. But there is a third police officer on the right that is not shown this same way. And if you look at this painting, you can see this painting says: not all police officers are the same. Some are questionable, some aren't. It revolved around a major incident in our city, St. Louis, Ferguson, but the arch is in there and expresses that well.

This painting should not have been removed. Congressman CLAY is right to stand up for the First Amendment and for his constituent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help restore this painting to its rightful place in the Cannon tunnel and to allow people to see it and make their own decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and appreciate being a part of this.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, let me also thank my friend from Tennessee who happens to be a member of the House Judiciary Committee. As he stated, we are working together on police reform legislation. I appreciate his services.

Mr. COHEN. And I am an art critic.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, he is an art critic.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), my friend, a Constitutional scholar and professor.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CLAY for convening us this evening to discuss this very important matter.

Why is it so important?

Well, we live in a time of rampant official lawlessness and disrespect for the Constitution of the United States.

But I am not here to talk about the Emoluments Clause or the power of Congress to declare war, or about equal protection. I am here to join my colleagues in talking about an incident of artistic discrimination committed by this institution, an assault on the First Amendment.

Why is it so important?

I was thinking about a professor I had who wrote a book about broken windows. The thesis of the book basically was that if windows are broken in the neighborhood and nothing is done about it, it sends the message that you can go on to bigger and better things. In other words, petty crimes and misdemeanors unaddressed go on to become high crimes and misdemeanors.

When we started the 115th Congress, unfortunately, within the first week or two, we started with a broken Constitutional window, Mr. CLAY, because we allowed, we tolerated, and we countenanced an act of vigilante discrimination and censorship by certain Members against speech by the constituents of other Members.

So I want to tell the story to the people of America, especially the young people of America, who have open minds and open hearts, and I am delighted that so many young people are in the chamber tonight to hear about what happened here because this is a very important moment in the history of this institution.

□ 1630

Now, I am a professor of constitutional law by training. I did that for 25 years before I came to Congress, and I teach, also, the First Amendment.

There are six rights contained in the First Amendment, and I hope all of you learn the six rights. They are: the right to petition for a redress of grievances; the free exercise of religion; the right of assembly; the right of free press; the right of no establishment of religion; and then, last but certainly not least, the right of freedom of speech.

Here in Congress, since 1982, we have had a Congressional Arts Competition. It is a magnificent statement of American values. We invite Members from every district in America—there are 435 districts here, plus five Delegates who come from territories or the District of Columbia—so there are a total of 440 that are eligible.

Each one impanel a group of artists. They have a whole process, and the best artwork is adjudicated and then brought to Washington. You can find them in the tunnel connecting the Cannon House Office Building to the Capitol Building, to the Chamber where we are right now. There are hundreds of beautiful, extraordinary, interesting, vivacious, controversial paintings done by the young people of America.

So what is the issue? Well, we are living in a time of political correctness. Let's say it plain. Sometimes the political correctness comes from the left. It happened recently at Berkeley in California, where the college canceled a planned appearance by Ann Coulter, a rightwing commentator whose views are totally anathema to me, but they canceled her speech.

Now, in fairness to Berkeley, they said there had been violence there and they thought there might be violence again. But there was such a storm of outrage about this example of a kind of leftwing political correctness, they reversed the decision and they said she could come. They understood it was their responsibility to make sure that her speech could proceed without being disrupted and broken up, so they did the right thing.

What are we experiencing here right where you sit in the Congress of the United States, in the House of Representatives? We are experiencing an example of a rightwing political correctness run amok. It is rightwing political censorship because some people didn't like somebody else's expression. Instead of walking on to the next painting, they decided to take it down, remove it, and return it to the office of Congressman CLAY. Not once, not twice, not three times, not four times, but five times they took this painting down.

Congressman CLAY and I wrote a letter to Speaker RYAN protesting this act of vigilante censorship right here in the Congress of the United States. Speaker RYAN, instead of standing up for the First Amendment, instead of standing up for the Speech and Debate

Clause, instead of standing up for artistic expression, instead of standing up for freedom and teaching a lesson to the young people of America, he called the painting disgusting and then initiated an official process whereby they censored it. For the first time in the history of this competition going back to 1982, 35 years, they censored a painting.

Now, luckily they have made this young artist one of the most famous artists in America now, and we can all wish him nothing but magnificent fortune as he goes ahead to develop his skills and his artistic voice. They were not able, I hope, to crush the spirit of this young man, but they did something really deeply injurious to the Republic of the United States. They engaged in an act of naked viewpoint discrimination against a work of art.

Now, what are the constitutional values here that need to be vindicated for artists like David Pulphus or the winner from my district last year, Alannah Van Horn, who did a self-portrait?

Let's just be clear about one thing: these paintings hung for 6 months before the vigilante censors in the House of Representatives decided to come and take them down. For 6 months, they didn't harm anybody, they didn't hurt anybody, they didn't cause a riot, they didn't cause a ruckus, nothing—until they decided somehow that this painting ran afoul of their political correctness litmus test for what is acceptable in Congress.

So what is really at stake here? Well, first of all, it is the rights of the Member who sponsored this painting.

I want to say I am so impressed by the courage and the strength and the determination of Representative CLAY to stand with his constituent and his constituency as well as with the Constitution here.

He brought a First Amendment lawsuit with Mr. Pulphus not for money, not for damages, but for a preliminary and permanent injunction against congressional censorship of this painting. So they went to court.

They had a very simple argument. The First Amendment says Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. That is it. That is one of the six rights that I referenced when I opened my speech. Congress can't censor speech.

Congress just censored speech.

The judge in the case, Judge Bates of the United States District Court, rendered a fascinating opinion. He found that this was indeed a clear case of viewpoint discrimination. It was censorship based on the views or the perspective of the artist. There was little doubt, he said, the government was engaged in a blatant act of viewpoint discrimination.

There are lots of cases that make clear that viewpoint discrimination is unacceptable in the United States, like *Rosenberger v. University of Virginia*, which said that UVA could not set up a

program for young journalists and newspapers and magazines at UVA and exclude those from a religious point of view. The Court said, if you are going to set up a forum for speech like that, you can't single out one point of view and then suppress it.

It was the same idea in *Texas v. Johnson* in 1995, when the Supreme Court said that the right to burn a flag as a political protest is constitutionally protected. You don't have to agree with it, but other people have the right to burn the flag if it is their flag. That is their property.

The Court pointed out also that, in America, flag burning is the proper mode of flag disposal. If you look at the flag treatment protocol, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts burn flags all the time. So, if you punish someone for burning a flag, you are punishing them for a thought crime; you are not punishing them for an action which is done all the time in the United States.

In any event, the Court says viewpoint discrimination is unacceptable. Nonetheless, Judge Bates said that Congressman CLAY doesn't win. Why? It is because of where it took place. He said that the hallway in the Cannon House Office Building leading to the Capitol is not a public forum of any kind. It is not a traditional public forum like a street or park. It is not a limited public forum, something that is set up for the expression of speech, which is precisely what you would think it is. It is not even a nonpublic forum, Judge Bates says. Judge Bates says that the 440 paintings down there are government speech.

Now, that doesn't make any sense. We have lots of people who are in the gallery tonight, and I assume you passed by these paintings on the way over. If you didn't, check them out.

I challenge anybody in America to go down to the tunnel and look at the paintings and regard the magnificent diversity of views and perspectives embodied in this one painting, for example, and say that it is government speech. In fact, the reason it was censored is because it wasn't government speech.

Yet, the court got it wrong. Now, I am not going to say really nasty things about him. I am not President of the United States. I am not going to say that he is a nonjudge or a so-called judge. I think that he made a serious mistake. I think the D.C. Circuit will reverse it. I think the U.S. Supreme Court would reverse it.

You know what? It doesn't make any difference, because everyone who has the honor of serving in this Chamber takes an oath to the Constitution of the United States. We have got to uphold the First Amendment. That is a responsibility that we have got. And we can't just say, "Oh, we will let a court deal with it." We have got to deal with the First Amendment.

And it is very clear—the court said it itself—this was viewpoint discrimination. That is unacceptable. And we

should say that, yes, the Constitution applies in the Congress of the United States. We don't hold ourselves exempt from it. We don't say, if we set up a forum for young artists to bring their paintings in, that we are speaking. That doesn't make any sense. They are the ones speaking.

So where do we go from here?

Well, we are appealing to Speaker RYAN and to our friends in the majority to back off of the regime of right-wing political correctness. Just like it was wrong for Berkeley to try to censor Ann Coulter, as much as many of us abhor everything she says and stands for, it is equally wrong for the Republican majority here to censor Mr. Pulphus for your subjective interpretation of what his painting means.

One of the reasons why the Supreme Court has always said you can't censor art is because art is polysemous. What does that mean? It means it is open to multiple possible significances. Who is to say what this painting means or what Guernica means?

Guernica, by the way, would certainly be censored under the principles that are being advanced here because it is sensationalistic or it deals with contemporary controversy. I mean, what art doesn't deal with contemporary controversy? I mean, it just doesn't make any sense what they are saying.

