



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 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 gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman 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

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

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

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
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
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
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray

Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires

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.
ERNE 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	DeBene	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)	Dogett	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)	Hartzer	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)	Suozi
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) Emmer
Barletta Clarke (NY) Engel
Barr Clay Espallat
Barragán Cleaver Estes (KS)
Barton Coffman Esty (CT)
Bass Cohen Evans
Bera Cole Farenthold
Bergman Collins (GA) Faso
Beyer Collins (NY) Ferguson
Biggs Comer Fitzpatrick
Bilirakis Comstock Fleischmann
Bishop (MI) Conaway Flores
Bishop (UT) Conyers Fortenberry
Black Cook Foster
Blackburn Cooper Foxx
Blum Costa Frankel (FL)
Blunt Rochester Costello (PA) Franks (AZ)
Bonamici Courtney Frelinghuysen
Bost Cramer Gabbard
Brady (TX) Crawford Gaetz
Brat Crist Gallagher
Bridenstine Crowley Gallego
Brooks (AL) Cuellar Garamendi
Brooks (IN) Culberson Garrett
Brown (MD) Curbelo (FL) Gibbs
Brownley (CA) Davidson Gohmert
Buchanan Davis, Danny Gonzalez (TX)
Buck Davis, Rodney Goodlatte
Bucshon Delaney Gosar
Budd DeLauro Gottheimer
Burgess Demings Gowdy
Bustos Denham Granger
Byrne Dent Graves (GA)
Calvert DeSantis Graves (LA)
Cárdenas DesJarlais Graves (MO)
Carson (IN) Deutch Green, Al

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
Pittenger
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lipinski
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)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

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
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)
Correa
Courtney
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
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
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lipinski
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray

Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Mitchell
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Payne
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey

Price (NC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

Smucker
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Suozi
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Titus
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Emmer
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gohmert
Hensarling
Nolan
Holding
Jenkins (WV)
Lowey
Marchant

Marino
Messer
Moore
Newhouse
Pascrell
Quigley
Rohrabacher

Rooney, Thomas
J.
Russell
Simpson
Slaughter
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Yoho

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.

NAYS—161

Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crist
Cummins
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Fudge

Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Gibbs
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Keating
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Knight
LaHood
Lance
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McSally
Meehan
Moolenaar

Murphy (PA)
Neal
Norcross
O'Halleran
Pallone
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Hurd
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Smith (MO)
Soto
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Visclosky
Walberg
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Rice (SC) Tonko

NOT VOTING—30

Calvert Coffman Demings
Cartwright Cramer Ellison

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 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 women, 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 imppanels 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 sensor 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 sensor 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 sensor 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 Fed's 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 Fed's 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. MCCLINTOCK, 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. PASCARELL):

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. DEFASIO and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 1824: Mr. DEFASIO 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.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 2017

No. 71

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Lord, the fountain of wisdom, thank You for Your mighty love. Give our lawmakers the will and strength they need to meet the challenges of these times. May they bend their ear to Your Spirit's voice and follow Your leading. Lord, activate their conscience as You motivate them to live with honor. Keep them vigilant to look for redemptive possibilities in each of life's seasons, finding wisdom in Your precepts. May they hear the murmur of Your truth so they will not deviate from Your path.

Father of life, fill the precious hours of this day with Your presence.

We pray in Your majestic Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, North Korea's determined effort to field a nuclear-armed intercontinental ballistic missile threatens the United States and our allies. By all appearances, Kim Jong Un has broken from a predictable cycle of escalation dem-

onstrated by previous leaders by which the regime takes a provocative action, draws the United States into a negotiation, and extracts concessions. Instead, Kim appears willing to risk the disapproval of the U.N. and our regional allies by undertaking a breakneck testing program.

The President has made clear that a North Korea that is armed with a nuclear-armed missile—a capability they have yet to test—is unacceptable to us and threatens our vital national security interest. Thus, in order to allow the Senate to better understand this threat, I asked the administration to brief all Senators on the issue, and the President graciously offered to hold the meeting down at the White House. I encourage all of our colleagues to attend this afternoon's meeting on North Korea down at the White House.

NOMINATION OF ALEXANDER ACOSTA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, I am pleased that the Senate voted yesterday to confirm Rod Rosenstein to serve as Deputy Attorney General, despite the unnecessary delay, and I look forward to advancing another nominee today.

For the past 8 years, burdensome regulations put forth by the Obama administration have held back our economy and taken a toll on too many hard-working Americans. Fortunately, we now have an administration that has already proven its commitment to easing the regulatory burden on our economy and advancing policies that actually promote economic growth and job creation.

The Department of Labor nominee before us today, Alexander Acosta, shares that commitment, and he has just the right experience to address these issues. He was previously confirmed to three positions by voice votes here in the Senate, meaning not a single Senator of either party recorded a

vote in opposition, so it is no surprise that he has earned a host of bipartisan support for his current nomination as well. We should confirm him without delay. The sooner we do, the sooner he can advance labor policies that put American workers, businesses, and our economy first.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on one other important matter currently being discussed here in the Senate, conversations are ongoing about the way forward on a government spending bill. Our friends on the other side of the aisle sent me a letter that asked for this bill to reject poison pill riders. I would suggest that if they take their own advice, we can finish this negotiation and produce a good agreement that both sides can support.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE CONGRESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, with the media and others looking at the first 100 days or so of this new administration, and looking at this new Congress and the Republican majority, I think it bears reflecting on the last couple of months in the Congress under the new Trump administration and looking at some of the accomplishments that have been made on behalf of the American economy and the American people.

We are committed to helping job creators do what they do best; that is, innovate, create more jobs, and employ

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2539

more people, and not force those same job creators to waste time dealing with onerous rules and regulations that bear no relationship to public safety. With a like-minded President, we have been able to deliver some real relief to the American people.

One of the ways we have been able to do that is through a mechanism known as the Congressional Review Act. The Congressional Review Act was created to give Congress an opportunity to do away with regulations with which it disagrees. It allows Congress to act as a real check.

The problem with regulations is, it is really a substitute for lawmaking. Of course, when Congress acts and passes laws, the President signs them, and then we are held accountable by the voters for the laws we pass. That is not so when it comes to the bureaucracy that writes regulations. Bureaucrats don't stand for election. Bureaucrats are not accountable to the people. So that is why it is really important for us to have a mechanism like the Congressional Review Act to act as a check on runaway regulation.

By using this mechanism, the Congressional Review Act, with an ally in the White House, we have started undoing some of the thousands of burdensome rules and regulations created by the Obama administration—rules and regulations that add up to a hefty pricetag for our country. By one estimate, the costs of these Obama-era regulations add up to more than \$1 trillion. That is a tremendous wet blanket on the American economy. If the job creators have to pay somebody to help them comply with these onerous rules and regulations, they obviously are not paying somebody to grow their business and to be productive. By one estimate, the cost of these Obama regulations adds up to more than \$1 trillion and more than 700 million hours of paperwork, but fortunately we have been able to chip away at them by working with the White House and focusing on bringing regulatory relief to the American people.

Here is the tally so far. So far, we have been able to save the American economy \$636 billion worth of regulatory relief. That adds up to 52 million hours of compliance time. Again, when somebody is busy complying with busy work mandated by a micromanaging Federal bureaucracy, they are not doing productive work.

Now, some of these rules and regulations are things that we may not read or hear about in the headlines or the evening news—things like the stream buffer rule, the Bureau of Land Management planning rule, and the Securities and Exchange Commission resource extraction rule. These are not well-known rules and regulations, but they have a real cost on the American economy. There is a real reason why, after the great recession of 2008, our economy has been bouncing along at about 2 percent real growth. That is not enough growth to keep hiring peo-

ple as they come of age and become eligible to work in the workforce. We need the economy to grow faster, and one of the ways to do that is to relieve businesses and the economy of those overly onerous regulations.

As I was thinking about it, I think what has happened to our economy is, it has died a death of 1,000 cuts. Each of these regulations, while they seem rather innocuous, in and of themselves, or people don't know about them, have actually accumulated to cause real damage to the American economy. So we have been able to help those small businesses that would like to hire more people to do productive work, to grow the economy, and to help pay their employees better wages. We have helped them by repealing these regulations to help our job creators and not hurt them.

This has always been, to me, the mystery of Washington, DC. Back home in Texas, we look at the job creator as a positive influence on our economy, as somebody who is going to be creating a real opportunity for someone to find productive work and to pursue their dreams, but here in Washington so often the opposite seems to be true. It almost seemed like the attitude, particularly of the previous administration, was, What other obstacles can we put in the way of businesses? What other burdens can we impose upon the economy in the name of trying to micromanage the economy from Washington, DC? Well, I think what we have seen—the evidence is pretty clear—is anemic growth, and that is something we need to roll back, along with these rules and regulations.

I am hopeful the President will be signing more of these Congressional Review Act initiatives soon. So far, he has signed 13 of them, and we have more in the queue.

As we look ahead to big-ticket items we all want to make progress on, I am committed to continuing to work with all of our colleagues and the administration in doing all we can to help small businesses, family farmers, and entrepreneurs spend more time doing productive work and less time doing busy work mandated by the bureaucrats here in Washington, DC.

One of those big-ticket items is tax reform. We have seen some big ideas floated out there by the House of Representatives and last night and today by the President and his Cabinet as well. I look forward to reviewing the proposal the President has made.

There is no question there is a lot of room for reforming our Tax Code. Our Tax Code is literally a self-inflicted wound which damages our economy. We have trillions of dollars earned by American-based businesses earned overseas that they will not bring back because they don't want to be taxed twice on that money. We know our Tax Code is way too complicated. It is riddled with loopholes, inconsistencies, and provisions that impede job creation. Pro-growth tax reform should be

our goal. It is something that has united Republicans and Democrats in the past, and there is no reason we shouldn't be united again in accomplishing that tax reform.

So I look forward to hearing more about the President's proposal, and I applaud him for making a bold statement about the direction we ought to pursue. Now is finally the time to address it.

All of these efforts—tax reform, rolling back unnecessary regulations and rules, and providing a better environment for businesses to thrive—are vital to getting our economy back on track and away from years of stagnant growth we saw under President Obama.

I should note it is hard to argue with how business-friendly policies—and the promise of more—affect the economy and create an atmosphere conducive to building businesses and helping families get by.

I think what we have seen is a resurgence of public confidence in the American economy. One index by Gallup suggests that business owners are now more optimistic than they have been since the summer of 2007. That is the kind of confidence and optimism that helps them grow their business and create opportunity for the working man and woman in our country, and it is a testament to the sea change we have seen over the last few months since the new administration came into office and the American people chose to retain Republican majorities in the House and the Senate. More family-run businesses are expecting us to keep putting forward policies that empower job creators, not to get in their way.

I know we have only seen the first few months of the new Congress and we have only seen the first few months of a new Presidential administration, but I am proud of what we have been able to accomplish so far; frankly, without much help from our friends across the aisle who have done everything they can to slow-walk nominations and otherwise impede progress. I hope they realize that is bad politics, and it is not serving the interests of the American people very well. Sooner or later, enough Democrats are going to say: We came here not to just say no to every constructive proposal made but actually participate in the legislative process and work for the benefit of the American people.

I look forward to doing even more to help those who want to bring more jobs and more economic growth to our communities across this great land.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Acosta nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of R. Alexander Acosta, of Florida, to be Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as Senators continue to negotiate the appropriations bills this week, I want to reiterate my hopes that we can reach an agreement by this Friday. So long as we try to operate within the parameters our parties have operated under for the last few spending bills, I am optimistic about the chances for a deal.

I am glad the President has taken the wall off the table in the negotiations. Democrats have always been for border security. In fact, we supported one of the toughest border security packages in comprehensive immigration reform in an amendment offered by two of my Republican colleagues, Senator HOEVEN and Senator CORKER. We may address border security in this bill as well, but it will not include any funding for a wall, plain and simple.

Now, we still have a few issues to work out, including the issue of cost sharing, Puerto Rico, and getting permanent healthcare for miners, which I was glad to hear the majority leader voice support for yesterday—permanent healthcare for miners. I want to salute Senator MANCHIN, who has worked so long and hard for these poor miners who have struggled and have had hard, hard, hard lives. They shouldn't have their health benefits taken away. But above all, in the bill we have to make sure there are no poison pill riders. That has been a watchword of our negotiations in the past and is what led to success, and I hope both sides of the aisle will pursue that now.

We Democrats remain committed to fighting President Trump's cutback on women's health, a rollback of financial protections in Wall Street reform, rollbacks of protections for clean air and clean water, and against a deportation force. Those are the kinds of poison pill riders that could hurt an agreement, and I hope we will just decide at the given time that we can debate them in regular order, but they shouldn't hold the government hostage and pass them without debate.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PLAN

Mr. President, today we will also be hearing some details—we don't know how many—about the President's tax

plan. We will take a look at what they are proposing, but I can tell you this: If the President's plan is to give a massive tax break to the very wealthy in this country—a plan that will mostly benefit people and businesses like President Trump's—that will not pass muster with Democrats.

The very wealthy are doing pretty well in America. Their incomes keep going up. Their wealth keeps going up. God bless them. Let them do well. But they don't need another huge tax break while middle-class Americans and those struggling to get there need help just staying afloat. It is already the case that CEOs and other folks at the top of the corporate ladder can use deductions and loopholes to pay less in taxes than their secretaries. We don't need a plan that establishes the same principle in the basic rates by allowing wealthy businessmen, like President Trump, to use passthrough entities to pay 15 percent in taxes while everyone else pays in the twenties and thirties. We don't need a tax plan that allows the very rich to use passthroughs to reduce their rates to 15 percent while average Americans are paying much more. That is not tax reform. That is just a tax giveaway to the very, very wealthy that will explode the deficit.