So I think that the majority should really rethink whether it wants to be in the business of censorship. This is not Russia. This is not Azerbaijan. This is not Saudi Arabia. This is not Iran. This is the United States of America.

People have a right to paint the painting that they want. If you don't like the painting, you go to the next painting. You don't take it down, especially in the Congress of the United States where we should be setting an example. Justice Brandeis said government is the omnipresent teacher to the people of the constitutional values of the whole society.

Now, we have got one other serious problem I want to mention before I go because, you see, before they engaged in this act of censorship against this young artist who was from St. Louis who was obviously upset about what happened in Ferguson, Missouri, and painted this painting which I think is actually a very interesting, captivating painting that reminds me of Picasso's Guernica and clearly evokes themes from George Orwell's "Animal Farm," before they did that, you didn't have to agree with any particular painting or sculpture or artwork in the Capitol complex, right?

We have great champions of freedom and justice in the Republic who are portrayed all over the Capitol complex, like Abraham Lincoln, for example, like Rosa Parks, like Martin Luther King, like Lyndon Johnson, like Sojourner Truth.

You know what? We also have people who are traitors to the country, people who were Confederate conspirators against the United States, like John

Breckinridge, a guy who served as a U.S. Senator and as Vice President of the United States and then defected from the Union, took up arms against the United States of America, and was declared a traitor and stripped of his titles as a former Vice President and a former Senator.

There is Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy. There is a statue of him up. Robert E. Lee, obviously the general for the Confederacy during the Civil War. There is John C. Calhoun, who defected from the Union and took up arms against us.

So we have these portraits, statues, and busts of great Americans who stood for freedom, justice, and equality in America and the Constitution. And we have people who got themselves into trouble and, I think, brought disgrace to themselves with what they did. But they were all up together.

Now that we are entering into a new area of authoritarian thought control and censorship and political correctness in Congress, how can we have a statue of John Breckinridge up in the Capitol complex? How can we have Jefferson Davis up in the Capitol complex?

If this is government speech, now we are going to have to litigate each one of these artistic displays to see whether or not they are actually consistent with the values of the United States Congress and consistent with the values of the U.S. Constitution. Is that where we want to go?

I invite my colleagues—I beseech my colleagues—don't take us there. Reverse this act of censorship against this young man. Don't set out to crush his spirit. Don't step on the First Amendment. Show America that we believe in the Constitution. Otherwise, we are going to be engaged in some very interesting discussions about the kinds of artwork that are found all over the Capitol campus.

I just want to salute, again, Congressman CLAY for bringing us together and all of my colleagues who have come forward to stand up for the First Amendment tonight.

□ 1645

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend from Maryland who, as we heard, his 25 years of knowledge on the U.S. Constitution bodes well for this entire body, and I appreciate his friendship and his support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in my office watching this debate, and I really appreciate the opportunity to come down. I ran down the stairs because I wanted to speak to this issue.

Now, it really doesn't matter what anybody in here thinks about what I think is a pretty amazing piece of art. Under the banner of artistic discovery—that is the competition that we have, artistic discovery—we are in-

viting young people, high school students, to express themselves, sometimes to find themselves in the artwork that they do, to clarify ideals for themselves and to challenge people. What is art about, if not that?

So, in my office right now, we are putting together the artwork that has been submitted from the high schools in our district. We take very great pride in our artistic discovery contests, and so we are collecting that artwork.

But as we looked at the instructions before we did it, we saw this new addition that just came up, first time. How long is this? Thirty-two years we have been doing this? This is the first year that it includes suitability guidelines, and it makes very clear that subjects of contemporary political controversy are not allowed.

Then we have to sign, each Member of Congress will be required to submit a letter of support for their work of art. This letter is to ensure that the Member has seen the artwork before it is submitted, has taken responsibility for the content, and has certified that the artwork, in the Member's opinion, adheres to the suitability guidelines.

Now, of course it says: "While it is not the intent to censor any artwork, we do wish to avoid artwork that is potentially inappropriate for display in this highly traveled area leading to the Capitol."

What the heck does that really mean? Does that mean that people are not—you know, we have to worry about is somebody going to take offense at something or say, "Ooh, I don't like that picture"? They are entitled to do it, and the artist is entitled to put it out here.

Now, it so happens that none of the pieces that were submitted, I think, were unsuitable, but who the heck knows anymore? Who makes the decision about what is unsuitable? I don't know.

Some of the—if you look down the hall and look at some of them, some of those self-portraits, I don't know, these kids look troubled to me. Is that something that ought to be taken down? No. Absolutely no.

This young person lived through a traumatic incident in his community and I think, quite artistically, decided to express his feelings about it. I think it is absolutely an outrage. We already heard about the violation of the Constitution, but each and every American should be offended by that and about these suitable guidelines. I am sorry. I object. I hope you do too.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my friend and dean of the Ohio delegation.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CLAY for organizing this Special Order, and the people of Ohio in my district stand with him and with the young artist I will discuss in a moment.

The United States of America and this Capitol stand as a symbol of American values and our freedoms. It just so

happens I represent a district that contains 2 of the 10 finest museums in America, at Cleveland and Toledo. We know a little bit about artistic expression.

Here in the Capitol, we have created a place to gather and celebrate our Nation's highest ideals, and first and foremost among these is the right of every citizen to freely express themselves as equal citizens.

A recent act of censorship here at the Capitol placed this American right under threat, and it is important that all Americans think about this and know about it. I speak to say this action cannot be tolerated. I stand with my distinguished colleagues and with the American people to speak out against the removal of David Pulphus' award-winning painting from the United States Capitol.

There was a famous French artist named Edgar Degas, who said: "Art is not what you see, but what you make others see." Surely, surely, David Pulphus' painting does this. And I support Mr. Pulphus' continued efforts to appeal a preliminary decision by the District of Columbia Federal Circuit Court that rejected his First Amendment legal claims, and that case will move forward.

In May 2016, his extraordinary acrylic painting that reveals deep meaning, which he named *Untitled #1*, was awarded the prestigious honor to represent Missouri's First Congressional District in the Congressional Arts Competition.

I have entered, for three decades, works from my district in this competition; and just like the other 434 pieces selected to represent a congressional district in the annual competition, *Untitled #1* was approved and accepted by the Architect of the Capitol for public display inside our Capitol.

For over 26 weeks, *Untitled #1* hung in the underground tunnel between the Capitol and the Cannon House Office Building. For over 180 days there was no controversy. And for more than half a year, citizens and Members of Congress, congressional staff, thousands and thousands of international and national visitors passed by and viewed it with no concern.

But that changed abruptly when, in fact, a Member from the Republican side of the aisle, I think, likely violated the law and pulled it off the wall in the Capitol of the United States. It didn't belong to him, but he did that. And, I dare say, that gentleman missed the deeper meaning of what this young man has portrayed.

There was an added twist of irony in that the censorship moment occurred 1 day after our national holiday honoring civil rights icon Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The censorship sent a woeful and chilling message to our Nation and one that says that our young people's voices and their thoughts are not respected. I say that is un-American. Their views and experiences and perspectives must be valued.

When we look at what was done, his freedom of expression, even when expressed through a juried competition, is not protected in the top site of liberty's essence, the legislative branch inside the United States Capitol Building.

So Members of Congress have to take a stand. We must demand that the creative contributions of Americans, young and old, in the arts are embraced, including inside this Capitol. We cannot tolerate actions that directly and unjustly stifle or threaten an artist's artistic point of view. That is what America is all about.

David Pulphus' painting won the honor to represent Missouri's First Congressional District because it reflects an important, compelling message. His work reminds us of the value of the arts in a free society.

The painting was inspired by the civil unrest that occurred in Ferguson, Missouri, in 2014, and it depicts the racial confrontation that ensued with police after that fatal shooting of the unarmed teen, Michael Brown, Jr.

This is a complex work and it does not deserve anyone's rejection. It tells us about ourselves and our society so that we face it fully. And if you look at it, there are serious messages in here that say, "Stop Killing," "Racism Kills." It talks about "History."

And if you really look at it, you see that some of those involved in the killing, there is no right side. One of the perpetrators is portrayed as a wolf. It is very interesting to study the deeper meaning. This painting includes challenging images: a man being crucified, wearing a graduation cap, holding the scales of justice.

This is a young man, he is not even 20 years old, thinking about this.

There is a horned beast in a police uniform tangling with a devil with a pointed tail—looks like a wolf—and demonstration signs that read "History" and "Stop Killing."

Simply put, this commanding work of art from a teenager is a true testament to the power and immeasurable significance of our Nation's young artists who express us.

The debate sparked by its removal from the Capitol is about something larger than the artwork itself. It is about defending our fundamental First Amendment freedom. This right to artistic expression is considered objectionable by a few and applauded by the vast majority of Americans who understand what free expression in this society is about.

Neither the Architect of the Capitol nor a Member of Congress has the right to censor, self-censor citizens based on their political points of view, whether in the name of official decorum or because they find it offensive or because they fail to grasp its deep meaning.

In America, if you do not like a painting you see in a display, you simply move on to the next one. You don't take it down. It doesn't belong to you.

Nevertheless, as a painter myself and citizen who deeply reveres our con-

stitutional rights, I am confident that in this case justice ultimately will prevail and *Untitled #1* will soon resume its rightful place inside our Capitol because a young man with this depth of expression is proudly an American. If it doesn't come back, I fear for the slippery slope the Architect of the Capitol has begun, and it is not worthy of us as Americans.

I want to thank Congressman CLAY so very much for standing by this young American who is not even 18 years old yet, I don't think, and who managed to put this complex piece of art together. I am so proud of him; I am so proud of our country; and I just know that, working together, we are going to get it right for artistic expression here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio. I certainly appreciate her support.

In closing, let me say that the student artist in question, my constituent, David Pulphus, is a great young man. He is academically gifted, artistically talented, and is now a freshman in college. He is doing everything that we encourage young Americans to do to become successful citizens.

His winning entry is a colorful, symbolic representation of the great anger, pain, frustration, and deep deficit in trust for local law enforcement that many young African Americans feel in their hearts. The painting also reflects generations of struggle, sacrifice, abuse of power, and tenuous relationships between minorities and a system of justice that still provides equal justice for some, but not for all.

□ 1700

So the larger, much more fundamental question is: Why does this young American feel that way, and what can we do as leaders of a compassionate and just nation to finally remedy that?

I am so thankful for the remarkable public service of my exceptional pro bono legal team who are guiding this case, including Dr. Laurence Tribe of Harvard University School of Law, Dr. Erwin Chemerinsky of the University of California, Irvine School of Law, and others. As a Member of Congress who reveres the Constitution, I am confident that freedom and justice will prevail.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1694, FANNIE AND FREDDIE OPEN RECORDS ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. WOODALL (during the Special Order of Mr. CLAY), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-96) on the resolution (H. Res. 280) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1694) to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, President Trump recently signed an executive order that made abundant sense for those who are in the world of common sense where good sense is common, which at least is not the case in the Federal courthouse in San Francisco.

Our friend, Andrew McCarthy, has written an op-ed for National Review regarding the decision of the oligarch masquerading in the Federal courthouse in San Francisco. Judge William H. Orrick III is amazing. In fact, his arrogance is only exceeded by his ignorance.

It is an excellent article. Normally I wouldn't read an entire article, it is not that long, but this is so well written by the prosecutor of The Blind Sheikh that it bears hearing the words from Andrew McCarthy.

He said: "A showboating Federal judge in San Francisco has issued an injunction against President Trump's executive order cutting off Federal funds from so-called sanctuary cities. The ruling distorts the E.O. beyond recognition, accusing the President of usurping legislative authority despite the order's express adherence to 'existing law.' Moreover, undeterred by the inconvenience that the order has not been enforced, the activist court—better to say, the fantasist court—dreams up harms that might befall San Francisco and Santa Clara, the sanctuary

jurisdictions behind the suit, if it were enforced. The court thus flouts the standing doctrine, which limits judicial authority to actual controversies involving concrete, nonspeculative harms.

"Although he vents for 49 pages, Judge William H. Orrick III gives away the game early, on page 4. There, the Obama appointee explains that his ruling is about . . . nothing.

"That is, Orrick acknowledges that he is adopting the construction of the E.O. urged by the Trump Justice Department, which maintains that the order does nothing more than call for the enforcement of already existing law. Although that construction is completely consistent with the E.O. as written, Judge Orrick implausibly describes it as 'implausible.'"

I would interject at this point, Mr. Speaker, that upon hearing President Trump's executive order requiring sanctuary cities such as San Francisco, where their heart is so calloused on the side figuratively facing people like Kate Steinle, innocent people who are just trying to live freely their own lives, and is greatly softened on the side of those criminals who have come into the United States illegally who would tend to shoot lovely, law-abiding daughters like Kate.

So it seemed eminently reasonable what I had read was in the order. I didn't read the whole order originally, but it made eminent sense, of course, the President of the United States saying that he is authorized by the Constitution in carrying out enforcement and by Congress in carrying out enforcement, saying we are not sending Federal money to sanctuary cities—to any cities—that are refusing to use the money for the purpose for which it is intended. That makes eminent sense, because if you are not going to follow Federal law, if it is made clear to the whole world that you would rather see people like Kate Steinle shot and killed dead so that you can have criminals committing the worst kinds of violence on law-abiding citizens. That makes sense to these people who are ruling in San Francisco. One ruler is Judge Orrick who we reference here.

There was a time in America when people in power thought it was a good idea for everyone to follow the law. But we have devolved in some areas of the country where we are no longer a nation of laws, where at least at one time there was a goal of pursuing absolute fairness where everyone could live under the same laws following the same laws. There was that time.

Yet we have people who are educated far beyond their mental ability to absorb education since it has used up all the gigabytes that might have otherwise been used for wisdom for cluttered knowledge that has prevented this judge and others from being able to use common sense to follow the law to protect people who are counting on the courts and law enforcement officers to follow and enforce the law themselves.

There was that time when Manifest Destiny was being pursued, people were moving West. The areas West were not actual States within the United States. There was a lawlessness. People were yearning in those territories to be States so that they could count on the Federal Government to provide fairness—ultimate fairness—and provide a life that would be lived under the United States Constitution. They felt, in those days, if we could just get the Federal Government to have a Federal marshal here and a Federal Court here, wow, life would be so much better. Now we have seen it has lived beyond the usefulness it once had and has become quite a burden to overcome in reaching fairness and constitutionality.

So, Mr. Speaker, before I continue with Andy McCarthy's piece, I want to point out we are in preparation of a bill that would eliminate any Federal district court or circuit court from having jurisdiction over matters regarding immigration. Certainly, we had that power. In fact, we have the power to eliminate the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals altogether. We have a bill that would, in fact, limit the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals to California, and all of the other States that comprise the Ninth Circuit would be part of a new 12th Circuit. In that new 12th Circuit, whoever the current President is when the law is passed would appoint the entire banc of judges for the 12th Circuit Court of Appeals.

Following the Reid rule in the Senate, if we were to get that passed through the House and Senate, I feel sure President Trump would sign it into law, and then President Trump would have an entire circuit where he appoints the judges, where people would know they would have judges of the quality of Judge Gorsuch—at least the quality he is supposed to represent—and people would know they weren't going to get oligarchs as judges, they were going to get people who at least maintain some semblance of trying to follow the Constitution and trying to live up to the oath that they took to defend the Constitution—just support the Constitution for goodness' sake.

McCarthy goes on. He says: "Since Orrick ultimately agrees with the Trump Justice Department, and since no enforcement action has been taken based on the E.O., why not just dismiss the case? Why the judicial theatrics?"

"There appear to be two reasons.

"The first is Orrick's patent desire to embarrass the White House, which rolled out the E.O. with great fanfare. The court wants it understood that Trump is a pretender: For all the hullabaloo, the E.O. effectively did nothing. Indeed, Orrick rationalizes his repeated misreadings of what the order actually says by feigning disbelief that what it says could possibly be what it means. Were that the case, he suggests, there would have been no reason to issue the order in the first place.

"Thus, taking a page from the activist leftwing judges who invalidated

Trump's 'travel ban' orders, Orrick harps on stump speeches by Trump and other administration officials. One wonders how well Barack 'If you like your plan, you can keep your plan' Obama would have fared under the judiciary's new Trump doctrine: The extravagant political rhetoric by which the incumbent President customarily sells his policies relieves a court of the obligation to grapple with the inevitably more modest legal text of the directives that follow.

"Of course, the peer branches of government are supposed to presume each other's good faith in the absence of a patent violation of the law. But let's put aside the unseemliness of Orrick's barely concealed contempt for a moment, because he is also wrong. The proper purpose of an executive order is to direct the operations of the executive branch within the proper bounds of the law. There is, therefore, nothing untoward about an E.O. that directs the President's subordinates to take enforcement action within the confines of congressional statutes. In fact, it is welcome.

"It is the President's burden to set Federal law enforcement priorities. After years of Obama's lax enforcement of immigration law and apathy regarding sanctuary jurisdictions, an E.O. openly manifesting an intent to execute the laws vigorously can have a salutary effect. And indeed, indications are that the cumulative effect of Trump's more zealous approach to enforcement, of which the sanctuary-city E.O. is just one component, has been a significant reduction in the number of aliens seeking to enter the U.S. illegally."

□ 1715

"In any event, 8 years of Obama's phone and pen have made it easy to forget that the President is not supposed to make the law, and thus that we should celebrate, not condemn, an E.O. that does not break new legal ground. Orrick, by contrast, proceeds from the flawed premise that if a President is issuing an E.O., it simply must be his purpose to usurp congressional authority. Then he censures Trump for a purported usurpation that is nothing more than a figment of his own very active imagination."

He is talking about the judge here. What an imagination.

"Orrick's second reason for issuing his Ruling About Nothing is to rationalize what is essentially an advisory opinion. It holds—I know you'll be shocked to hear this—that if Trump ever did try to cut off funds from sanctuary cities, it would be an epic violation of the Constitution. Given that courts are supposed to refrain from issuing advisory opinions, the Constitution is actually more aggrieved by Orrick than by Trump.