So we will take a look at what the President proposes later today. If it is just another deficit-busting tax break for the very wealthy, I predict their proposal will land with a dud with the American people.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. President, later today, the Senate will be receiving a briefing by the administration on the situation in North Korea. I look forward to the opportunity to hear from the Secretary of State, who I understand drafted the administration's plan, and other senior administration officials about their views on North Korea and the posture of the United States in that region.

I think what many of my colleagues hope to hear articulated is a coherent, well-thought-out, strategic plan. So far, Congress and the American public have heard very little in the way of strategy with respect to North Korea. We have heard very little about strategy to combat ISIS. We have heard very little about a strategy on how to deal with Putin's Russia. We have heard very little about our strategy in Syria. Only a few weeks ago, the President authorized a strike in Syria. Is there a broader strategy? Does the administration support regime change or not? Do they plan further U.S. involvement?

These are difficult and important questions, and there are many more of them to be asked and answered about this administration's nascent national security policy for hotspots around the globe. I hope that later today, at least in relation to North Korea, we Senators are given a serious, well-considered outline of the administration's strategic goals in the Korean peninsula and their plans to achieve them.

THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST ONE HUNDRED DAYS

Mr. President, as we approach the 100-day mark of the Trump administration, we Democrats have been highlighting the litany of broken and unfulfilled promises that President Trump made to working families. It is our job as the minority party to hold the President accountable to the promises he made to voters, particularly the ones he made to working families who are struggling out there. Many of these folks voted for the President because they believed him when he promised to bring back their jobs or get tougher on trade or drain the swamp. So it is important to point out where the President has gone back on his word and where he has fallen short in these first 100 days.

On the crucial issues of jobs and the economy, this President has made little progress in 100 days. His party hasn't introduced a major job-creating piece of legislation to date, and he has actually backtracked on his promises to get tough on trade and outsourcing, two things which have cost our country millions of jobs. I was particularly upset to see the President consider repealing President Obama's law that prevented corporate inversions that allowed big corporations to locate overseas to lower their tax rates.

Instead of draining the swamp and making the government more accountable to the people, President Trump has filled his government with billionaires and bankers and folks laden with conflicts of interest. Amazingly enough, he was going to clean up Washington and make it transparent. The White House has decided to keep the visitor log secret and, even worse, allowed waivers to lobbyists to come to work at the White House on the very same issues they were just lobbying on, and those waivers are kept secret. We will not even know about them.

These reversals aren't the normal adjustments that a President makes when transitioning from a campaign to the reality of government; these are stunning about-faces on core promises the President made to working Americans.

TRUMP CARE

Mr. President, I would like to focus now on one issue: the President's promises on healthcare. On the campaign trail, the President vowed to the American people that he would repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act with better healthcare that lowered costs, provided more generous coverage, and guaranteed insurance for everyone, with no changes to Medicare whatsoever. That is what he said. We are not saying this; he said that. Those are his words: I am going to cover everybody. He said, "We're going to have insurance for everybody . . . much less expensive and much better."

"We're going to have insurance for everybody." But once in office, President Trump broke each and every one of these promises with the rollout of his healthcare bill, TrumpCare. Did

TrumpCare lower costs, as he promised? No. The CBO said premiums would go up by as much as 20 percent in the first few years under TrumpCare.

His bill allowed insurance companies to charge older Americans a whopping five times the amount they could charge to younger folks, and it was estimated that senior citizens could have to pay as much as \$14,000 or \$15,000 more for healthcare, depending on their income and where they lived.

Did his bill provide for better coverage? No. In fact, the most recent version of the TrumpCare bill would allow States to decide whether to protect folks who have preexisting conditions. This was one of the most popular things in ObamaCare, even if people didn't like some other parts of it. If you are a parent and your child has cancer, the insurance companies said: We are cutting you off, and you have to watch your child suffer because you can't afford healthcare. ACA, the Affordable Care Act, ended that. They couldn't cut you off or not give you insurance because your child or you had a serious illness that would cost the insurance company a lot of money. But now, in the proposal they are making, it is up to the States. Tough luck if you live in a State without it.

Did his bill guarantee "insurance for everyone"? That is what he said. No, far from it. The Congressional Budget Office said that TrumpCare would result in 24 million fewer Americans with health coverage after 10 years.

Despite an explicit pledge from Candidate Trump on the eve of the election that he would protect Medicare—because hard-working Americans "made a deal a long time ago"—TrumpCare slashed more than \$100 billion from the Medicare trust fund.

TrumpCare was the exact opposite of everything the President promised his healthcare bill would be. Americans should breathe a sigh of relief—a huge sigh of relief—that the bill didn't pass.

There is a lack of fundamental honesty here. If you believe that there shouldn't be government involvement in healthcare and the private sector should do it all, that is a fine belief. I don't agree with it. But that means higher costs and less coverage for most Americans, and the President and, frankly, many of our Republican colleagues are trying to have it both ways. They want to say to their right-wing friends: I am making government's involvement much less. But then they say to the American people: You are going to get better coverage, more coverage, at lower rates. The two are totally inconsistent. That is why they are having such trouble with TrumpCare over in the House, and there will be even worse trouble here in the Senate, if it ever gets here, which I hope it doesn't.

Healthcare is another example of why this President has so little to show for his first 100 days. Instead of reaching out to Democrats to find areas

where we could compromise on improving our healthcare system—we Democrats have always said: Don't repeal ObamaCare; improve it. We know it needs to have some changes. But, instead, they started out on their own in a partisan way, the very same party that criticized President Obama for working just with Democrats on the issue, despite a yearlong effort to try. So it failed, and it is emblematic of the President's first 100 days. The President's "my way or the highway" approach is one of the main reasons he has so little to show on healthcare and so little to show for his first 100 days in office.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 946 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FLAKE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING JAY DICKEY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I come to the floor to honor the memory of former Congressman Jay Dickey, who passed on April 20. When Jay Dickey roamed the Halls of Congress, you knew there might be mischief afoot—and what merry mischief it was.

Jay was opinionated, colorful, and zany. Now that he has passed, the warm laughter of memories once again echoes in these cold, marble halls as we reflect on his life.

He died last Thursday after a battle with Parkinson's, a battle he fought

like every other—with determination and gusto. I, for one, will miss his counsel and friendship, as will the people of Arkansas whom he loved so deeply.

Jay was an Arkansas original. He was born and bred and in the end breathed his last in his hometown of Pine Bluff. He shared a lot in common with the mighty pines of South Arkansas. He stood tall and proud of his community's heritage. He was a pillar of the community. A lawyer and a businessman, he left his mark as an entrepreneur, starting franchises throughout the State, as an advocate representing the city and later taking on such famous clients as coach Eddie Sutton.

Unlike the proverbial tree in the forest, now that Jay Dickey has fallen, the whole State has taken notice.

But, of course, a man's accomplishments are only a window into his character. You had to know Jay personally to get a sense of all the fun there was inside him. It was as if his feet had sunk deep into the soil and soaked up all of the Natural State's richness: its humor, its earnestness, and its strip-the-bark-off candor.

I got to know Jay in my first political campaign. We had never met, and I was a political newcomer, but Jay spent many hours getting to know me and ultimately supported my candidacy, which helped to put me on the map.

Of course, Jay shared a lot of candid advice too. After attending one of my early townhalls, Jay and I went to lunch down the road at Cracker Barrel. I asked him how I did. Jay replied:

Ya did good. Ya did good. But you gotta cut it down some. Ya see that baked potato there? That's a fully loaded baked potato—it's got cheese, sour cream, bacon, onions. Your answers are like that fully loaded baked potato! Make em like a plain potato.

That is just one of the countless stories that added to his legend.

This was the man who offered a ninth grader a college-level internship because he thought the kid had potential; the man who answered any phone in his office that rang twice, just to keep his staff on their toes; the man whose dog once drove his truck into a radio station in Hampton because he left the truck running during an interview to keep the dog cool, and somehow that dog put it in gear; the man who kept a picture of Jesus on his wall, and who, when meeting a new client, would point to the picture and say: "Have you met my friend?"

Yes, the first great joy of his life was his faith, but the second great joy was politics. Jay was the first Republican elected to Congress from South Arkansas since Reconstruction. He won in 1992, the very same year Arkansas elected our Democratic Governor as President.

Despite being who the Democrats must have viewed as the most Republican incumbent in the country, he held onto that seat for almost a decade. Arkansans knew good stock when

they saw it. He lost only by the narrowest of margins in 2000, with President Bill Clinton campaigning for his opponent, then-State Senator Mike Ross. True to form for Jay, he and Mike would become friends after that race, speaking regularly about issues and their faith.

Jay's time in office will not be remembered as a historical oddity, an anomaly, or a one-off because unconventional though it was, it was also a forerunner of things to come. It was an early sign of a coming political realignment, as the small towns that dotted rural America—towns where few people had ever even seen a Republican, never mind voted for one—were starting to cast their votes up and down the ballot for the Grand Old Party.

In other words, Jay Dickey was a trailblazer—or perhaps a bulldozer. He smashed through history and precedent and grooved a path in rough terrain for the rest of us to follow. For that, he has my thanks and the thanks of the people of Arkansas, and for his humorous, quirky, unparalleled example, he has the thanks of the U.S. Congress, which today is a little sadder for his passing but also a little brighter for his memory.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, on Monday morning I stood with workers and fellow public officials in Bridgeport, CT, to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the L'Ambiance Plaza disaster. Thirty years ago last Sunday, L'Ambiance Plaza collapsed, 28 families lost loved ones, and 22 others were seriously injured in the collapse. Their worlds collapsed as the lift-slab construction used as the device for building L'Ambiance Plaza, in effect, imploded.

The workers were constructing a 16-story apartment building when that disaster happened. The lift-slab construction method used at that site subsequently was banned. It was banned because it was unsafe.

That disaster was preventable, as so many workplace injuries and deaths are preventable. That was a tragedy in the modern American workplace 30 years ago—L'Ambiance Plaza. It is an urgent and great need for this Nation to confront. L'Ambiance Plaza collapsed, literally, within seconds, and when it was over, the 28 workers who woke up that day and left their homes never came back. Their families, who said good-bye, never saw them again alive. They were victims of workplace dangers that day, but so many others have followed them since.

Those families are still affected, still grieving. One of them spoke at that ceremony on Monday morning, and it provides for many of us the memories of that day when literally hundreds of workers from throughout Connecticut went to that site, digging, often by hand, through the wreckage, trying to find the living survivors. On that day, and every day since, I have sought to increase the safety of our workplaces and avoid those kinds of tragedies. That is why I am here today, because that pledge would be, in my view, inconsistent with voting for the nomination of Alexander Acosta to be Secretary of Labor.

I will state at the outset that I commend Mr. Acosta for his record of public service during the Presidency of George W. Bush, serving as a National Labor Relations Board member and holding two positions at the Department of Justice, as Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division and, later, as U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Florida. I want to thank him for his willingness to serve again. I say that in all seriousness, as a former U.S. attorney myself.

I believe that, as Secretary of Labor, he will have important responsibilities if he is confirmed in the area of enforcement, and I am constrained to oppose his nomination because I believe, No. 1, that this administration needs a champion, not simply a bystander, and Mr. Acosta has given me no reason at his hearings and in his record to assure me that he will overcome what I see as a bias against enforcement in this administration.

Last month President Trump proposed a budget that guts the Department of Labor. The budget admittedly is short on specifics and boasts little more than one page about the agency that is tasked with ensuring the safety of tens of millions of American workers. Let me make clear: It would slash resources at the Department of Labor by 21 percent. That is \$2.5 billion. That means 21 percent fewer inspectors, 21 percent fewer investigators, 21 percent less enforcement. That is one-fifth less enforcement, when, in fact, five times more enforcement is appropriate. The budget, although short on details, singled out programs that helped to train workers and employers in ways to ensure avoidance of hazards on the job.

President Trump has proposed the elimination—the zeroing out—of that program. At his confirmation hearing last week, Mr. Acosta demonstrated neither a willingness nor an interest in challenging the budget or the President's priorities, stressing that his soon-to-be boss, President Trump, guides the ship. I find that view and perspective alarming. There is an old saying that budgets are “moral documents.” It is a saying frequently repeated, but it has a real meaning when it comes to enforcement of worker safety. It has a real meaning to real people in their lives or loss of lives. It is a matter of life or death. Where you

put scarce dollars and resources reveals moral values and moral priorities.

President Trump has put his values on clear display in this budget. He believes in building a wall, a needless show project that he mentioned repeatedly in his budget, but he has given short shrift or no shrift to efforts that protect people who go every day to workplaces where they are in serious jeopardy, and where—as in L'Ambiance Plaza—they can lose their lives. Voting for Mr. Acosta would mean failing to keep that pledge that I believe I made to the families of L'Ambiance, to the workers who lost their lives there, and to countless other workers in danger every day in workplaces that must be made safer—and can be—through vigorous enforcement of rules and laws that exist now and improvement of those laws.

One of the greatest challenges facing our Nation today is fairness in the workplace, particularly fairness in pay for women, fairness concerning pay disparity between men and women, with women making a fraction of what men make for the same work. On this critical issue also, this nominee is silent. On other issues critical to the modern workplace—overtime pay, minimum wage, protecting workers' retirement, fighting discrimination, matters that affect women and minorities more than others—he has said little or nothing, certainly little to indicate that he will be an enforcer of laws that protect minorities and women and others who may be the victims of discrimination.

There is no question that this nominee is far better than the President's first proposed person to fill this job, Andy Puzder, who rightly and fortunately withdrew, but the standard we should use is not whether he is better than his predecessor, who was found wanting even before the vote was taken, but rather whether they can be trusted to protect workers, to enforce rules vigorously and fairly, and to fight for a budget and a set of priorities that are critical to the future of American workers. On that score, unfortunately, I answer this question with a clear “no,” and I will vote against this nominee.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to oppose the nomination of Alexander Acosta to be Secretary of Labor.

I did not come to this decision lightly, but, after closely examining Mr. Acosta's record, I cannot in good conscience vote for his confirmation to be Labor Secretary on behalf of the American people.

The most troubling part of Mr. Acosta's record is how he handled a 2007 sex trafficking case that he oversaw while serving as the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Florida. In that case, which left many vulnerable victims devastated when it concluded, Mr. Acosta failed to protect underage crime victims who looked to his office to vindicate their rights against billionaire Jeffrey Epstein.

The case, led by Mr. Acosta's office and the FBI, involved an investigation

of Mr. Epstein for his sexual abuse and exploitation of more than 30 underage girls.

It ended with an agreement, negotiated by Mr. Acosta's office, in which Mr. Acosta agreed not to bring Federal charges, including sex trafficking charges, against Mr. Epstein in exchange for his guilty plea to State charges and registration as a sex offender. Thanks to this agreement, Mr. Epstein served a mere 13 months of jail time and avoided serious Federal charges that would have exposed him to lengthy prison sentences.

What troubles me about this case is not just the leniency with which Mr. Epstein was treated, but how the victims themselves were treated.

In 2004, I authored the Crime Victims' Rights Act with then-Senator Kyl because we both saw that victims and their families were too frequently "ignored, cast aside, and treated as nonparticipants in a critical event in their lives." I strongly believe victims have a right to be heard throughout criminal case proceedings.

My concern with how Mr. Acosta handled this case stems from his office's obligations under the Crime Victims' Rights Act. The victims have asserted that Mr. Acosta's office did not provide them with notice of the agreement before it was finalized, nor were they provided with timely notice of Mr. Epstein's guilty plea and sentencing hearings. Worse, throughout the process, the victims were denied the reasonable right to confer with the prosecutors; this flies in the face of the Crime Victims' Rights Act we authored.

I am very concerned that Mr. Acosta's office did not treat the victims "with fairness and with respect for the victim's dignity and privacy" as required by law. Rather, according to the victims, Mr. Acosta's office "deliberately kept [them] 'in the dark' so that it could enter the deal" without hearing objections. These allegations raise serious concerns.

From his position of immense power and responsibility, Mr. Acosta failed, and the consequences were devastating.

Another deeply troubling aspect of Mr. Acosta's record comes from his tenure when he led the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division from August 2003 to June 2005. According to the Justice Department's inspector general, that office repeatedly used political or ideological tests to hire career civil servants in violation of federal law.

During his confirmation hearing before the HELP Committee, Mr. Acosta himself admitted that discriminatory actions were taken under his supervision and that they should not have happened.

At a time when the public's faith in government institutions is eroding on a daily basis, Mr. Acosta's handling of these high-profile incidents lead me to question his ability to carry out the duties of Labor Secretary with fairness and impartiality.

This doubt is further compounded by statements that Mr. Acosta made during his hearing regarding whether he will exercise independence in upholding and enforcing certain rules and regulations, such as the fiduciary rule and overtime rule to protect workers.

In response to such questions, Mr. Acosta avoided making a commitment to uphold these rules as Secretary of Labor, and I am greatly concerned that he may not look out for the best interests of workers.

All of the issues I have outlined here simply do not allow me, in good faith, to vote in favor of Mr. Acosta's nomination.

Thank you.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I am honored to speak here today in support of Alex Acosta, and I wholeheartedly encourage my colleagues to support his nomination to be our next Secretary of Labor. I know this nominee well. As a fellow Floridian and as a native of Miami, I have been familiar with his work for many years. As I said when the President nominated him, I think he is an outstanding choice to lead the Department of Labor.

Alex has an impressive academic record. He has two degrees from Harvard—the first from Harvard College and then from Harvard Law School.

He also has a sterling record of public service in the State of Florida and in the United States of America. He was a member of the National Labor Relations Board. He was appointed by President George W. Bush and served from 2002 to 2003. From there, he was selected by President Bush to serve as Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, where he also served as Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General in that office. He also served our Nation as the U.S. Attorney in one of the most challenging districts in our country—Florida's Southern District.

Most recently, Alex has served the State of Florida as the dean of Florida International University College of Law, where he has been instrumental in raising the still young school's profile and in its graduating young men and women who are now well prepared to excel in their legal careers.

With every challenge he has confronted throughout his distinguished career, he has demonstrated his ability

to effectively tackle with ease the problems at hand. He is a brilliant legal mind, someone with a deep knowledge of labor issues, and he is a proven leader and a proven manager. It is for these reasons and many more that I am confident that Alex Acosta will serve this Nation admirably.

He was—listen to this—previously confirmed unanimously by the Senate for three different positions in the U.S. Government. This man is not even 50 years old, and he has already been confirmed unanimously by the Senate for three separate positions. I believe that in a few moments, he will be one step closer to being confirmed to his fourth. He is well qualified for this role, and I look forward to working with him to ensure that Americans are equipped with the skills they need to be successful in the 21st-century economy.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of R. Alexander Acosta, of Florida, to be Secretary of Labor.

John Barrasso, Susan M. Collins, Ron Johnson, Deb Fischer, Luther Strange, Bill Cassidy, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, David Perdue, Lamar Alexander, Tom Cotton, Orrin G. Hatch, Todd Young, Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, Dan Sullivan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of R. Alexander Acosta, of Florida, to be Secretary of Labor shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 61, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 115 Ex.]

YEAS—61

Alexander	Graham	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Perdue
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heitkamp	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Capito	Hoeben	Rounds
Cassidy	Inhofe	Rubio
Cochran	Isakson	Sasse
Collins	Johnson	Scott
Corker	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Strange
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McCain	Tillis
Daines	McCaskill	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	Menendez	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young
Flake	Murkowski	
Gardner	Nelson	

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Feinstein	Murray
Bennet	Franken	Peters
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Reed
Booker	Harris	Sanders
Brown	Hassan	Schatz
Cantwell	Heinrich	Schumer
Cardin	Hirono	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Udall
Coons	Leahy	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markey	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). On this vote, the yeas are 61, the nays are 39.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, when workers and families fought back against President Trump's first disastrous pick for Secretary of Labor, Andrew Puzder, they made it clear that they want a Secretary of Labor who will fight for their interests, especially as President Trump continues to break promise after promise he made to workers on the campaign trail. I couldn't agree with them more. As bad as Puzder would have been, our standard cannot be "not Puzder."

Never has it been so critical to have a Secretary of Labor who is committed to putting workers' protections and rights first, even if that means standing up to President Trump. It is with this in mind that I cannot support Alexander Acosta to run the Department of Labor.

Given Mr. Acosta's professional history, I have serious concerns about whether undue political pressure would impact decision making at the Department. My concerns were only heightened at his nomination hearing, when Mr. Acosta said he would defer to President Trump on the priorities of the Department of Labor. The Trump administration has already cemented a reputation for flouting ethics rules and attempting to exert political pressure over Federal employees. We need a Secretary of Labor who will prioritize workers and the mission of the Department of Labor over special interests and political pressure.

Unfortunately, Mr. Acosta's time leading the civil rights division at the Department of Justice suggests he will not be the mission-focused Secretary of Labor workers across the country have demanded. A formal investigation by the inspector general showed that, under Acosta's tenure, the civil rights division illegally considered applicants' political opinions in making hiring decisions, ignoring their professional qualifications. As Assistant Attorney General, Acosta chose to recuse himself from consideration of a Texas redistricting plan, instead, allowing political appointees to overrule career attorneys who believe the plan discriminated against Black and Latino voters.

Mr. Acosta's past raises questions about whether—instead of making workers' rights and protections the priorities of that Department—he will allow political pressure to influence his decision making.

Mr. Acosta's refusal to take a strong stand on many of the most pressing issues workers face today was equally concerning. We need a Secretary of Labor who is committed to expanding overtime pay to more workers, fighting for equal pay, and maintaining protections for our workers. But in responding to questions about those priorities, Mr. Acosta made it clear that he simply plans to defer to President Trump, who has already made it abundantly clear that he will not stand up for workers.

Mr. Acosta continued to evade addressing my concerns about how he would prioritize workers' interests at the Department of Labor in our followup questions. We need a Secretary of Labor who will remain committed to the core principles of the Department of Labor—someone who will prioritize the best interests of our workforce, who will enforce laws that protect workers' rights and safety and livelihoods, and who will seek to expand economic opportunities for workers and families across our country.

Unfortunately, Alexander Acosta has failed to show he will stand up to President Trump and prioritize those principles and help our workers get ahead. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to listen to the millions of workers who have made their voices heard about the need for a Secretary of Labor who is committed to building an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top, and vote against this nomination.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

(The remarks of Mr. DURBIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 948 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

GULF OF MEXICO OIL DRILLING MORATORIUM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to address the Senate on the occasion of the solemn memorial of 7 years since the Deepwater Horizon explosion and the resulting oilspill, where 11 workmen were tragically killed.

The oilspill fouled the sensitive gulf ecosystem in ways that we still do not fully realize. Yet we are hearing today that the President is expected to issue an Executive order this week that ignores the implications of that tragedy, which was also the largest environmental disaster in U.S. history, by blindly encouraging more drilling in very sensitive areas.

I can tell you that drilling off the coast of Florida's neighboring States poses a real threat to our State's environment and our multibillion-dollar tourism industry, and that is because a spill off the coast of Louisiana can end up on the beaches of northwest Florida, just like a spill off the coast of Virginia or South Carolina can affect the entire Atlantic coast.

BP, as a result of Deepwater Horizon, agreed to pay more than \$20 billion in penalties to clean up the 2010 oilspill and repay gulf residents for lost revenue. But, apparently, that wasn't enough, if BP's recent spill in Alaska is any indication.

So we shouldn't be surprised, since oil companies and their friends have fought against any new safety standards or requirements, that the President still wants to open up additional waters to drilling, despite the fact that we haven't applied the lessons learned from Deepwater Horizon. This is at a time when the United States has been able to find all new reserves of oil and gas onshore. So we are not in a time of a shortage of discovery or a shortage of oil reserves. Our domestic energy market is being affected by the low price of natural gas, since so much of the reserves are just tremendous here in the continental United States.

The most visible change since the Deepwater Horizon spill is the division of the Minerals Management Service into the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement. All of those changes were made as a result of trying to improve things after the BP spill, but it doesn't seem to have made any major improvements in oversight, according to a report issued by the GAO last month.

So I have come to the floor to try to alert other Senators about the importance of preserving the moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. It makes no sense to put Florida's multibillion-dollar, tourism-driven economy at risk.

And there is something else at risk.

The Department of Defense has stated numerous times—I have two letters from two Republican Secretaries of Defense that say it—that drilling and oil-related activities are incompatible with our military training and weapons testing. That is the area known as the gulf training range. It is in the Gulf of Mexico off of Florida. It is the largest testing and training range for the United States military in the world.

Now, in that gulf training range is where the pilots of the F-22 are trained. That is at Tyndall Air Force Base. It is where the new F-35 pilots are trained, by the way, not only for the United States but also for the many foreign nations that have bought F-35s. Of course, that is essential to our national security.

That is just pilot training. That doesn't speak of the testing done on some of our most sophisticated weapons over hundreds and hundreds of miles of restricted airspace.

Oh, by the way, when the U.S. Navy Atlantic Fleet shut down our training in Puerto Rico and the island of Vieques, where do you think a lot of that training came to? The Navy still has to train. So they will send their squadrons down to Key West Naval Air Station at Boca Chica Key. When those pilots and their F-18 Hornets lift off the runway, within 2 minutes they are out over the Gulf of Mexico in restricted airspace. So they don't spend a lot of fuel and a lot of time to get there.

That is why a lot of our colleagues across the State of Florida on the other side of the aisle—in other words, this is bipartisan—have weighed in with this administration, urging continued protection for the largest military testing and training area in the world.

Opposition to drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico is bipartisan, bicameral—the Senate and House—but so is our opposition to drilling off the Atlantic coast.

Now, let me just distinguish between the two. Years ago, my then-Republican colleague Senator Mel Martinez and I both offered in law an exemption until the year 2022 of any oil drilling off of the coast of Florida. It is actually everything east of what is called the Military Mission Line. It is virtually the Gulf of Mexico off of Florida. Of course we did that for the reasons that I have already stated. That is in law up until 2022. But the administration will be coming forth with another plan for the 5-year period for oil drilling offshore for the years 2023 up through 2028.

It is my hope that the words of this Senator and the words of our bipartisan colleagues from the Florida delegation will convince the administration that it is not wise to impede the military's necessary training and testing area, not even to speak of the tremendous economic deprivation that will come as a result of an oil spill.

Just think back to the BP spill. Think back to the time when the beaches, the sugary-white sands of Pensacola Beach, were completely covered with oil. That picture—a very notable picture, a contrast of the black oil on top of the white sand—went around the world.

The winds started blowing the oil from the BP spill off the coast of Louisiana. The winds continued to blow it to the east, and so some of the oil got into Pensacola Bay, some of the oil started getting into Choctawhatchee Bay, and some oil got on the beautiful beaches of Destin and Fort Walton Beach. The winds took it as far east as the Panama City beaches. There they received basically tar balls on the beach. Then the winds reversed and started taking it back to the west, so none of the other beaches all the way down the coast of Florida—Clearwater, St. Petersburg, on down to the beaches off of Bradenton, Sarasota, Fort Myers, Naples, and all the way down to Marco

Island—none of those beaches received the oil because the wind didn't keep blowing it that way. But the entire west coast of Florida lost an entire tourist season because our guests, our visitors, the tourists, didn't come because they had seen those pictures and they thought that oil was on all of our beaches.