"In a nutshell, the court claims that the E.O. is Presidential legislation, an unconstitutional violation of the separation of powers. Orrick insists that

the E.O. directs the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security to cut off any Federal funds that would otherwise go to States and municipalities if they 'willfully refuse to comply' with Federal law that calls for State and local cooperation in enforcing immigration law.

"According to Judge Orrick, Trump's E.O. is heedless of whether Congress has approved any terminations of State funding from Federal programs it has enacted. In one of the opinion's most disingenuous passages, Orrick asserts that the E.O. 'directs the Attorney General and the Homeland Security Secretary to ensure that "sanctuary jurisdictions" are "not eligible to receive" Federal grants.'

"But this is just not true."

In other words, Judge Orrick lied in his opinion.

"Orrick has omitted key context from the relevant passage, which actually states that 'the Attorney General and the Secretary, in their discretion and to the extent consistent with law, shall ensure that jurisdictions that willfully refuse to comply with 8 U.S.C. 1373 are not eligible to receive Federal grants.'

"In plain English, the President has expressly restricted his subordinates to the limits that Congress has enacted. Under Trump's order, there can be no suspension or denial of funding from a Federal program unless congressional statutes authorize it. The President is not engaged in an Obama-esque rewrite of Federal law; he explicitly ordered his subordinates to follow Federal law.

"It is not enough to say Orrick mulishly ignores the clear text of the executive order. Again and again, Justice Department lawyers emphasized to the court that Trump's order explicitly reaffirmed existing law. Orrick refused to listen because, well, what fun would that be? If the President is simply directing that the law be followed, there is no basis for a progressive judge"—like Orrick—"to accuse him of violating the law. Were he to concede that, how would Orrick then win this month's Social Justice Warrior in a Robe Award for Telling Donald Trump What for?"

"Orrick can't confine himself to merely inventing a violation, either, because there is no basis for a lawsuit unless a violation results in real damages. So, the judge also has to fabricate some harm. This takes some doing since, in addition to merely directing that the law be enforced, the Trump administration has not actually taken any action against any sanctuary jurisdiction to this point.

"No problem: Orrick theorizes that because San Francisco and Santa Clara receive lots of government funding, Trump's order afflicts them with 'pre-enforcement' anxiety. They quake in fear that their safety-net and service budgets will be slashed."

Mr. Speaker, I would inject that it appears that Judge Orrick and leaders in San Francisco must be deeply in

need of a safe space where they can go sit in the dark, suck their thumbs, hold their blankets, and feel comforted somehow because of the illusions that they have generated of all these bugaboos that are threatening in their wild imaginations.

Mr. McCarthy goes on:

"Sanctuary cities? Maybe we should call them snowflake cities.

"As noted above, there is a transparent agenda behind Orrick's sleight of hand. The judge is keen to warn the President that, if ever his administration were to deny funds to sanctuary cities, it would violate the Constitution. It is in connection with this advisory opinion that the judge makes the only point worthy of consideration—albeit not in the case before him.

"Here, it is useful to recall the Supreme Court's first ObamaCare ruling. While conservatives inveighed against Chief Justice Roberts' upholding of the individual mandate, the decision had a silver lining: The majority invalidated ObamaCare's Medicaid mandate, which required the States, as a condition of qualifying for Federal Medicaid funding, to enforce the Federal Government's generous new Medicaid qualifications.

"In our system, the States are sovereign—the Federal Government may not dictate to them in areas of traditional State regulation, nor may it conscript them to enforce Federal law. The Supremes, therefore, explained that State agreements to accept Federal funding in return for adopting Federal standards, e.g., to accept highway funding in exchange for adopting the Federally prescribed 55-mile-per-hour speed limit, are like contracts. The State must agree to the Federal Government's terms. Once such an agreement is reached, the States may not unilaterally make material changes in the terms, nor may they use their superior bargaining position to extort a State into acceding to onerous new terms in order to get the Federal money on which it has come to depend. Whether a particular case involves such an extortion, as opposed to a permissible nudge, depends on the facts. If the States are too heavy-handed, they run the risk of violating the 10th Amendment's Federalist division of powers.

"Who knew Federal judges in ur-statist San Francisco had become such Federalists?"

"Orrick contends that if Trump were to cut off funds from sanctuary cities for failure to assist Federal immigration-enforcing officials, it would offend the 10th Amendment. This is highly unlikely. First, let's remember—though Orrick studiously forgets—that Trump's order endorses only such stripping of funds as Congress has already approved. Thus, sanctuary jurisdictions would be ill-suited to claim that they'd been sandbagged. Second, the money likely to be at issue would surely be nothing close to Medicaid funding. Finally, Trump would not be

unilaterally rewriting an existing Federal-State contract; he'd be calling for the States to follow Federal laws that, A, were on the books when the States started taking Federal money and, B, pertain to immigration, a legal realm in which the courts have held the Federal Government is supreme and the States subordinate.

"Still, all that said, whether any Trump-administration effort to cut off funding would run afoul of the 10th Amendment would depend on such considerations as how much funding was actually cut; whether Congress had authorized the cut in designing the funding program; whether the funding was tightly related or unrelated to immigration enforcement; and how big a burden it would be for States to comply with Federal demands. Those matters will be impossible to evaluate unless and until the administration actually directs a slashing of funds to a sanctuary jurisdiction.

"If that happens, there will almost certainly be no legal infirmity as long as Trump's E.O. means what it says—namely, that any funding cuts must be consistent with existing Federal law. But it hasn't happened."

And for our poor, miseducated Judge Orrick sitting on the bench with his head crammed full of mush, but none of it entangled with the U.S. Constitution, he fails to understand that Federal courts are not allowed to issue advisory opinions. There is no standing. There is no jurisdiction of the court. But don't let the Constitution nor Federal law get in the way of Judge Orrick's ego.

McCarthy points out:

"If that happens . . . any funding cuts must be consistent with Federal law. But it hasn't happened. And as long as it hasn't happened, there is no basis for a court to involve itself, much less issue an anticipatory ruling.

"Such niceties only matter if you are practicing law, though. Judge Orrick is practicing politics."

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the kind of judge that really should be removed from office. He is allowed to sit as long as he exhibits good conduct, but this is not the conduct that is good, when he takes an oath to be judicious, follow the law, and defend the Constitution. It is certainly unbecoming to a judge.

Yes, here in Congress we debate and go back and forth. Before the courts, lawyers go back and forth. But the judge is supposed to be judicious and follow the law.

It is time for us to take away all authority of any Federal district court, any Federal magistrate, any Federal judge of any kind other than the Supreme Court when it comes to issues such as this.

We have created immigration courts, but when it comes to appeals and to lawsuits filed regarding immigration and naturalization, I think, Mr. Speaker, we should restrict that to the one and only Federal court that, as Professor Gwen used to say in constitu-

tional law at Baylor, only one court in the United States Federal system that owes its existence to the Constitution.

□ 1730

All other Federal courts of any kind owe their existence and their jurisdiction to the United States Congress. So the Congress giveth when it comes to courts, and the Congress can taketh away. It is time to start removing authority from some of these courts that Congress has created that have now created more problems than they have solved.

An article here by Stephen Dinan and Andrea Noble in *The Washington Times* basically says what so many of the news media did that a Federal judge, Judge Orrick, says Trump is wrong to tie Federal funding to sanctuary status and blocks the executive order. But really it turns out, when you get the actual order and you find out what really happened, there was no such order because there was no violation. There was no harm. The plaintiffs had no standing. The court had no jurisdiction. This is a zero in the effect in this country other than the politics that this Federal judge was playing.

Unfortunately, when a Federal judge acquires a lifetime appointment and he starts running for an office he already holds when there is no opponent, he is acting outside the realm of the Constitution, and we really should have debates over what good conduct means. It doesn't matter whether or not a judge voted Republican, Socialist, Libertarian, it doesn't matter. If he or she is not acting within the confines of their oath, they need to be removed from the bench.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, we will take up—I know my friend DARRELL ISSA and others have filed bills about the Ninth Circuit Court that has more cases filed in it because lawyers know it is more likely to gut the U.S. Constitution and ignore the Constitution, so anybody who has a claim that is not particularly meritorious under the Constitution, as written, wants to be in the Ninth Circuit because there they have got a shot that the oligarchs out there will do what a judge basically is quoted as saying before, that, gee, we know we don't follow the Constitution or we don't care about precedent, don't care what the Supreme Court says, but that is why we come out with so many decisions. We know the Supreme Court can't reverse them all.

That is a court that really ought to be disbanded. When you have a court that is ignoring their oath, ignoring the Constitution, it is just really time to get rid of it.

We have a report, too, Mr. Speaker, after the great work of the two main leaders—and I do mean that in every good sense of the term "leaders"—MARK MEADOWS and JIM JORDAN, especially MARK MEADOWS, working in the last couple weeks, working to try to have a solution even though, apparently, according to one of my col-

leagues who is not a part of the Freedom Caucus, he was hoping that we would stay here until we got an agreement on a healthcare bill but was told, no, we want the Freedom Caucus to go home and let their constituents yell at them, and then they will be ready to sign or vote for whatever we put in front of them.