Let me tell you how risky that was. In the Gulf of Mexico, there is something known as the Loop Current. It comes through the separation of the Yucatan Peninsula of Mexico and the western end of Cuba and goes up into the gulf, and then it loops and comes south in the gulf. It hugs the Florida Keys and becomes the Gulf Stream that hugs the east coast of Florida. And about midway down the peninsula, it starts to leave the coast, follows and parallels the east coast of the United States, and eventually goes to Northern Europe. That is the Gulf Stream.

Had that oil spill been blown south from Louisiana and had the Loop Current come enough north, that oil spill would have gotten in the Loop Current, and it would have taken it down past the very fragile coral reefs of the Florida Keys and right up the beaches of Southeast Florida, where there is a huge tourism business.

By the way, the Gulf Stream hugs the coast in some cases only a mile off of the beach.

That is the hard economic reality of what could happen to Florida's tourism industry, not only on the west coast, as it already did in that season of the BP oil spill, but what could happen on the east coast of Florida too.

Opposition to drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico is certainly bipartisan, but so is the opposition to drilling off the Atlantic coast. In the last Congress, Members from both parties joined together to file a House companion to the legislation this Senator had filed that would prohibit seismic testing in the Atlantic off of Florida. The type of seismic airgun testing companies wanted to use to search for oil and gas would threaten thousands of marine mammals and fish, including endangered species such as the North American right whale. The blast from seismic airguns can cause permanent hearing loss for whales and dolphins, which disrupts their feeding, calving, and breeding.

In addition to the environmental damage those surveys would cause, businesses up and down the Atlantic coast would also suffer from drilling activity. Over 35,000 businesses and over 500,000 commercial fishing families have registered their opposition to offshore drilling in the Atlantic. From fishermen, to hotel owners, to restaurateurs, coastal residents and business owners understand it is too dangerous to risk the environment and the economy on which they depend.

There is one unique industry that opposes drilling off the Florida east coast. We made the case way back in the 1980s when Secretary of the Inte-

rior James Watt decided he was going to drill from Cape Hatteras, NC, all the way south to Fort Pierce, FL. This Senator was a young Congressman then and took this case on and finally convinced the Appropriations Committee not to include any funds for the execution and offering of those leases. It was a simple fact that that was where we were launching our space shuttle then, as well as our military rockets from Cape Canaveral, and you simply can't have oil rigs out there and be dropping the first stages and the solid rocket boosters from the space shuttle.

As we know, the Cape has come alive with activity—a lot of commercial rocketry, as well as the mainstays for our military space program. In a year and a half, NASA will launch the largest rocket ever, one-third more powerful than the Saturn V, which was the rocket that took us to the Moon, and that is the beginning of the Mars program, as we are going to Mars with humans. Because of that space industry—whether it is commercial or whether it is civilian NASA or whether it is military—you simply can't have oil rigs out there in the Atlantic where we are dropping the first stages of those rockets. That is common sense.

When President Obama took the Atlantic coast off the table from 2017 to 2022—that 5-year period planning in the offshore drilling plan—Floridians finally breathed a deep sigh of relief. They sighed happily too. If President Trump intends to open up those areas to drilling, his administration will receive and can expect to receive a flood of opposition from the folks who know what is going to happen.

It is this week—and here we are mid-week—that we are expecting the Trump administration to move forward with an Executive order that would ignore the wishes of coastal communities. I want to say that the areas off of Florida in the east coast of the Atlantic are very sensitive, as I have just outlined, but there is nothing to say that if you have a spill off of Georgia or South Carolina, that it can't move south, and that starts the problem all over.

This announcement by the President will be like a big present for the oil companies, which, by the way, in areas in the Gulf of Mexico that are rich with oil—and there are, in fact, active leases that are not producing the oil. Why would they want to grant more leases in areas that are important to preserve the Nation's economy as well as our military preparedness?

I hope the President thinks twice before putting Florida's economy at such a risk. I hope he refrains from issuing this Executive order, but if he doesn't, this Senator and a bipartisan delegation from Florida will fight this order.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues in the Senate to oppose the nomination of Alexander Acosta for Labor Secretary.

The test of whether a nominee is qualified to be Labor Secretary is a pretty simple one: Will that person stand up for 150 million American workers and their families? Mr. Acosta has had multiple opportunities in more than 2 months since he was nominated for this position to demonstrate that he would stand up for workers, and time after time, he has refused.

Americans deserve to know where a nominee like Mr. Acosta stands on key policy matters that will have a powerful impact on the lives of working people.

At Mr. Acosta's confirmation hearing, I asked him where he stood on three policy issues that are important to working Americans and their families.

First, will you promise not to delay a rule that will protect 2.3 million Americans from being poisoned by lethal cancer-causing silica on the job?

Second, will you appeal a Texas court's injunction that has halted implementation of a new overtime rule that would give 4.2 million Americans a \$1.5 billion raise in a single year?

And third, will you promise not to delay a rule that will stop investment advisers from cheating retirees out of an estimated \$17 billion a year?

Now, these are not tough questions. For most people, these would have been total softballs: Will you keep workers from being poisoned, will you make sure that employers pay for overtime, and will you make sure that investment advisers aren't cheating retirees? Come on. This is the very least that a Labor Secretary can do—the very least.

Mr. Acosta refused to answer a single one of these questions. Instead, he bobbed and weaved, stalled and repeated my questions; he even insisted that these topics were so complex that he needed more time to study them. And it wasn't just my questions that Mr. Acosta refused to answer. He spent more than 2 hours ducking, hand-waving, and dodging basic questions from committee members—both Democrats and Republicans—questions about whether he would commit to stand up for workers on issues that profoundly affect their health, their safety, and their economic security.

Mr. Acosta has been so evasive about his views that we still have virtually no idea what he will do to help or harm workers if he is confirmed for this job.

The fact that Mr. Acosta isn't willing to step up on easy questions and tell us that he will be on the side of workers tells us a lot about him—and none of it is good.

That is particularly troubling, since Mr. Acosta is President Trump's nominee, and we can see how President Trump treats workers. In less than 100 days on the job, President Trump has managed to kill, weaken, or undermine an unprecedented number of protections for working people.

He signed a bill to make it easier for government contractors to steal wages from their employees.

He signed a bill to make it easier for employers to hide injuries and deaths that their workers suffer on the job.

He signed a bill to keep cities from offering retirement accounts to more than 2 million employees who don't have access to a retirement plan on the job.

He delayed a rule protecting workers from lethal, cancer-causing beryllium.

He delayed a rule protecting construction workers from deadly silica.

And he delayed a rule preventing investment advisers from cheating retirees—a rule that will save hard-working Americans about \$17 billion a year.

That is a pretty long list, and it doesn't even include the devastating impact to workers of the President's proposed 20-percent cut to the Labor Department funding, which means fewer cops on the beat when employers steal wages or force people into unsafe working conditions.

During his campaign, President Trump talked a big game about standing up for workers and creating good, high-paying jobs. But if his first 100 days are any indication, his real plan is to keep corporate profits soaring by gutting the rules that American workers depend on to keep money in their pockets, food on their tables, and to keep them safe in the workplace.

Unlike President Trump's first failed nominee for this job, Mr. Acosta is not openly contemptuous of people who work hard for a living, and I suppose we should be thankful for that. But that is not the test for Labor Secretary. The test for Labor Secretary is whether this person will stand up for American workers.

Mr. Acosta won't make that commitment, and he has made it perfectly clear that he sure won't stand up to President Trump. That is just not good enough. Because of this ongoing evasiveness, I have no confidence that Mr. Acosta is the right choice for this position, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing his confirmation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the role.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF ROD ROSENSTEIN

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I wish to speak about my vote yesterday on the nomination of Rod Rosenstein to be Deputy Attorney General at the U.S. Department of Justice. I voted no on his nomination not because I think he is unqualified or because I think he is unfit for the job. He is neither of those things. Rather, I opposed his nomination because of the troubling actions the Justice Department is taking on criminal justice, civil rights, and immigration issues and because I firmly believe a special prosecutor is needed to investigate Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election.

Since taking over as our Nation's top law enforcement official, Attorney General Sessions has indicated he wishes to roll back certain actions taken during the Obama administration. For instance, Attorney General Sessions is considering changes to existing Justice Department drug charging policies. I am concerned he will direct Federal prosecutors to increase the use of mandatory minimum penalties in low-level, nonviolent drug cases. Since 1980, our Federal prison population has increased by nearly 800 percent in large part because of the failed war on drugs and the use of mandatory minimums. Increasing the utilization of mandatory minimums will not make us safer or fix our broken criminal justice system. To the contrary, it will come at great cost—not only to American taxpayers, but to public safety, to families, and to confidence in our justice system. As Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Rosenstein will play a critical role in enacting those changes to existing charging policies.

Attorney General Sessions also recently indicated that the Justice Department may reverse its policy on the use of consent decrees to combat civil rights abuses by law enforcement when they occur. He has consistently criticized the use of consent decrees, and in his first major speech as Attorney General, he vowed to "pull back" on Federal suits against State and local police departments for civil rights abuses. There is no doubt that America's law enforcement community deserves our utmost respect and protection. These brave women and men have answered the call to serve and the vast majority of them serve with integrity. However, the Justice Department plays a critical role in assisting police departments struggling to combat systemic practices that unfairly target

minorities. Scaling back on the use of consent decrees means civil rights violations may not be remedied. As Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Rosenstein will play a critical role in reversing course on the use of consent decrees.

Finally, the pending investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election has caused deep concern and anxiety for many Americans. We owe it to the public to conduct an investigation that is beyond reproach and ensure that every person, regardless of their political affiliation, has confidence in the results no matter what they are. While Mr. Rosenstein is undoubtedly a man of integrity, such an investigation can only be conducted by an independent, special prosecutor. It concerns me that, in his confirmation hearing, Mr. Rosenstein would not commit to appointing such a person.

Mr. Rosenstein has served his country with honor and distinction. He is well respected on both sides of the aisle. In most circumstances, I believe I would have supported his nomination. However, the disturbing agenda on civil and human rights of the Trump administration and the actions Attorney General Sessions continues to advance at the Justice Department and Mr. Rosenstein's responses to questions regarding this agenda at his confirmation hearing leave me deeply troubled about the role he will play as the second highest ranking individual at the Department. For those reasons, I voted no on his nomination to be Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I supported Rod Rosenstein's nomination to become Deputy Attorney General. Throughout his 27-year career, Mr. Rosenstein has earned a reputation as a fair and focused administrator of justice. He has served in Maryland in both Republican and Democratic administrations and has earned the distinction of being the longest serving U.S. attorney in the country.

I had the honor to introduce Mr. Rosenstein to the Senate Judiciary Committee at his confirmation hearing. He has aggressively prosecuted not only dangerous gangs and criminals in Maryland but also elected officials who violated the people's trust. He has shown impartiality in these investigations, and his successful prosecutions have led to ethics reforms that increased transparency and public confidence in Maryland.

When Mr. Rosenstein and I met recently, I asked him if he supported the consent decree negotiated between the Obama administration and the city of Baltimore. He assured me that, if the court formally entered the consent decree, he would support its implementation. Attorney General Sessions, however, has frequently expressed skepticism about consent decrees. Baltimore is the only city to invite the Justice Department to conduct a thorough, methodical analysis of its police department in order to foster transparency and increase trust between po-

lice officers and Baltimore city residents. As the former U.S. attorney in Maryland, Mr. Rosenstein is well acquainted with the challenges that the city faces. He has prosecuted corruption charges against Baltimore city police officers and should recognize the importance of reform and effective community policing. I trust Mr. Rosenstein will keep his promise to support the consent decree.

In addition to being a top-notch lawyer, Mr. Rosenstein is known for the professional manner in which he runs his current office. In his letter of support, Maryland's Attorney General Brian Frosh notes that Mr. Rosenstein "inherited an office in turmoil" when he became Maryland's U.S. attorney, but with a "steady hand and superb management," created a department that is now universally respected. Those skills will be put to the test immediately. Mr. Rosenstein will assume the office of Deputy Attorney General at a tumultuous time for the Justice Department. His job will be to serve justice, not political leaders.

As Mr. Rosenstein and I discussed, the question for him is the same that then-Senator Sessions posed to Sally Yates during her hearing to become Deputy Attorney General. Senator Sessions said: "You have to watch out because people will be asking you to do things you just need to say no about." Senator Sessions then asked: "Do you think the Attorney General has the responsibility to say no to the President if he asks for something that's improper?" Like Sally Yates, Mr. Rosenstein said that he would be willing to put his job on the line to uphold the integrity of the Department of Justice.

I believe that any investigation into the ties between the Trump administration and Russian interference in our elections will require the appointment of an independent special counsel, and I have also joined my fellow Senators in calling for a nonpartisan commission.

I also made clear to Mr. Rosenstein that, if the FBI Director did, in fact, request that the Justice Department deny President Trump's unsubstantiated claims that the Obama administration wiretapped Trump Tower, then the Justice Department has a duty to immediately let the public know the truth.

It is vitally important that the American public have faith that our laws apply equally to all Americans, regardless of rank or position. Rod Rosenstein has applied that principle faithfully during his time as U.S. attorney in Maryland. It is essential that he apply the same principle at the Department of Justice.

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on April 26 of each year, we celebrate World Intellectual Property Day and recognize the important role of intel-

lectual property rights in the fabric of our society. This year, we take time to recognize the innovators and creators who are making our lives healthier, safer, and more productive through their ingenuity and the robust system of intellectual property protections enshrined in our laws.

The Founding Fathers recognized the value of intellectual property, empowering Congress "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."

Placing this authority within Congress's enumerated powers underscores the weight that our Founding Fathers placed on intellectual property's value to the budding Nation as a means of fostering economic development and growth. Our success as a nation in agriculture, manufacturing, technology, and medicine shares a common thread of intellectual property rights.

True to their predictions, our system of intellectual property has fostered innovation and ensured America's role as an economic engine of inventions that have made us healthier, safer, and more secure.

Our system of intellectual property rights has evolved since the ratification of the Constitution and the passage of the Copyright Act of 1790, but its core mission of promoting innovation has remained constant.

Our innovators and creators rely on IP protections such as patents, trademarks, copyrights, and trade secrets to help drive and recoup their investments of ingenuity.

Of course, the innovation that intellectual property helps encourage benefits society more broadly as well. It drives enormous economic activity and development, helping assure America's place as an economic and intellectual beacon to the world. As the U.S. Chamber's Global Intellectual Property Center recently pointed out, IP-intensive industries employ over 40 million Americans, accounting for 34.8 percent of total U.S. gross domestic product.

Iowans have long held intellectual property as an integral part of our economy. Our commitment to growth and innovation has led to \$11.2 billion in annual IP-related exports from the State, more than 667,000 IP-related jobs, and 19.9 percent higher wages for direct IP workers than non-IP workers.

As a society, we depend on innovators to make our lives better and to solve the challenges we face. These innovators, in turn, depend on different forms of intellectual property.

The Judiciary Committee will continue to play an important role in protecting intellectual property and we will continue to work to advance innovation. This week, Senator LEAHY and I reintroduced the Patents for Humanity Program Improvement Act to encourage and reward companies that innovate and use patented technology to

address humanitarian needs. This legislation improves the incentives for small businesses to participate in the program, by ensuring that the prize—a certificate for expedited processing of certain matters at the USPTO—can be transferable to third parties.

Yesterday, we held a hearing with witnesses from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and industry innovators who described the central role that intellectual property has played in allowing their businesses to grow and innovate. We also heard about some of the enforcement challenges that those in IP-intensive industries face as they seek to protect their intellectual property.

As a cochair of the Congressional Trademark Caucus, which we just relaunched this week, I recognize the value of trademarks and their impact on society and the economy, as well as how counterfeiting can seriously impact consumer health and safety. Counterfeiting of goods presents a worldwide problem with enormous health and economic impacts, costing the global economy over 2.5 million jobs per year, while draining tax revenue and hurting the ability of American companies to compete in foreign markets.

Similarly, trade secret theft is an increasingly serious problem. A report by the IP Commission found that annual losses due to trade secret theft are over \$300 billion and is the cause of an estimated loss of 2.1 million American jobs. That is why we passed into law the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016. This important legislation brings needed uniformity to trade secret law and provides more certainty to the innovators who rely on trade secrets to develop novel solutions to important problems that face us as a nation.

Intellectual property is a key driver of innovation and fundamental building block of our modern economy. This World IP Day, as we recognize the positive impacts IP has on innovation, let us continue to find ways to work together to ensure its protection against infringement and maintain the United States enduring position as the most innovative and creative country in the world.

TRIBUTE TO MARK SCHLEFER

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate and honor a Vermont resident for his outstanding commitment to ensuring transparency between the Federal Government and the American public. Mark Schlefer of Putney, VT, played an integral role in the creation of the Freedom of Information Act, FOIA, that came into effect in 1967. Since its incorporation, FOIA has given the American people the right to request to access records from any Federal agency and has required agencies to post certain categories of information and frequently requested records online.

Mr. Schlefer was inspired to join the legal group that drafted FOIA after

working with a shipping client, Pacific Far East Line, which was denied tariff documentation to stop at the Mariana Islands by the Federal Maritime Commission. Mr. Schlefer was upset to find that the Federal Maritime Commission was not required to provide an explanation of the justification behind the rejection.

Along with two other lawyers who came across similar situations with government agencies, Mr. Schlefer helped to draft the legislation for FOIA. After years of working on the bill and convincing both Members of the House and the Senate to support the legislation, it was signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson on July 4, 1966.

FOIA helped pave the way for greater government transparency. Increased transparency restores faith in governance by holding government officials accountable to the American people. A truly transparent government roots out systemic waste, fraud, and abuse. It is clear that we need to maintain the transparency and accountability of government to the people it is meant to represent. I strongly believe that, as a democracy, we must strive to make our government as transparent as possible and that citizens should be able to obtain information from the government in a reasonable fashion.

Without FOIA, much of the U.S. Government would still be closed off to the American people. This legislation has been an inspiration to other governments and has served as a model throughout the world for opening government information to the public. Since FOIA was enacted nearly 50 years ago, similar Freedom of Information laws have been passed in all 50 States and 93 other nations.

Mark Shlefer has demonstrated an extraordinary level of commitment to ensuring the American people had access to more information throughout the Federal Government. Since its initial enactment, all three branches of the Federal Government have recognized the FOIA as a vital part of our democracy. I heartily applaud Mr. Schlefer for leading the way to a more transparent government. I have no doubt that his outstanding life work has had a significant and positive impact on people and their governments throughout the world.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE STIVERS AND BRAD WENSTRUP

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like to recognize my friend and colleague, Congressman STEVE STIVERS, and congratulate him on his promotion to brigadier general in the Ohio National Guard.

STEVE has served our State and our Nation in uniform for more than three decades. When his guard unit was called up in 2005, he served our country in Operation Iraqi Freedom. His leadership earned him the Bronze Star, and his service and sacrifice earned him the honor of a grateful nation.

But STEVE hasn't been content to only serve in uniform—he is working to support his fellow soldiers in Congress. He and I have worked together to make sure that servicemembers who suffer traumatic brain injuries have their medical records given from the DOD to the VA. We are working to designate the new Ohio veterans Museum in Columbus as the National Veterans Museum.

As persuasive as STEVE is, he is nothing compared to his mother. A few years ago, STEVE's mother, Carol, brought to my attention the need to preserve the Parker House—a way station on the Underground Railroad located in Ripley, OH. She wanted to incorporate it into the National Park System.

I worked with STEVE, who of course couldn't say no to his mother, and others in the Ohio delegation, including JOYCE BEATTY, to preserve this house where a freed slave worked and helped others find their way to freedom. This January, the National Park Service award \$50,000 to the Ohio History Connection to help preserve the sites throughout Ohio that played critical roles in the civil rights movement, including the Parker House.

STEVE is not the only member of our delegation to carry on the proud tradition of Ohioans serving our Nation in uniform. I would also like to congratulate my friend BRAD WENSTRUP on his promotion to colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve.

BRAD also served a tour in Iraq as a combat surgeon. He was awarded a Bronze Star and a Combat Action Badge and earned the honor and gratitude of all Ohioans. It is not just overseas where BRAD serves our troops. He fulfills his Reserve duties, treating our wounded soldiers at Walter Reed, and fights to ensure our servicemembers and veterans have the support they deserve on the House Armed Services Committee and Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Whether it is supporting our State's civil rights heritage or supporting our troops, BRAD and STEVE have always been dedicated public servants for Ohio. They are both so deserving of these promotions. We thank them and their entire families—STEVE's wife, Karen, and children Sarah and Sam, and BRAD's wife, Monica, and son Brad, Jr.—for their sacrifice for our country.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING INA M. BOON

● Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me today in honoring the life of Ina Boon, a beloved member of the St. Louis community. With her passing, Ina has left a powerful legacy of public service that will always be cherished, and St. Louis will not be the same without her.

In addition to being a wife, a mother, and dear friend to so many, Ina was a

fighter. Not the kind you see shuffling in rings on television; Ina was a special kind of warrior. Her weapons were her voice, her feet, and, as anyone who knew her would tell you, her tenacious nature. Her cause was one that is dear and relevant to every American—true freedom, equality, and justice for all. For decades, Ina fought on the front lines of the civil rights movement for justice and equality for all citizens in my home State of Missouri and in numerous other States throughout the country.

For more than 50 years, Ina was the fearless leader who served tirelessly at the helm of the St. Louis NAACP Region IV branch. Whether she was advocating for diversity and inclusion in hiring and housing practices, fighting for equal access and fair treatment in healthcare and education, or helping young people find jobs and urging them to register to vote, Ina's life reveals an inspiring commitment to social change and progress.

Her half-century record of service provides a clear example of how much good can be accomplished with a steadfast and caring spirit. At the same time, Ina's life shows the selfless and generous heart of a public servant. When times were lean at NAACP, Ina worked hard and faithfully while giving up her pay. Additionally, even though she was committed to large-scale, systemic social changes across the State and country, Ina was equally committed to her family and her neighbors. She nurtured her son, mentored young people, and remained active in her church, serving in various leadership positions.

Ina recently passed away at the age of 90. She was blessed to live a long life and bear witness to some incredible historic moments in our State's history and our country's history as well. I know that Ina was humbled to play a role in some of these moments. With Ina's passing, we have lost a prolific public servant and a dynamic individual. Ina is survived by her son Gentry, as well as nieces, nephews, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and a host of extended family members and friends.

It may come as small comfort to them, but Ina will forever be a part of St. Louis history. She will always be remembered for her leadership, passion, and activism. Right now, many of my fellow Missourians are justifiably saddened by the loss of one of our local champions, but my hope is that Ina's legacy will inspire current and future generations of leaders to continue the vitally important work of perfecting our vibrant, diverse Union.

I ask that the Senate join me in honoring the life and legacy of Mrs. Ina M. Boon. ●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:10 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, an-

nounced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 455. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

H.R. 534. An act to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 876. An act to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1372. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to ensure that the needs of children are considered in homeland security planning, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition.

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 455. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 534. An act to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 876. An act to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1372. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to ensure that the needs of children are considered in homeland security planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1386. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bacillus Thuringiensis (mCry51Aa2) Protein in or on Cotton; Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9957-23) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1387. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Bacillus simplex strain BU288; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9960-61) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1388. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pyrooxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9959-25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1389. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pyriofenone; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9953-96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1390. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Deltamethrin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9959-54) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1391. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benzobicyclon; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9951-02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1392. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tioxazafen; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9955-97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1393. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert S. Ferrell, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1394. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael E. Williamson, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1395. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Patrick J. Donahue II, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1396. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary (Terrorism and Financial Intelligence), Department of the Treasury, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1397. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics,

and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary (International Markets and Development), Department of the Treasury, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1398. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1399. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic that was declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1400. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was originally declared in Executive Order 13611 on May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1401. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment" (RIN1333-AE67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1402. A communication from the Minority Whip of the Puerto Rico House of Representatives, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA) and its expenditures; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1403. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; General Permit to Limit Potential to Emit from Major Stationary Sources of Air Pollution" (FRL No. 9952-93-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1404. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead, 2008 Ozone, 2010 NO₂, 2010 SO₂, and 2012 PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Wyoming" (FRL No. 9958-35-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1405. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; CT; Approval of Single Source Orders" (FRL No. 9958-37-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1406. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; ME; Emission Statement Reporting" (FRL No. 9961-42-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1407. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Rhode Island; Repeal of NO_x Budget Trading Program" (FRL No. 9961-57-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1408. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; TN: Non-interference Demonstration for Federal Low-Reid Vapor Pressure Requirement in Middle Tennessee" (FRL No. 9961-48-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1409. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Revision of Regulations for Sulfur Content of Fuel Oil" (FRL No. 9961-31-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1410. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Plans; State of Maryland; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incineration Units" (FRL No. 9961-37-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1411. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; State of Delaware, District of Columbia, and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, City of Philadelphia; Control of Emissions from Existing Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incinerator Units" (FRL No. 9961-23-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1412. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Arizona Air Plan Revisions, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality and Pinal County Air Quality Control District" (FRL No. 9961-36-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1413. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Butte County Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9957-15-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate

on April 11, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1414. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Housing Cost Amounts Eligible for Exclusion or Deduction for 2017" (Notice 2017-21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 24, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1415. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Examination of Returns and Claims for Refund, Credit, or Abatement; Determination of Correct Tax Liability" (Rev. Proc. 2017-26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 24, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1416. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—February 2017" (Rev. Rul. 2017-4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1417. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Application of Modified Carryover Basis to General Basis Rules" ((RIN1545-BK09) (TD 9811)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1418. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Transfers of Certain Property by U.S. Persons to Partnerships with Related Foreign Partners" ((RIN1545-BM95) (TD 9814)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1419. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to targeted missile strikes on the Shayrat military airfield in Syria, received during adjournment of the Senate on April 8, 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1420. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017-0069-2017-0076); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1421. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules for Certain Reserves" (Rev. Rul. 2017-3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1422. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Title I—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged (Subpart C—Migrant Education Program)" (RIN1810-AA99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April

21, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1423. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation" (RIN1810-AA16) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1424. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Requirements to Submit Prior Notice of Imported Food; Technical Amendments" (Docket No. FDA-2017-N-0011) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1425. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Market Stabilization" ((RIN0938-AT14) (CMS-9929-F)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 18, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1426. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's amended fiscal year 2016 report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1427. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1428. A communication from the Executive Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's fiscal year 2016 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1429. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Transportation's fiscal year 2016 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1430. A communication from the Census Bureau Federal Register Liaison Officer, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Foreign Trade Regulations (FTR): Clarification on Filing Requirements" (RIN0607-AA55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1431. A communication from the Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2016 Data Mining Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1432. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the Department's activities during calendar year 2015 relative to prison rape abatement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1433. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0245) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1434. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8851) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1435. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0245) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1436. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8184) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1437. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9299)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1438. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6897)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1439. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0651) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1440. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of

Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Models Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9531)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1441. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; American Champion Aircraft Corp." ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0283)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1442. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0059)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1443. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Meggitt (Troy), Inc. Combustion Heaters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0603)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1444. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class C Airspace; Little Rock, AR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0233)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1445. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Louisville, GA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0581)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1446. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Monongahela, PA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9102)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1447. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Savannah, GA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9101)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1448. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (1); Amdt. No. 3740" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1449. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (69); Amdt. No. 3739" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1450. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (36); Amdt. No. 3741" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1451. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9385)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1452. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0879)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1453. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-7095)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1454. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0189)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1455. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-3257)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1456. A communication from the Deputy Under Secretary for Operations performing the duties of Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Chesapeake Bay Office Biennial Report to Congress; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1457. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "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" (RIN2130-AC59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1458. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2017 Revisions to the Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustment Tables" ((RIN2120-AK90) (Docket No. FAA-2016-7004)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1459. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Standard for Infant Bath Tubs" (CPSC Docket No. CPSC-2015-0019) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1460. A communication from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer, National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedule of Fees for Access to NOAA Environmental Data, Information, and Related Products and Services" (RIN0648-BG39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1461. A communication from the Acting Chief of Technology Transfer Office, John H. Glenn Research Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, a report relative to the Center's Technology Transfer Office; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 942. A bill to require a plan to combat international travel by terrorists and foreign fighters, accelerate the transfer of certain border security systems to foreign partner governments, establish minimum international border security standards, authorize the suspension of foreign assistance to countries not making significant efforts to comply with such minimum standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 943. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an accurate comprehensive student count for the purposes of calculating formula allocations for programs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. ERNST, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 944. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform and extend the incentives for biodiesel; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 945. 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEE, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 946. 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 Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 947. A bill to protect passengers on flights in air transportation from being denied boarding involuntarily, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 948. A bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 949. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to create a classification that more accurately reflects the vital role of wildland firefighters; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 950. A bill to correct problems pertaining to human resources for career and volunteer personnel engaged in wildland fire and structure fire; to the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 951. A bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 952. A bill to increase the role of the financial industry in combating human trafficking; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 953. A bill to require the United States Secret Service to make certain White House visitor logs available to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. UDALL):

S. Con. Res. 13. A concurrent resolution calling upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the abiding importance of the Helsinki Final Act and its relevance to the national security of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 236

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 372

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 372, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to ensure that merchandise arriving through the mail shall be subject to review by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and to require the provision of advance electronic information on shipments of mail to U.S. Customs and Border Protection and for other purposes.

S. 384

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 384, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 445

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 445, a bill to

amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 487

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 487, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to modernize the regulation of nuclear energy.

S. 534

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes.

S. 591

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 591, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 678

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 678, a bill to delcare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to

include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 819

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 819, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 842

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, a bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes.

S. 867

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 867, a bill to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. ERNST, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 944. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform and extend the incentives for biodiesel; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have long been a champion of domestic biofuel production, including ethanol, biodiesel and cellulosic fuels. Domestic biodiesel production supports tens of thousands of jobs. Replacing traditional diesel with biodiesel reduces emissions and creates cleaner air. Homegrown biodiesel improves our energy security by diversifying our transportation fuels and reducing our dependence on foreign oil. Biodiesel itself is a very diverse fuel. It can be produced from a wide array of resources such as recycled cooking oil, soybean and other plant oils, and animal fats.

I am proud of the success of the American biodiesel industry, and I am glad to be introducing today the American Renewable Fuel and Job Creation Act of 2017, which will ensure the continued success. I appreciate Senator CANTWELL's leadership in joining this effort. I also appreciate the support of Senators ROBERTS, HIRONO, BLUNT, WHITEHOUSE, ERNST, HEITKAMP, THUNE, UDALL, HEINRICH, SHAHEEN, KLOBUCHAR, FRANKEN, DONNELLY, and MURRAY. This bill will modify the biodiesel fuel blender's credit to a domestic production credit starting this year and extend the credit through 2020.

Congress created the biodiesel tax incentive in 2005 when I was chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. As a result of this incentive and the Renewable Fuel Standard, biodiesel is providing significant benefits to the nation.

Senator CANTWELL and I have been advocating the mixture credit be modified to a producer credit since 2009. Converting to a producer credit improves the incentive in many ways. The blenders credit can be difficult to administer because the blending of the fuel can occur at many different stages of the fuel distribution. This can make it difficult to ensure that only fuel that qualifies for the credit claims the incentive. It has been susceptible to abuse because of this.

A credit for domestic production will also ensure that we are incentivizing the domestic industry and associated American jobs, rather than subsidizing imported biofuels. A credit for domestic production will also ensure that we are incentivizing the domestic industry and associated American jobs, rather than subsidizing imported biofuels. Since 2014, we have seen imports increase from 510 million gallons to about 1 billion gallons in 2016, and already in the first quarter of 2017 imports are 10 percent higher than they were last year at this time.

We should not provide a U.S. taxpayer benefit to imported biofuels. By restricting the credit to domestic production, we will also save taxpayer money. The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation estimated a similar amendment adopted in the Finance Committee in 2015 would have reduced the cost of the extension by \$90 million for 2016 alone.

Importantly, modifying the credit will have little to no impact on the

consumer. Much of the credit will continue to be passed on to the blender and ultimately, the consumer. Additionally, the U.S. biodiesel industry is currently operating at approximately 65 percent of capacity, which does not even account for idled capacity. The fact is, the domestic biodiesel industry has the capacity and access to affordable feedstocks to meet the demand of U.S. consumers.

The current biodiesel credit expired at the end of 2016. Adoption of the American Renewable Fuel and Job Creation Act of 2017 should be strongly considered as part of tax reform efforts currently underway. Absent tax reform, Congress should include it as part of any tax legislation extending expired tax provisions.

Modifying the current blenders credit to a producers credit will ensure that the credit is doing what Congress intended—incentivizing investment in domestic biodiesel production and promoting American jobs. Surely we can agree that we should not be providing a U.S. taxpayer subsidy to already heavily subsidized foreign biodiesel imports. I therefore urge my colleagues to support the production of American biodiesel and this commonsense, cost reduction reform.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 945. 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 945

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 "New Hope and Opportunity through the Power of Employment Act" or the "New HOPE Act".

SEC. 2. STATE LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES.

Section 124(c) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2344(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16)(B), by striking "and" after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (17), by striking the period at the end and inserting ";; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:
 "(18) consulting and coordinating with other State agencies for the identification, consolidation, or elimination of licenses or certifications which pose an unnecessary barrier to entry for aspiring workers and provide limited consumer protection."

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEE, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 946. 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.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, Arizona is home to more than a half million veterans. They have served in every conflict from World War II to present-day operations in the Middle East. Nothing makes me prouder than to shake the hand of one of these veterans and to call them an Arizonan.

Fortunately, many of these veterans have the support of friends and family, as well as their fellow veterans with whom they served, but far too many who have served our country lack a support system that can help them successfully make the transition back to civilian life.

For those who have post-traumatic stress or traumatic brain injury, this could be particularly difficult. Studies have shown that veterans often do not seek out medical health treatment due to concerns about stigma, negative career prospects, lack of awareness, or logistical challenges in accessing care. For those who go without treatment, it can lead to substance abuse and, in some cases, run-ins with the law.

While there is no justification for criminal behavior, it is important to recognize when certain actions may be symptomatic of the harrowing experiences a veteran has endured during years of service. This is something the criminal justice system often fails to deal with. By not providing treatment that actually addresses a veteran's underlying service-connected issues, our criminal justice system sometimes creates a vicious cycle. It overcriminalizes service-connected mental illness, undertreats incarcerated veterans, and increases recidivism.

To address the problem, the VA created the Veterans Justice Outreach Program in 2009. The program was established to remove veterans from the regular criminal justice process and to provide specially tailored treatments to address many of these underlying issues. These veterans treatment courts have a proven record of preventing initial incarceration and reducing recidivism.

The lifeblood of the program is the veterans justice outreach specialists, VJO specialists, who link veterans to available court services. These outreach specialists identify veterans in jails and local courts, they assess their health status, and they help them develop the rehabilitation treatment program specific to each of their needs.

I recently had the opportunity to observe the veterans docket and meet with some of these dedicated specialists while visiting the Mesa Municipal Court earlier this month. Let me tell you, there is no substitute for seeing this firsthand. Even though it is a courtroom setting, there is a comradery and collaboration that you don't see in traditional courtroom proceedings. I was amazed at how many

organizations there are to help these veterans—to help them successfully transition and help them with treatment.

The collaboration I am talking about comes from having a judge and hard-working staff who have served in the military themselves. They understand the hardship of multiple deployments for servicemembers and their families. They understand the mental and physical tolls of combat. They understand that the transition back to civilian life can mark the beginning of a new battle for veterans.

The program has experienced remarkable success. The unfortunate reality is that the VA doesn't have enough outreach specialists to ensure access to already available treatment for justice-involved veterans. Demand for VJO specialists is outpacing the program's ability to serve eligible veterans. This means future veterans treatment courts can't be established, existing courts will go understaffed, and veterans will go unserved. That is not right.

That is why today I am introducing the Veterans Treatment Court Improvement Act to ensure our veterans receive swift and appropriate access to justice. This legislation will provide 50 additional VJO specialists for veterans treatment courts nationwide. By increasing the number of dedicated specialists at these facilities, Congress can ensure that more veterans have access to the treatments they have earned with their service. This is bipartisan legislation. I will work to inform my colleagues about the need for this program and additional VJOs in the coming weeks and months.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 948. A bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 948

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “America’s Red Rock Wilderness Act of 2017”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS

Sec. 101. Great Basin Wilderness Areas.

Sec. 102. Grand Staircase-Escalante Wilderness Areas.

Sec. 103. Moab-La Sal Canyons Wilderness Areas.

Sec. 104. Henry Mountains Wilderness Areas.

Sec. 105. Glen Canyon Wilderness Areas.

Sec. 106. San Juan-Anasazi Wilderness Areas.

Sec. 107. Canyonlands Basin Wilderness Areas.

Sec. 108. San Rafael Swell Wilderness Areas.

Sec. 109. Book Cliffs and Uinta Basin Wilderness Areas.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. General provisions.

Sec. 202. Administration.

Sec. 203. State school trust land within wilderness areas.

Sec. 204. Water.

Sec. 205. Roads.

Sec. 206. Livestock.

Sec. 207. Fish and wildlife.

Sec. 208. Management of newly acquired land.

Sec. 209. Withdrawal.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Utah.

TITLE I—DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS

SEC. 101. GREAT BASIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the Great Basin region of western Utah is comprised of starkly beautiful mountain ranges that rise as islands from the desert floor;

(2) the Wah Wah Mountains in the Great Basin region are arid and austere, with massive cliff faces and leathery slopes speckled with piñon and juniper;

(3) the Pilot Range and Stansbury Mountains in the Great Basin region are high enough to draw moisture from passing clouds and support ecosystems found nowhere else on earth;

(4) from bristlecone pine, the world’s oldest living organism, to newly flowered mountain meadows, mountains of the Great Basin region are islands of nature that—

(A) support remarkable biological diversity; and

(B) provide opportunities to experience the colossal silence of the Great Basin; and

(5) the Great Basin region of western Utah should be protected and managed to ensure the preservation of the natural conditions of the region.

(b) **DESIGNATION.**—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Antelope Range (approximately 17,000 acres).

(2) Barn Hills (approximately 20,000 acres).

(3) Black Hills (approximately 9,000 acres).

(4) Bullgrass Knoll (approximately 15,000 acres).

(5) Burbank Hills/Tunnel Spring (approximately 92,000 acres).

(6) Conger Mountains (approximately 21,000 acres).

(7) Crater Bench (approximately 35,000 acres).

(8) Crater and Silver Island Mountains (approximately 121,000 acres).

(9) Cricket Mountains Cluster (approximately 62,000 acres).

(10) Deep Creek Mountains (approximately 126,000 acres).

(11) Drum Mountains (approximately 39,000 acres).

(12) Dugway Mountains (approximately 24,000 acres).

(13) Essex Canyon (approximately 1,300 acres).

(14) Fish Springs Range (approximately 64,000 acres).

(15) Granite Peak (approximately 19,000 acres).

(16) Grassy Mountains (approximately 23,000 acres).

(17) Grouse Creek Mountains (approximately 15,000 acres).

(18) House Range (approximately 201,000 acres).

(19) Keg Mountains (approximately 38,000 acres).

(20) Kern Mountains (approximately 15,000 acres).

(21) King Top (approximately 110,000 acres).

(22) Ledger Canyon (approximately 9,000 acres).

(23) Little Goose Creek (approximately 1,200 acres).

(24) Middle/Granite Mountains (approximately 80,000 acres).

(25) Mount Escalante (approximately 18,000 acres).

(26) Mountain Home Range (approximately 90,000 acres).

(27) Newfoundland Mountains (approximately 22,000 acres).

(28) Ochre Mountain (approximately 13,000 acres).

(29) Oquirrh Mountains (approximately 9,000 acres).

(30) Painted Rock Mountain (approximately 26,000 acres).

(31) Paradise/Steamboat Mountains (approximately 144,000 acres).

(32) Pilot Range (approximately 45,000 acres).

(33) Red Tops (approximately 28,000 acres).

(34) Rockwell-Little Sahara (approximately 21,000 acres).