Actually, most of us, it sounds like from our discussions, have been reaffirmed and encouraged by our constituents. In my case, it certainly felt like, as I traveled throughout east Texas, apparently not being at the places where the Democrats who call themselves Indivisible were appearing, but going to veterans' groups, chambers of commerce, banquets, meeting with many constituents, but hearing about three-fourths of the time, which was my percentage, basically, with which I won the last general election, people are saying: Hang in there. Don't give up.

So with the encouragement of constituents that most of us in the Freedom Caucus have had, we came back still willing to negotiate, still trying to work. MARK MEADOWS has done some good work.

I still have trouble understanding why we didn't just go ahead and bring to the floor, bring out of committee—it has been through committee before—the bill 2 years ago. I mean, it had hearings, passed out of the House and Senate. It repealed most of ObamaCare, not all of it, but more than the current bill being taken up in this Congress. Why not just bring that to the floor? Then we pass that, and we could take other steps. One that is absolutely critical—and I do applaud Speaker RYAN for bringing it to the floor. It was a very critical step in getting competition in health insurance, not to be confused with health care.

For too long, going back to 1993 when Hillary Rodham Clinton was talking about everybody deserves health care, she was using "health care" and "health insurance" as if they were synonymous. Those terms are not synonymous. People can get health care without health insurance. I know because, after ObamaCare was passed, Congress was mandated to have ObamaCare, and then President Obama, Harry Reid, and John Boehner, as Speaker—come to think of it, all three people who are no longer in positions of power—came together, and they agreed to act as if the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, did not say that Members of Congress could no longer receive the subsidy that every Federal employee in America gets to help pay for healthcare insurance. So they just ignored the law, made very clear. Even though every other Federal employee gets that assistance—and with my wife and me paying off kids' student loans, because if I had never run for elected office, they had money set aside, that we had set aside, would have paid for every year of their college. We didn't think that they should have to have big student loan debt because their father felt

the calling to be a public servant. So we are paying off student loans, and this will be the first year that I will be able to file a financial disclosure that doesn't have student loan debt listed because when it falls below \$10,000, you don't have to list it. So we have made progress.

But because of that, we were not in a position to pay the massive amount that the insurance was going to cost, so I went without insurance up here in Congress. I know what it is to have health care and not have health insurance. I still don't have government-funded or healthcare insurance here. I have insurance now, but it is not through the Federal Government. So I understand the difference between insurance and health care.

I look forward to the day when we keep blurring that line because, when the line is totally blurred, then Americans are more easily duped into allowing the Federal Government to turn the best health care in the world's history into VA-styled problems of treating people. Most of us don't want that. Most Americans don't want that. They didn't want it in 2010. They don't want it now.

But the bill Speaker RYAN brought to the floor had over 400 votes, and it is an important bill. We are going to bring down the costs, have real competition in health care and in health insurance; and what that bill did was eliminate the exemption from antitrust laws that health insurance companies have had since the McCarran-Ferguson bill passed in 1945. Although people have talked more about buying insurance across State lines, the fact is, if we don't end the exemption from antitrust laws of health insurance companies and we do allow people to buy their insurance across State lines, then instead of having 30 to 50 monopolies as we may have now in the health insurance business, we will end up with one monopoly in the whole country; because, if you don't have to follow antitrust laws, if you don't have to avoid taking actions to create monopolies and to force others out of business using antitrust tactics, then you can become the monopoly, and you will become the monopoly.

If it is legal for an insurance company that is the biggest insurance company in a town, State, or country to go to a hospital or go to a healthcare network and say, you know, we have got most all of the health insurance business in the country and we want to put you in our network, but you are going to have to agree to let us pay you a fraction of what you normally would get, and if you ever allow any of these new entrepreneurial health insurance companies to have you in their network, then we will cut you out of our network.

Well, hospitals, networks in their right minds would say, we can't turn these people down, we will go out of business because they are the big company. If we are not in their network,

then we will go out of business. But, unfortunately, that would also mean all these other brilliant entrepreneurial-type insurance ideas, whether it is Medi-Share, Christians coming together and sharing expenses, whatever it is, the big monopoly health insurance company can run them out of business, and that needs to be prevented.

I applaud the Republican leadership for bringing that bill to the floor. I applaud the leadership, people like PAUL GOSAR, Dr. GOSAR, and AUSTIN SCOTT. They have done a good job, and I would like to think I have been pretty vocal on that issue as well. We had a vote on that, and over 400 people voted to end the exemption from antitrust laws of health insurance companies.

I know good and well, if the Senate brings that same bill to the Senate floor, it will also have a huge—I don't know if it would be unanimous, but it would certainly be a huge victory. It would certainly be bipartisan to pass it. I think that is the kind of thing Americans are wanting to see.

But as I talk to people around east Texas, most people have never heard of that because the newspapers around east Texas are more interested usually in talking about this Democratic group that calls itself Indivisible, as if everybody doesn't know that they are basically Democrats.

□ 1745

I think a meeting that called itself a townhall over in Longview got all kinds of good press. It was sponsored, as I understand it, by Democratic Women of Gregg County and Stonewall, a Democratic group. It wasn't a local group, the Stonewall group. Anyway, I would be busy around the rest of the district at Chamber banquets, meetings, and things like that.

But it has been refreshing to talk to real Americans, people that are just trying to make a living, people that are just trying to pay their bills. I know some people talk in bold terms about how we are on vacation. But it is fantastic when Members of Congress go home and hear from their constituents. And I do. I hear those, Mr. Speaker, that are part of the 26 percent that want to keep ObamaCare. But I sure have my heart set on keeping our promises.

In my district, the 74 percent said: "We need ObamaCare repealed. We need the Federal Government to get out of our private lives. We need better jobs. We need the economy going much stronger."

I am excited about President Trump's proposal that he rolled out today. Having talked to my friend KEVIN BRADY, a good friend from Texas, the plan they are rolling out, I have come to have very grave concerns about the border adjustment tax.

But if we do as President Trump proposed, bring our corporate tax down to 15 percent, as the President proposed today, manufacturing jobs will come rushing back to America. They will.

I know there are the pseudointellectual elites that like to tell themselves that we have evolved somehow into this service society where we don't denigrate ourselves to the point that a lot of us have been throughout our lives, and so no problem, and that is doing hard labor, producing products, and manufacturing. It is a good thing.

America needs manufacturing jobs back. It is a good thing to have a job. I know there are those that are quite cynical, those who are atheist, agnostic, and other religions. But for those who believe the teaching in the Bible, when God created the world and there was a Garden of Eden, everything was perfect. And even in a perfect Garden of Eden, God felt like it was good for people to have a job. So he gave Adam and Eve a job. He said: Your job is tending the garden. And in some form or other, Mr. Speaker, that is the job we have—tending the magnificent garden.

We can use the resources, we can continue to make the world better—cleaner air and cleaner water. Nobody wants dirty water and dirty air. And it is continuing to be clean in Texas, whether there were a Federal EPA or not. Our agencies in Texas are doing a good job.

Our Federal Government needs to allow the brilliance, the creativeness, and the entrepreneurial spirit of Americans to bloom. If we drop the largest tariff that any nation in the industrialized world places on its own products, if we get rid of that, or at least drop that down to 15 percent, manufacturing jobs will return to America and our economy will explode for the better.

Some of these young people that have come out of school—high school, college, graduate studies—so many have no idea what it is to have countering offers for their employment. They don't know. They had to move home and live at home for awhile. But it is exciting when you are wanted by more than one employer, and money is offered, and it is good money. It makes you feel good about yourself. Mr. Speaker, I am ready, like most Americans, to see that happening in America again so our young people can have that feeling of self-worth because there are so many jobs.

One of the first steps was to repeal ObamaCare and allow health care that would be affordable—insurance that would be affordable. Well, the bill we are taking up is not going to do that. But I have advised the House leadership, Republican leadership, and the President and Vice President that I will vote for the bill in its current form. It is not what I wanted.

It is not a full repeal, but it does enough now that it will bring down premiums. And it won't be 10 years under the law the way it is written right now.

It protects those who have pre-existing conditions.

It allows people 26 years of age and younger—I wouldn't mind it being 50,

but it is 26—be on their parents' insurance as dependents. That is not being touched. That is there.

But some of the mandates are being repealed the way it sits now. I am not thrilled with it. But I have talked to enough people that have just got to have help on the premiums. The bill, the way it was, was not going to help them. We have got the bill to a point where it will help much more quickly with premium assistance.

I am looking forward to getting that behind us, moving on to dropping the corporate tax rate to 15 percent so we can return manufacturing jobs in droves, and seeing this economy explode.

There is reason to be optimistic. Not everybody is as mindless as Judge Orrick, so there is reason for optimism.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me just note that today I am paying close attention to the healthcare issue. I don't want anybody to think when they look at me giving this speech on the floor of the House that this is evidence that there is arm-twisting going on here in the Capitol about trying to get people's vote on the healthcare issue. No, it is just humorous.