(35) San Francisco Mountains (approximately 39,000 acres).

(36) Sand Ridge (approximately 73,000 acres).

(37) Simpson Mountains (approximately 42,000 acres).

(38) Snake Valley (approximately 100,000 acres).

(39) Spring Creek Canyon (approximately 4,000 acres).

(40) Stansbury Island (approximately 10,000 acres).

(41) Stansbury Mountains (approximately 24,000 acres).

(42) Thomas Range (approximately 36,000 acres).

(43) Tule Valley (approximately 159,000 acres).

(44) Wah Wah Mountains (approximately 167,000 acres).

(45) Wasatch/Sevier Plateaus (approximately 29,000 acres).

(46) White Rock Range (approximately 5,200 acres).

SEC. 102. GRAND STAIRCASE-ESCALANTE WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) **GRAND STAIRCASE AREA.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(A) the area known as the Grand Staircase rises more than 6,000 feet in a series of great cliffs and plateaus from the depths of the Grand Canyon to the forested rim of Bryce Canyon;

(B) the Grand Staircase—

(i) spans 6 major life zones, from the lower Sonoran Desert to the alpine forest; and

(ii) encompasses geologic formations that display 3,000,000,000 years of Earth’s history;

(C) land managed by the Secretary lines the intricate canyon system of the Paria

River and forms a vital natural corridor connection to the deserts and forests of those national parks;

(D) land described in paragraph (2) (other than East of Bryce, Upper Kanab Creek, Moquith Mountain, Bunting Point, and Vermillion Cliffs) is located within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument; and

(E) the Grand Staircase in Utah should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(2) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) Bryce View (approximately 4,500 acres).
 (B) Bunting Point (approximately 11,000 acres).

(C) Canaan Mountain (approximately 16,000 acres in Kane County).

(D) Canaan Peak Slopes (approximately 2,300 acres).

(E) East of Bryce (approximately 750 acres).

(F) Glass Eye Canyon (approximately 24,000 acres).

(G) Ladder Canyon (approximately 14,000 acres).

(H) Moquith Mountain (approximately 16,000 acres).

(I) Nephi Point (approximately 14,000 acres).

(J) Orderville Canyon (approximately 9,200 acres).

(K) Paria-Hackberry (approximately 188,000 acres).

(L) Paria Wilderness Expansion (approximately 3,300 acres).

(M) Parunuweap Canyon (approximately 43,000 acres).

(N) Pine Hollow (approximately 11,000 acres).

(O) Slopes of Bryce (approximately 2,600 acres).

(P) Timber Mountain (approximately 51,000 acres).

(Q) Upper Kanab Creek (approximately 49,000 acres).

(R) Vermillion Cliffs (approximately 26,000 acres).

(S) Willis Creek (approximately 21,000 acres).

(b) KAIPAROWITS PLATEAU.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
 (A) the Kaiparowits Plateau east of the Paria River is one of the most rugged and isolated wilderness regions in the United States;

(B) the Kaiparowits Plateau, a windswept land of harsh beauty, contains distant vistas and a remarkable variety of plant and animal species;

(C) ancient forests, an abundance of big game animals, and 22 species of raptors thrive undisturbed on the grassland mesa tops of the Kaiparowits Plateau;

(D) each of the areas described in paragraph (2) (other than Heaps Canyon, Little Valley, and Wide Hollow) is located within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument; and

(E) the Kaiparowits Plateau should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(2) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) Andalex Not (approximately 18,000 acres).

(B) The Blues (approximately 21,000 acres).

(C) Box Canyon (approximately 2,800 acres).

(D) Burning Hills (approximately 80,000 acres).

(E) Carcass Canyon (approximately 83,000 acres).

(F) The Cockscomb (approximately 11,000 acres).

(G) Fiftymile Bench (approximately 12,000 acres).

(H) Fiftymile Mountain (approximately 203,000 acres).

(I) Heaps Canyon (approximately 4,000 acres).

(J) Horse Spring Canyon (approximately 31,000 acres).

(K) Kodachrome Headlands (approximately 10,000 acres).

(L) Little Valley Canyon (approximately 4,000 acres).

(M) Mud Spring Canyon (approximately 65,000 acres).

(N) Nipple Bench (approximately 32,000 acres).

(O) Paradise Canyon-Wahweap (approximately 262,000 acres).

(P) Rock Cove (approximately 16,000 acres).

(Q) Warm Creek (approximately 23,000 acres).

(R) Wide Hollow (approximately 6,800 acres).

(c) ESCALANTE CANYONS.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
 (A) glens and coves carved in massive sandstone cliffs, spring-watered hanging gardens, and the silence of ancient Anasazi ruins are examples of the unique features that entice hikers, campers, and sightseers from around the world to Escalante Canyon;

(B) Escalante Canyon links the spruce fir forests of the 11,000-foot Aquarius Plateau with winding slickrock canyons that flow into Glen Canyon;

(C) Escalante Canyon, one of Utah's most popular natural areas, contains critical habitat for deer, elk, and wild bighorn sheep that also enhances the scenic integrity of the area;

(D) each of the areas described in paragraph (2) is located within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument; and

(E) Escalante Canyon should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(2) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) Brinkerhof Flats (approximately 3,000 acres).

(B) Colt Mesa (approximately 28,000 acres).

(C) Death Hollow (approximately 49,000 acres).

(D) Forty Mile Gulch (approximately 6,600 acres).

(E) Hurricane Wash (approximately 9,000 acres).

(F) Lampstand (approximately 7,900 acres).

(G) Muley Twist Flank (approximately 3,600 acres).

(H) North Escalante Canyons (approximately 176,000 acres).

(I) Pioneer Mesa (approximately 11,000 acres).

(J) Scorpion (approximately 53,000 acres).

(K) Sooner Bench (approximately 390 acres).

(L) Steep Creek (approximately 35,000 acres).

(M) Studhorse Peaks (approximately 24,000 acres).

SEC. 103. MOAB-LA SAL CANYONS WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the canyons surrounding the La Sal Mountains and the town of Moab offer a variety of extraordinary landscapes;

(2) outstanding examples of natural formations and landscapes in the Moab-La Sal area include the huge sandstone fins of Behind the Rocks, the mysterious Fisher Towers, and the whitewater rapids of Westwater Canyon; and

(3) the Moab-La Sal area should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Arches Adjacent (approximately 12,000 acres).

(2) Beaver Creek (approximately 41,000 acres).

(3) Behind the Rocks and Hunters Canyon (approximately 22,000 acres).

(4) Big Triangle (approximately 20,000 acres).

(5) Coyote Wash (approximately 28,000 acres).

(6) Dome Plateau-Professor Valley (approximately 35,000 acres).

(7) Fisher Towers (approximately 18,000 acres).

(8) Goldbar Canyon (approximately 9,000 acres).

(9) Granite Creek (approximately 5,000 acres).

(10) Mary Jane Canyon (approximately 25,000 acres).

(11) Mill Creek (approximately 14,000 acres).

(12) Porcupine Rim and Morning Glory (approximately 20,000 acres).

(13) Renegade Point (approximately 6,600 acres).

(14) Westwater Canyon (approximately 37,000 acres).

(15) Yellow Bird (approximately 4,200 acres).

SEC. 104. HENRY MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Henry Mountain Range, the last mountain range to be discovered and named by early explorers in the contiguous United States, still retains a wild and undiscovered quality;

(2) fluted badlands that surround the flanks of 11,000-foot Mounts Ellen and Pennell contain areas of critical habitat for mule deer and for the largest herd of free-roaming buffalo in the United States;

(3) despite their relative accessibility, the Henry Mountain Range remains one of the wildest, least-known ranges in the United States; and

(4) the Henry Mountain range should be protected and managed to ensure the preservation of the range as a wilderness area.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Bull Mountain (approximately 16,000 acres).

(2) Bullfrog Creek (approximately 35,000 acres).

(3) Dogwater Creek (approximately 3,400 acres).

(4) Fremont Gorge (approximately 20,000 acres).

(5) Long Canyon (approximately 16,000 acres).

(6) Mount Ellen-Blue Hills (approximately 140,000 acres).

(7) Mount Hillers (approximately 21,000 acres).

(8) Mount Pennell (approximately 147,000 acres).

(9) Notom Bench (approximately 6,200 acres).

(10) Oak Creek (approximately 1,700 acres).

(11) Ragged Mountain (approximately 28,000 acres).

SEC. 105. GLEN CANYON WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the side canyons of Glen Canyon, including the Dirty Devil River and the Red,

White and Blue Canyons, contain some of the most remote and outstanding landscapes in southern Utah;

(2) the Dirty Devil River, once the fortress hideout of outlaw Butch Cassidy's Wild Bunch, has sculpted a maze of slickrock canyons through an imposing landscape of monoliths and inaccessible mesas;

(3) the Red and Blue Canyons contain colorful Chinle/Moenkopi badlands found nowhere else in the region; and

(4) the canyons of Glen Canyon in the State should be protected and managed as wilderness areas.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Cane Spring Desert (approximately 18,000 acres).

(2) Dark Canyon (approximately 134,000 acres).

(3) Dirty Devil (approximately 242,000 acres).

(4) Fiddler Butte (approximately 92,000 acres).

(5) Flat Tops (approximately 30,000 acres).

(6) Little Rockies (approximately 64,000 acres).

(7) The Needle (approximately 11,000 acres).

(8) Red Rock Plateau (approximately 213,000 acres).

(9) White Canyon (approximately 98,000 acres).

SEC. 106. SAN JUAN-ANASAZI WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) more than 1,000 years ago, the Anasazi Indian culture flourished in the slickrock canyons and on the piñon-covered mesas of southeastern Utah;

(2) evidence of the ancient presence of the Anasazi pervades the Cedar Mesa area of the San Juan-Anasazi area where cliff dwellings, rock art, and ceremonial kivas embellish sandstone overhangs and isolated benchlands;

(3) the Cedar Mesa area is in need of protection from the vandalism and theft of its unique cultural resources;

(4) the Cedar Mesa wilderness areas should be created to protect both the archaeological heritage and the extraordinary wilderness, scenic, and ecological values of the United States; and

(5) the San Juan-Anasazi area should be protected and managed as a wilderness area to ensure the preservation of the unique and valuable resources of that area.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Allen Canyon (approximately 5,900 acres).

(2) Arch Canyon (approximately 30,000 acres).

(3) Comb Ridge (approximately 15,000 acres).

(4) East Montezuma (approximately 45,000 acres).

(5) Fish and Owl Creek Canyons (approximately 73,000 acres).

(6) Grand Gulch (approximately 159,000 acres).

(7) Hammond Canyon (approximately 4,400 acres).

(8) Nokai Dome (approximately 93,000 acres).

(9) Road Canyon (approximately 63,000 acres).

(10) San Juan River (Sugarloaf) (approximately 15,000 acres).

(11) The Tabernacle (approximately 7,000 acres).

(12) Valley of the Gods (approximately 21,000 acres).

SEC. 107. CANYONLANDS BASIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Canyonlands National Park safeguards only a small portion of the extraordinary red-hued, cliff-walled canyonland region of the Colorado Plateau;

(2) areas near Arches National Park and Canyonlands National Park contain canyons with rushing perennial streams, natural arches, bridges, and towers;

(3) the gorges of the Green and Colorado Rivers lie on adjacent land managed by the Secretary;

(4) popular overlooks in Canyonlands National Park and Dead Horse Point State Park have views directly into adjacent areas, including Lockhart Basin and Indian Creek; and

(5) designation of those areas as wilderness would ensure the protection of this erosional masterpiece of nature and of the rich pockets of wildlife found within its expanded boundaries.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Bridger Jack Mesa (approximately 33,000 acres).

(2) Butler Wash (approximately 27,000 acres).

(3) Dead Horse Cliffs (approximately 5,300 acres).

(4) Demon's Playground (approximately 3,700 acres).

(5) Duma Point (approximately 14,000 acres).

(6) Gooseneck (approximately 9,000 acres).

(7) Hatch Point Canyons/Lockhart Basin (approximately 149,000 acres).

(8) Horsethief Point (approximately 15,000 acres).

(9) Indian Creek (approximately 28,000 acres).

(10) Labyrinth Canyon (approximately 150,000 acres).

(11) San Rafael River (approximately 101,000 acres).

(12) Shay Mountain (approximately 14,000 acres).

(13) Sweetwater Reef (approximately 69,000 acres).

(14) Upper Horseshoe Canyon (approximately 60,000 acres).

SEC. 108. SAN RAFAEL SWELL WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the San Rafael Swell towers above the desert like a castle, ringed by 1,000-foot ramparts of Navajo Sandstone;

(2) the highlands of the San Rafael Swell have been fractured by uplift and rendered hollow by erosion over countless millennia, leaving a tremendous basin punctuated by mesas, buttes, and canyons and traversed by sediment-laden desert streams;

(3) among other places, the San Rafael wilderness offers exceptional back country opportunities in the colorful Wild Horse Badlands, the monoliths of North Caineville Mesa, the rock towers of Cliff Wash, and colorful cliffs of Humbug Canyon;

(4) the mountains within these areas are among Utah's most valuable habitat for desert bighorn sheep; and

(5) the San Rafael Swell area should be protected and managed to ensure its preservation as a wilderness area.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Cedar Mountain (approximately 15,000 acres).

(2) Devils Canyon (approximately 23,000 acres).

(3) Eagle Canyon (approximately 38,000 acres).

(4) Factory Butte (approximately 22,000 acres).

(5) Hondu Country (approximately 20,000 acres).

(6) Jones Bench (approximately 2,800 acres).