This is a shoulder replacement. I had this one replaced, actually, 4 or 5 months ago, and it is doing fine now. This one was a week ago. The cause of this, of course, has been excessive surfing. When I was older, I should have understood that you cannot surf as much as you can when you are younger without eliminating the cartilage that is there, then the cartilage is gone, and the bones grind on each other.

Well, that is just one example, however, of a healthcare issue that is going to be with us much more frequently now as the population of this country is growing older. The older people get, there will be other infirmities that really were not suffered on such a scale when we died off at a younger age.

So what we need to do is to make sure that we set down policies and a system that will provide the American people with the greatest and the most effective care that is possible within the budget that we have to deal with.

Today I thought I would talk about that, of course—health care. But there are a few other issues I would like to discuss.

Tax reform, of course, is something that is being focused on today as well—tax reform for fiscal year '17. And, of course, fiscal year '18, the appropriations bill. Border security, of course, has to be on this list.

These are issues that we are every day talking about here on Capitol Hill. The work is intense, people are serious, and there is a job for us to do. President Trump is in the White House, and he is working hard as well.

This is not the time for the other side to be politicizing every issue that comes up, but, instead, to admit that Republicans now have legitimately won the election for President and legitimately won a majority in both Houses of Congress.

Thus, we should put in place policies that are, yes, fair, honest, and effective. But, also, we have to realize that it is fair, honest, and effective based on what those people who are elected by the people to make the decision believe is fair and effective.

Unfortunately, what we have now, and we see this across the country, are people who—and I don't even know if they understand the system at all, but they are arrogantly trying to be engaged with disrupting the system because they did not win. That cannot be tolerated for long. I would hope that people have a change of heart and work with us. We are willing to work with Members of the other party, the Democratic Party, to make sure we come up with both health care and tax reform that the American people will accept and applaud.

First, let's take a look at health care. Tonight I would like to discuss with whoever is listening and whoever is reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an idea that I am proposing for the healthcare industry. And for the bill that is being put together, as we speak, where people are negotiating and compromising out, I have thrown this idea into the mix. And that is that we are—and we have to recognize—making progress toward replacement of ObamaCare.

I am asking my colleagues to give serious consideration to this simple amendment that I believe will revolutionize health care in America by protecting the formation and operation of healthcare cooperatives.

Now, let's get back to that. I am trying to suggest that a small change could actually bring about a revolution in the way health care is delivered to the American people today.

Let's first admit that our healthcare system today seems to be run by the insurance companies. Yes, insurance companies have almost more influence than doctors do on the policies that we have on health insurance. That is not something that we need to put up with much longer if there is an alternative.

What that should mean to Americans is that we need to open up the system of health care. We need to make sure that health care is being looked at as a target for a multiapproach that will come to grips with those challenges, both financial and technical, et cetera, and that we need to open it up, rather than just having such a major influence by those people who are the money changers—the insurance companies.

□ 1800

My amendment which I am proposing would go a long way towards opening up a whole new avenue. Now, when I say free enterprise—and I believe in free enterprise. When I say free enterprise, I don't just mean—and this is where, unfortunately, a lot of people have made a mistake in thinking that free enterprise approaches are simply the approaches that are based on greed and are based on profit motive. And instead of other things and motivations that are available, they believe that that is what free enterprise means, whether it is health care or whatever.

Well, I would submit that free enterprise means a lot more than just depending on the profit motive and competition and greed but instead, also, includes, and should include—but we have excluded this avenue—cooperation; cooperation among free people for their own benefit and the benefit of their families. We need it not only just in health care, but that is what we are discussing today, to make sure that Americans can cooperate together for their own benefits and the benefits of their family.

Now, how do I get this? How do I get this consciousness? My mom and dad were both born on very small farms in North Dakota. In North Dakota where we have homesteaders and others who are relatively poor, in North Dakota, the farmers may have been given the land—by a Republican President, I might add. Abraham Lincoln is the one who initiated the Homestead Act.

But they didn't have the money for the equipment, maybe even the money to buy seed. And what they did is, they formed farmers' collectives. What they called them, farmers' cooperatives. In Russia, they might have called them collectives, but they had the iron hand of evil in Russia, the iron hand of despotism, and a political control. But the cooperation in the United States was based on people gathering together, voluntarily working together to create a better situation. And you had cooperatives that would buy—farm cooperatives that would buy the machinery that was necessary for a small farm to succeed.

Well, that worked. I noticed that when I would go up to work on the farm when I was younger, and I noticed these farm cooperatives around. And that is totally consistent with free enterprise, the cooperation among people to share with each other the burden of buying that type of equipment.

Well, the amendment that I am proposing, in terms of our health care, falls right into that category. The amendment I am proposing stipulates that no provision in current law, or the underlying act, which we are amending, may restrict cooperative arrangements between individuals or organizations to jointly cover healthcare related expenses. The provision would further stipulate that such cooperative arrangements shall not be subject to any of the requirements, bureaucratic

rules and regulations, that currently apply to healthcare industry companies.

In addition, my amendment would stipulate that participation in such a cooperative arrangement shall be deemed as the equivalent of being covered by health insurance. If I might describe what I am talking about so people will understand. We are talking about now, the reason why a lot of people won't buy health insurance is that if they put it in, and they are healthy, that insurance money then goes to the insurance company, even though they have not used it at all.

And so you are going to be hesitant to give that money and to buy that insurance, and the insurance companies, of course, are very happy to have that money available to speculate on the stock market, et cetera, in order to make a profit. I am not against profit, but I want to make sure that profit and greed are not the driving forces for what most people would hope for is they can cooperate together and not be subject to someone else's greed and profit motive.

So what I am talking about, if this would be put into the healthcare bill, this small provision that I just read to you, making sure that cooperative efforts are covered and are not going to be controlled by the Federal Government, that they are free to do so without the many restrictions that would be on another company providing health insurance, that these cooperative efforts could—for example, you could have a co-op among people who worked at a certain school, or an industry, or you could have the same as we have now.

I think that the pathway has been certainly explored when it comes to credit unions where, again, people in a nonprofit situation are working together in order to establish something that benefits all of those people.

We could have a cooperative effort for health care, even run by some of the credit unions if they wanted to do so. They could have an app on their telephone or something where people would then put their money forward. If they didn't get sick, that money would still be part of what they have as their pot of money, their account with whoever it is. It is either an account or whatever, but the account will be returned. Thus, people will then take money out of the account to handle their own small medical needs, but they will also know that if they have a catastrophic condition—that is why everybody is banding together in this cooperative program—that they will be taken care of in terms of some catastrophic illness that might become them.

So what we have in this proposal is an alternative, a very simple change in our healthcare law, which will permit people to work together and make it profitable for them to do so and take them away from the control of other corporations in the health insurance

industry that may be thinking more profit than of what their interests are.

So with that said, I have asked my colleagues to consider that proposal, and those who are reading this tonight or tomorrow in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I hope they would call their Congressman to say that they are really interested in seeing that the cooperative alternative to health care is permitted in the bill.

Now, the second piece of legislation that I would like to talk about tonight also deals with a vitally important issue, vitally important to the well-being of the American people, and that is border security. Let me just say, I have been aware that a massive influx of illegals into our country was a threat to the well-being of the American people, and I have known that in the almost 28 years that I have been a Member of Congress.

But it has been discouraging to me that we have, over and over again, made attempts to try to do something that would draw the line and say we are not going to have any more illegals coming into our country. Now, by the way, that is illegals. I didn't say immigration, immigrants. I am talking about people coming here illegally, a massive flow of illegal immigration.

In fact, the United States permits 1 million legal immigrants to come into our country every year. How big is that? That happens to be more than all of the other countries of the world combined. And we are supposed to apologize about having that kind of an open system? But no, we have been attacked, over and over again, for trying to get control of this. And what happens when you get out-of-control illegal immigration? You get jobs for ordinary Americans; the value of their work is bid down. And if you want to know why some people can't get good jobs today, and those jobs actually paid a lot more in the past, is because we have flooded the market.

Basically, the Democratic Party has been deeply involved with opposing any of the efforts, and many Republicans have opposed the effort to get control of this flow of illegals. Why? Well, I guess we might be able to take a look at some motives and say: there are a lot of Republicans who could have done something on this, but they didn't want to stem the flow of illegal immigrants because Big Business wants—what do they want? Cheap labor.

That is a betrayal of the American people, just as much as it is a betrayal of the American people for the other party to try to keep the flow of illegal immigrants into our country, hoping they will give them a victory at the ballot box and, thus, give them political power that they wouldn't otherwise have.

Well, it is time to draw the line, and the American people did that in the last Presidential election. And I am very proud that the American people stood up to the most massive propaganda campaign against any Presi-

dential candidate that I have seen in my lifetime, and that was against President Donald Trump.

I just heard the other night, even the bankers up in Massachusetts and New York overwhelmingly were giving money to Hillary's campaign. But Donald Trump got a pittance. The establishment was out to destroy Donald Trump, because Donald Trump said that he was going to stop the flow of illegals, he was going to be watching out for the benefit of America's working people, and that would be the top priority.

Well, one of the things we remember, he wanted to make it real. It wasn't just a bunch of rhetoric. He kept talking about how he would build a huge wall. Now, we all know that "a huge" wasn't around before Donald Trump. I don't remember people using that phraseology. And what we have got now is Donald Trump is moving forward. The President of the United States is moving forward to fulfill his promise.

We should not have a situation where politics get in the way by people who lost the election and are now trying to stop and interfere with those people who won the election. That is what the democratic process is all about. And the proposal that I am making when it comes to border security is that—and I was very honored to be asked into the Oval Office by President Trump and to give him some ideas that might be good ideas on how to handle some of these problems.

What I suggested to him is, any wall that he has suggested will be built along our southern border will cost tens of billions of dollars. Well, I had a proposal that I made to him, and I have made to the leadership here in the House, and I hope that they do not ignore this because it is vitally important if we are serious about stopping this massive flow of illegal immigrants into our country. We have to be building that wall, if nothing else, as symbolism that this is a sovereign country, and we demand that our border laws be respected.

Well, what I am proposing is a change from a currently existing immigration law. And that is, we bring in 1 million legal immigrants every year. But guess what? Of that 1 million legal immigrants that we permit in—which I applaud—but among that 1 million legal immigrants, there are 50,000 of them coming in who are selected. What?

They are not selected by a process where you study who is what, who we need here, what kind of skills we need. They are selected by a lottery. They are selected by a lottery, just pulling them out of nowhere. Yes, they are vetted all right, but they are not in any way rationally designed, them coming here, in a way that would help the American people.

Well, what I am suggesting is that 50,000 people—we do not want to decrease the number of legal immigration. We don't want to decrease legal

immigration. So we have a 50,000 slot. If we eliminated that stupid lottery that we don't even decide who is coming in, that it is left up to chance, well, we eliminate that, and then we set up a special fund. And the fund is a dedicated fund that whoever puts in \$1 million into that dedicated fund will do so in exchange for immediate residency and U.S. citizenship within 2 years.

□ 1815

In other words, foreign people who are successful in whatever they have done in order to accumulate wealth, and we are not going to bring in criminals, it is going to be vetted just like every other legal immigrant will be vetted to make sure they are not criminals or terrorists or anything, but people who are overseas who would love to become U.S. citizens, that they will be given guaranteed U.S. citizenship within 2 years.

Now, that would mean \$1 million per person, and perhaps we might want to say that individuals could bring in their immediate family, minors, for \$500,000. But whatever that is, the revenue raised from this program could be put into that special account managed by the Secretary of Homeland Security for the purpose of carrying out border security and immigration enforcement activities.

In other words, the President of the United States does not have to have the burden of raising taxes in order to pay for that Southern border wall. He does not have to pass it off on further generations by increasing the debt by that level.

We have a method in this to bring in a better quality of people who we need coming into our country rather than selecting at random and paying for a wall that will reestablish the security of the people of this country and will go a long way to establish a mindset around the world that no longer are our borders open. No longer, whoever can get over here, are we going to take in and then give them free education and free health care and let them commit crimes and not even be kicked out of the country for it. No. Those days are over, and this wall will symbolize that.

What I have suggested, having these foreign wealthy people pay for that wall, makes it a real possibility. If people would be interested in talking to their Member of Congress, they can call or write, but they should call and say the idea of letting rich foreigners build that wall is the answer. Let's get going on it. Let's not wait for 5 years. Build the wall and let the others pay for it. That is a plan that will work.

I would like to also discuss another issue that I have been involved in. But let me just note that, on the tax bill, I have also asked for an amendment that would increase the well-being. And, how do you say, right now our wealth is becoming so centralized in just a few hands.

What we have now in the United States is a vision that the poor are get-

ting poorer and the rich are getting richer. There is a problem with this concentration of wealth.

Now, the reason we have that concentration of wealth is because there are a few people in our country that own capital, own the companies that produce the wealth. And over the years, that has been focused on fewer and fewer hands, and the working people are being shut out of a system that is something that they are essential players in.

So with that said, I am certainly not against profit motive and I am certainly not against competition. I am certainly for the private sector and not for big bureaucracy. But if we just passed an incentive into our system, that incentive would be this: I am proposing that when an employer provides stock for his employees, it has to be an equal distribution to all the employees. Those employees don't have to pay income tax on it. And if those employees keep that stock for over 10 years, the employees don't have to pay capital gains tax on it.

So what we have got—if a company is successful and we have got a large increase in the value of that company, it is being shared with the workers in the company. It is not being held up in the one percent of the elite management. What we need to do is to make sure that we deal with this concentration of wealth because the American people, that is what it was all about. It wasn't about having some elite. That was what the Homestead Act was all about that helped my grandparents. We need a Homestead Act for people who are working in the various industries in our country. And tweaking the system with a little tax incentive like I am talking about, this would be an ESOP, which are already in existence but have very complicated structure associated with them, an expensive structure associated with them, that this would be like ESOPs on steroids. We will have working people thinking in terms of partnership with their employer instead of being on an adversarial relationship. People with startup companies will be able to get the top-quality people knowing if their company is successful, the capital gains tax will be zero for them who came onboard early on.

This is another proposal that I am making, and I would hope that people will look at that again and ask their Congressman to consider Congressman ROHRBACHER's Employee Ownership Bill, Expanding Employee Ownership.

Finally, I would like to talk about one last issue that is something that is very controversial, I know, and I have never stepped away from being controversial. But what we have got here today is a major change in public attitude towards something that has been wrong for a long time but the public was not aware of it.

I would hope that we do not pass up the chance again of legalizing the medical use of marijuana. And the fact is,

44 States have taken many restrictions off the use of medical marijuana.

I have legislation that says respect State marijuana laws. This should be left up to the States. This should be left up to the people who decide for themselves whether or not they believe medical marijuana should be available to seniors, to veterans, and to other people. And we should stop paying money to the drug cartels by making sure that this medicine that we now know is possible with marijuana that we don't want to have the source being the drug cartels around the world.

So I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the medical marijuana initiative, what I have, which says we will respect medical marijuana laws and the United States.

I would hope that my colleagues get the message. These are four very important issues. These are issues I spent a lot of time on, but I am doing that because I understand these are fundamental. We have to start doing more. If we are going to drain the swamp, as the President says, we have got to be working on the fundamentals that are wrong with the system rather than just trying to create some image of progress and image of activity here.

We can do it. We have got good leadership here in the House. We have got a willingness to cooperate with the other side of the aisle. We have got a President who wants to work with us. Congress is here. We are in action, and we have got some great new creative ideas. Now the American people are welcome to participate.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2331

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa) at 11 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 27, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1147. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the "Iran-Related Multilateral Sanctions Regime Efforts" report for the period of August 7, 2016 to February 6, 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1148. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7095; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-085-AD; Amendment 39-18848; AD 2017-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1149. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH [Docket No.: FAA-2016-3257; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-072-AD; Amendment 39-18846; AD 2017-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1150. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0189; Directorate Identifier 2017-SW-008-AD; Amendment 39-18847; AD 2017-05-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1151. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8184; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-036-AD; Amendment 39-18843; AD 2017-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1152. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6897; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-187-AD; Amendment 39-18853; AD 2017-08-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1153. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9299; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-119-AD; Amendment 39-18851; AD 2017-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1154. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0651; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-043-AD; Amendment 39-18850; AD 2017-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1155. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31127; Amdt. No.: 3741] received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1156. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9385; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-111-AD; Amendment 39-18844; AD 2017-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1157. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0879; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-18842; AD 2017-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1158. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0245; Directorate Identifier 2017-NM-023-AD; Amendment 39-18841; AD 2017-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1159. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Models Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9531; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-011-AD; Amendment 39-18839; AD 2017-07-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1160. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0059; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-075-AD; Amendment 39-18832; AD 2017-06-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1161. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Meggitt (Troy), Inc. Combustion Heaters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0603; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-026-AD; Amendment 39-18827; AD 2017-06-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1162. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Direc-

tives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8851; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-070-AD; Amendment 39-18831; AD 2017-06-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1163. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0245; Directorate Identifier 2017-NM-023-AD; Amendment 39-18841; AD 2017-07-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1164. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; American Champion Aircraft Corp. [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0283; Directorate Identifier 2017-CE-009-AD; Amendment 39-18849; AD 2017-07-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1165. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Implementation of the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Improvements Act for a Violation of a Federal Railroad Safety Law, Federal Railroad Administration Safety Regulation or Order, or the Hazardous Material Transportation Laws or Regulations, Orders, Special Permits, and Approvals Issued Under Those Laws [Docket No.: FRA-2016-0021; Notice No.: 3] (RIN: 2130-AC59) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1166. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting a progress report for the period of July 1, 2016, through September 30, 2016; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

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. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 280. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1694) to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 115-96). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BARR, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 10. A bill to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, Rules, the Budget, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 2146. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide notice to State authorities when unaccompanied alien children are placed in that State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2147. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PITTENGER (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 2148. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to clarify capital requirements for certain acquisition, development, or construction loans; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2149. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require inclusion of the taxpayer's social security number to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 2150. A bill to ensure that permits issued by the Secretary of Transportation to foreign air carriers under the United States-European Union Air Transport Agreement of April 2007 do not undermine labor rights or standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2151. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 2152. A bill to require States and units of local government receiving funds under

grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds for pretrial services programs, to submit to the Attorney General a report relating to such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 2153. A bill to hold the salaries of Members of a House of Congress in escrow if the House of Congress does not agree to a budget resolution or pass regular appropriation bills on a timely basis during a Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2154. A bill to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schafer Agricultural Research Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2155. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to authorize funds to identify and eliminate excessive occupational licensure; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 2156. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRAT (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MCLINTOCK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALMER, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to limit the authority of the President to withdraw areas from oil and gas leasing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SANFORD, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil-, gas-, and methane hydrate-related seismic activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Straits of Florida planning areas of the outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2159. A bill to reduce the deficit by imposing a minimum effective tax rate for high-income taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 2160. A bill to improve the safety of school buses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and 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. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 2161. A bill to adjust the immigration status of certain Venezuelan nationals who are in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2162. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 2163. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require physicians and physician's offices to be treated as covered device users required to report on certain adverse events involving medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 2164. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to liability under State and local requirements respecting devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 2165. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to make certain improvements in managing TSA employee conduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. COLE, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2166. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the continuance of pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, during lapses in appropriations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 2167. A bill to provide for no net increase in the total acreage of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service, and for other purposes; 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. ISSA (for himself, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 2168. A bill to waive the passport fees for first responders proceeding abroad to aid a foreign country suffering from a natural disaster; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2169. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance information sharing in the Department of Homeland Security State, Local, and Regional Fusion

Center Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. COMER, Mr. COOK, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. VALADAO, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California):

H.R. 2170. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the repair, expansion, and construction, without elevation, of agricultural structures located in special flood hazard zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce taxpayer burdens and enhance taxpayer protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 2172. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to remove the mandate on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee to focus on maximum employment; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 2173. A bill to improve passenger vessel security and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MESSER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALMER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WALKER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. BLUM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 2174. A bill to provide for a reauthorizing schedule for unauthorized Federal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, 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. MURPHY of Florida (for herself, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 2175. A bill to direct the Director of National Intelligence to establish an integration cell to monitor and enforce United Nations Security Council resolutions with respect to North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 2176. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Asia-Pacific Defense Commission to enhance defense cooperation between the United States and allies in the Asia-Pacific region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2177. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to change the residency requirements for certain officials serving in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2178. A bill to provide for the compensation of Federal contractor employees that may be placed on unpaid leave as a result of the Federal Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2179. A bill to require certain welfare programs to deny benefits to persons who fail a drug test, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELBENE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HECK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BERA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2180. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2181. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the consolidation of life insurance companies with other companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MENG, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2182. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to Congress on the alternatives for the final disposition of Plum Island, including preservation of the island for conservation, education, and research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 99. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself and Ms. MENG):

H. Res. 279. A resolution recognizing Israeli-American heritage and the contributions of the Israeli-American community to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. RUSSELL, Ms. BASS, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 281. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 2017 as "Second Chance Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. COOPER):

H. Res. 282. A resolution supporting State, local, and community initiatives to encourage parents, teachers, camp counselors, and childcare professionals to take measures to prevent sunburns in the minors they care for, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that State, local, and community entities should continue to support efforts to curb the incidences of skin cancer beginning with childhood skin protection; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 283. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that congressional redistricting should be reformed to remove political gerrymandering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCBACHIN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 284. A resolution expressing support for honoring Earth Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. TAYLOR (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Res. 285. A resolution expressing the sense of the United States House of Representatives that Congress and the President should empower the creation of police and community alliances designed to enhance

and improve communication and collaboration between members of the law enforcement community and the public they serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H.R. 10.

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”);

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 (“To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures”);

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6 (“To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States”); and

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. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 2146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2147.

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. PITTEMBERG:

H.R. 2148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 1: All legislative Powers herein shall be vested in a Congress of the United States

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 2150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 2151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 2153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 2155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to regulate commerce among the several states

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 2156.

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 and foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 2157.

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. BEYER:

H.R. 2158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 2160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 2161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4: The Congress shall have Power To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution sets forth the power of appropriations and states that “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .”

In addition, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states that “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States. . . .”

Also, Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12 and 13 states that Congress shall have power “to raise and support Armies . . .” and “to provide and maintain a Navy.”

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 2169.

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. LAMALFA:

H.R. 2170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 2171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 2172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 2173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1: “All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other Bills.”

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law;

and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power to provide for the common defense and to make all laws necessary and proper to carry out this power.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power to provide for the common defense and to make all laws necessary and proper to carry out this power.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debt and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 2181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sections 8 & 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 99.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 37: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 44: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H.R. 80: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 82: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 112: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 115: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 179: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. COLE, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 256: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 371: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 389: Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 392: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. REED.
 H.R. 448: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 453: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. JONES, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
 H.R. 488: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. ROSEN.
 H.R. 490: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
 H.R. 499: Mr. SANFORD.
 H.R. 510: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 520: Mr. STEWART, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 553: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 566: Mr. BACON and Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 592: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. BERA.
 H.R. 608: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 613: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 619: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. MESSER.
 H.R. 632: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H.R. 681: Mr. BACON and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 721: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 747: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BACON, and Mr. SMUCKER.
 H.R. 750: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 782: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 785: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
 H.R. 807: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. LOVE.
 H.R. 810: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 813: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H.R. 820: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 828: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 830: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 881: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H.R. 909: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 918: Ms. ROSEN.
 H.R. 919: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 939: Mr. SOTO and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 986: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
 H.R. 989: Mr. COOK and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H.R. 990: Mr. COOK and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H.R. 997: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 1005: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 1017: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1027: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 1057: Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 1058: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1090: Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 1104: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1116: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1120: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 1141: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1146: Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1148: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 1149: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 1155: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 1156: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 1180: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 1192: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 1200: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 1212: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1235: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York; Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1239: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 1241: Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 1253: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1272: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 1300: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1310: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 1317: Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.R. 1322: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 1334: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 1379: Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 1393: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 1405: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 1421: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1444: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. SARBANES.
 H.R. 1447: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 1456: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 1457: Mr. BYRNE.
 H.R. 1468: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 1478: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1481: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 1485: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 1515: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1516: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 1532: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 1544: Mr. TAYLOR and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1552: Mr. KNIGHT.
 H.R. 1555: Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 1562: Mr. GALLEGRO.
 H.R. 1570: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 1588: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 1599: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 1625: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 1626: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. FASO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1632: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 1635: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MESSER, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
 H.R. 1644: Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 1651: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. DONOVAN.
 H.R. 1661: Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 1663: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 1665: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 1674: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1676: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 1677: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 1683: Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CORREA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1697: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. FASO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 1698: Mr. BUDD, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. FASO, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 1711: Mrs. DEMINGS.
 H.R. 1731: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 1759: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 1761: Mr. SCALISE and Mr. BIGGS.
 H.R. 1772: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1777: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BACON, and Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 1779: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 1794: Mr. BACON, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. GAETZ.
 H.R. 1796: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 1811: Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 1813: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 1819: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1820: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 1823: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 1824: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 1825: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 1833: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 1838: Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 1853: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
 H.R. 1874: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 1882: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 1891: Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 1892: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 1895: Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 1899: Mr. KILMER and Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 1902: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 1910: Mr. COLE and Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 1919: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 1921: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1928: Mr. COLE, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 1940: Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1953: Mr. FASO and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1957: Mr. NADLER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PAL-LONE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1971: Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 1989: Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1991: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KELLY of Penn-sylvania, and Mr. DENT.
 H.R. 1997: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 2000: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CLARK of Mas-sachusetts, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 2001: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CLARK of Mas-sachusetts, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 2004: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 2023: Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.R. 2024: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
 H.R. 2029: Mr. DUNN, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2043: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 2054: Mr. SANFORD.
 H.R. 2096: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 2097: Mr. COLE and Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 2106: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 2108: Mr. GALLEGRO and Mr. PERL-MUTTER.
 H.R. 2121: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 2132: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 2145: Ms. MOORE and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. COLE.
 H.J. Res. 88: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. COLE.
 H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FASO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BACON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. LEWIS of Min-nesota.
 H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. HUNTER.
 H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GRI-JALVA, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. GALLEGRO.
 H. Res. 15: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. FUDGE, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H. Res. 28: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. KILMER.
 H. Res. 31: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ROY-BAL-ALLARD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. HIMES.
 H. Res. 85: Mr. JEFFRIES.
 H. Res. 90: Mr. KHANNA.
 H. Res. 108: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H. Res. 218: Mr. COOK and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H. Res. 220: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H. Res. 239: Mr. SIRES, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H. Res. 249: Mr. TROTT.
 H. Res. 259: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida and Mrs. TORRES.
 H. Res. 269: Mrs. WAGNER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIM-ITTED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIM-ITTED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

H.J. Res. 99, making further continuing ap-propriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes, does not contain any con-gressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Rep-resentative CHAFFETZ, or a designee, to H.R. 1694, the Fannie and Freddie Open Records Act of 2017, does not contain any congres-sional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or lim-ited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and reso-lutions, as follows;

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. DAVIDSON.