(7) Limestone Cliffs (approximately 25,000 acres).

(8) Lost Spring Wash (approximately 37,000 acres).

(9) Mexican Mountain (approximately 100,000 acres).

(10) Molen Reef (approximately 33,000 acres).

(11) Muddy Creek (approximately 240,000 acres).

(12) Mussentuchit Badlands (approximately 25,000 acres).

(13) Pleasant Creek Bench (approximately 1,100 acres).

(14) Price River-Humbug (approximately 120,000 acres).

(15) Red Desert (approximately 40,000 acres).

(16) Rock Canyon (approximately 18,000 acres).

(17) San Rafael Knob (approximately 15,000 acres).

(18) San Rafael Reef (approximately 114,000 acres).

(19) Sids Mountain (approximately 107,000 acres).

(20) Upper Muddy Creek (approximately 19,000 acres).

(21) Wild Horse Mesa (approximately 92,000 acres).

SEC. 109. BOOK CLIFFS AND UINTA BASIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Book Cliffs and Uinta Basin wilderness areas offer—

(A) unique big game hunting opportunities in verdant high-plateau forests;

(B) the opportunity for float trips of several days duration down the Green River in Desolation Canyon; and

(C) the opportunity for calm water canoe weekends on the White River;

(2) the long rampart of the Book Cliffs bounds the area on the south, while seldom-visited uplands, dissected by the rivers and streams, slope away to the north into the Uinta Basin;

(3) bears, bighorn sheep, cougars, elk, and mule deer flourish in the back country of the Book Cliffs; and

(4) the Book Cliffs and Uinta Basin areas should be protected and managed to ensure the protection of the areas as wilderness.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Bourdette Draw (approximately 15,000 acres).

(2) Bull Canyon (approximately 2,800 acres).

(3) Chipeta (approximately 95,000 acres).

(4) Dead Horse Pass (approximately 8,000 acres).

(5) Desbrough Canyon (approximately 13,000 acres).

(6) Desolation Canyon (approximately 555,000 acres).

(7) Diamond Breaks (approximately 9,000 acres).

(8) Diamond Canyon (approximately 166,000 acres).

(9) Diamond Mountain (also known as "Wild Mountain") (approximately 27,000 acres).

- (10) Dinosaur Adjacent (approximately 10,000 acres).
- (11) Goslin Mountain (approximately 4,900 acres).
- (12) Hideout Canyon (approximately 12,000 acres).
- (13) Lower Bitter Creek (approximately 14,000 acres).
- (14) Lower Flaming Gorge (approximately 21,000 acres).
- (15) Mexico Point (approximately 15,000 acres).
- (16) Moonshine Draw (also known as "Daniels Canyon") (approximately 10,000 acres).
- (17) Mountain Home (approximately 9,000 acres).
- (18) O-Wi-Yu-Kuts (approximately 13,000 acres).
- (19) Red Creek Badlands (approximately 3,600 acres).
- (20) Seep Canyon (approximately 21,000 acres).
- (21) Sunday School Canyon (approximately 18,000 acres).
- (22) Survey Point (approximately 8,000 acres).
- (23) Turtle Canyon (approximately 39,000 acres).
- (24) White River (approximately 23,000 acres).
- (25) Winter Ridge (approximately 38,000 acres).
- (26) Wolf Point (approximately 15,000 acres).

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) NAMES OF WILDERNESS AREAS.—Each wilderness area named in title I shall—

- (1) consist of the quantity of land referenced with respect to that named area, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Utah BLM Wilderness"; and
- (2) be known by the name given to it in title I.

(b) MAP AND DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated by this Act with—

- (A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and
- (B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—A map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be filed and made available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 202. ADMINISTRATION.

Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, each wilderness area designated under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with—

- (1) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and
- (2) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

SEC. 203. STATE SCHOOL TRUST LAND WITHIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), if State-owned land is included in an area designated by this Act as a wilderness area, the Secretary shall offer to exchange land owned by the United States in the State of approximately equal value in accordance with section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)) and section 5(a) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1134(a)).

(b) MINERAL INTERESTS.—The Secretary shall not transfer any mineral interests under subsection (a) unless the State transfers to the Secretary any mineral interests in land designated by this Act as a wilderness area.

SEC. 204. WATER.

(a) RESERVATION.—

(1) WATER FOR WILDERNESS AREAS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each wilderness area designated by this Act, Congress reserves a quantity of water determined by the Secretary to be sufficient for the wilderness area.

(B) PRIORITY DATE.—The priority date of a right reserved under subparagraph (A) shall be the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PROTECTION OF RIGHTS.—The Secretary and other officers and employees of the United States shall take any steps necessary to protect the rights reserved by paragraph (1)(A), including the filing of a claim for the quantification of the rights in any present or future appropriate stream adjudication in the courts of the State—

(A) in which the United States is or may be joined; and

(B) that is conducted in accordance with section 208 of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 560, chapter 651).

(b) PRIOR RIGHTS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act relinquishes or reduces any water rights reserved or appropriated by the United States in the State on or before the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) SPECIFICATION OF RIGHTS.—The Federal water rights reserved by this Act are specific to the wilderness areas designated by this Act.

(2) NO PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED.—Nothing in this Act related to reserved Federal water rights—

- (A) shall establish a precedent with regard to any future designation of water rights; or
- (B) shall affect the interpretation of any other Act or any designation made under any other Act.

SEC. 205. ROADS.

(a) SETBACKS.—

(1) MEASUREMENT IN GENERAL.—A setback under this section shall be measured from the center line of the road.

(2) WILDERNESS ON 1 SIDE OF ROADS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a setback for a road with wilderness on only 1 side shall be set at—

- (A) 300 feet from a paved Federal or State highway;
- (B) 100 feet from any other paved road or high standard dirt or gravel road; and
- (C) 30 feet from any other road.

(3) WILDERNESS ON BOTH SIDES OF ROADS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a setback for a road with wilderness on both sides (including cherry-stems or roads separating 2 wilderness units) shall be set at—

- (A) 200 feet from a paved Federal or State highway;
- (B) 40 feet from any other paved road or high standard dirt or gravel road; and
- (C) 10 feet from any other roads.

(b) SETBACK EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) WELL-DEFINED TOPOGRAPHICAL BARRIERS.—If, between the road and the boundary of a setback area described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), there is a well-defined cliff edge, stream bank, or other topographical barrier, the Secretary shall use the barrier as the wilderness boundary.

(2) FENCES.—If, between the road and the boundary of a setback area specified in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), there is a fence running parallel to a road, the Secretary shall use the fence as the wilderness boundary if, in the opinion of the Secretary,

doing so would result in a more manageable boundary.

(3) DEVIATIONS FROM SETBACK AREAS.—

(A) EXCLUSION OF DISTURBANCES FROM WILDERNESS BOUNDARIES.—In cases where there is an existing livestock development, dispersed camping area, borrow pit, or similar disturbance within 100 feet of a road that forms part of a wilderness boundary, the Secretary may delineate the boundary so as to exclude the disturbance from the wilderness area.

(B) LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION OF DISTURBANCES.—The Secretary shall make a boundary adjustment under subparagraph (A) only if the Secretary determines that doing so is consistent with wilderness management goals.

(C) DEVIATIONS RESTRICTED TO MINIMUM NECESSARY.—Any deviation under this paragraph from the setbacks required under in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) shall be the minimum necessary to exclude the disturbance.

(c) DELINEATION WITHIN SETBACK AREA.—The Secretary may delineate a wilderness boundary at a location within a setback under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) if, as determined by the Secretary, the delineation would enhance wilderness management goals.

SEC. 206. LIVESTOCK.

Within the wilderness areas designated under title I, the grazing of livestock authorized on the date of enactment of this Act shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations and procedures as the Secretary considers necessary, as long as the regulations and procedures are consistent with—

- (1) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and
- (2) section 101(f) of the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-628; 104 Stat. 4469).

SEC. 207. FISH AND WILDLIFE.

Nothing in this Act affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to wildlife and fish on the public land located in the State.

SEC. 208. MANAGEMENT OF NEWLY ACQUIRED LAND.

Any land within the boundaries of a wilderness area designated under this Act that is acquired by the Federal Government shall—

- (1) become part of the wilderness area in which the land is located; and
- (2) be managed in accordance with this Act and other laws applicable to wilderness areas.

SEC. 209. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid rights existing on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal land referred to in title I is withdrawn from all forms of—

- (1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under public law;
- (2) location, entry, and patent under mining law; and
- (3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 20 years ago, when I was elected to the U.S. Senate, a group of people came to me and asked me to sponsor a bill. It was a bill that had been sponsored many times by Senator Bill Bradley of New Jersey. He retired shortly before I arrived.

The bill related to the Utah wilderness. I remember saying to those who approached me: This isn't my State. It is the State of Utah.

They said: This is a bill which we are having some controversy with when it

comes to the Utah congressional delegation.

Secondly, I said: It is a wilderness bill about a part of the world that I have never seen. I don't feel right introducing it.

They said: Why don't you come out and look at it?

I did just a few weeks later. My wife and I went and took a look at the Red Rocks Wilderness area in Utah. I will tell you, initially, as a midwesterner, when I looked at the stark landscape, I looked around thinking, what are we trying to preserve here? I took a closer look, which everyone should, and found a unique part of America—a wilderness area which can't be found anywhere else and a wilderness area which boasts archeological and historic and environmental significance way beyond what many people in the rest of the lower 48 might appreciate.

Today, I am reintroducing the America's Red Rock Wilderness Act. It would safeguard 9.2 million acres of Park Bureau Land Management land in Utah as wilderness—some of the last great wild places in the lower 48.

Throughout my time in the Senate, I have worked with the committed volunteers of the Utah Wilderness Coalition to protect the stunning, fragile desert landscape. These unique lands are rich in archeological resources and provide a habitat for rare plants and species. They offer unparalleled research, educational, and recreational opportunities for scientists, teachers, outdoor enthusiasts, and families.

The Bureau of Land Management has confirmed that the vast majority of the majority of the lands meet the qualifications for a wilderness designation. However, despite their pristine condition and their historical significance, these lands are threatened by oil and gas development, as well as rampant off-road vehicle use.

Although these activities are appropriate in some places, they don't belong in such a fragile landscape. Designating these lands as wilderness would safeguard wildlife, protect ancestral lands, help mitigate climate change, and provide access to future generations of hunters, anglers, hikers, boaters, and lovers of the natural world.

Last December, President Obama took an important step in protecting some of Southern Utah's fragile lands by designating the Bears Ears National Monument, which contains some of the lands that would be protected by my Red Rocks bill.

The 1.35 million-acre swath of land covers forested mesas and red rock canyons, and the designation protected the region's abundant Native American cultural resources. The monument contains well over 100,000 cultural and archeological sites. Let me say that again. Over 100,000 cultural and archeological sites, including ancient cliff dwellings, granaries, burial sites, and kivas, as well as spectacular pictographs and petroglyphs strewn upon rock walls and boulders all across the region.

Artifacts range from 700 to 12,000 years old, providing tribes with an incredible insight into the shared history of their ancestral homeland, bolstering their deep spiritual connection to the land itself.

The Bears Ears National Monument, designated by President Obama, is the first monument of its kind to be proposed and advocated by a united coalition of five Tribes who sought its protection because of its importance in their respective culture. In total, 30 Native American tribes with ancestral, historical, and contemporary ties to the Bears Ears region supported the designation.

The Tribal coalition's original Bears Ears proposal was 1.9 million acres. You see them here. It is slightly larger than the 1.35 million-acre designation by President Obama.

Many in the Utah delegation, including one of my colleagues in the Senate, have raised concerns about President Obama's decision to protect this area and even the size of the designation. One of the critics of the size of the designation is the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, ROB BISHOP.

Last Congress, before President Obama designated the Bears Ears region a national monument, the same Chairman BISHOP introduced a bill that would have protected part of the Bears Ears region while opening other areas of land for oil and gas development.

Look at the two here in comparison. Chairman BISHOP's proposal protected 1.28 million acres—only 17,500 acres smaller than the area protected by President Obama.

As you can see from these maps, the areas protected by Chairman BISHOP's Public Lands Initiative are not that much different than the areas protected by the Bears Ears National Monument. To argue that the designation is so much larger than anyone anticipated is to ignore what the chairman submitted in his own legislation last year. Both are much smaller than what the Tribes originally requested, which is the third map here.

Despite that, Utah's congressional delegation has called the area "well beyond the areas in need of protection" and they pushed President Trump to consider shrinking or overturning this wilderness monument designation. Yet Utah's Salt Lake Tribune called Utah politicians' determination to rescind these designations "blindness."

Let me quote the Salt Lake Tribune:

That blindness can be sourced to Utah's one-party political system that has given us leaders who are out of touch with their constituents.

They then continue and say:

The Bears Ears monument may be with us forever, and there is no bucket of gold waiting if it does go away. The presidential proclamation bent far toward the same boundaries and shared management [Utah Rep. Rob] Bishop pursued with his public lands initiative.

They saw the same maps and said: Why is this acceptable and this objectionable?

Today, President Trump is planning to sign an Executive order. It is going to call on the Department of Interior to review previous national monument designations under the Antiquities Act.

While the President's Executive order will target the Bears Ears National Monument first, the order is going to go well beyond Utah and consider changes to all of the national monuments that have been designated since 1996—more than 50 different sites.

These are areas designated "national monument protected areas" by Republican and Democratic Presidents with bipartisan support. Yet President Trump is going to insist with his new order that he can review and change every single one of them.

Let me tell you the list of places and sites of great cultural significance that could be impacted: A portion of Sequoia National Forest in California, Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historic Park in Maryland, African Burial Ground National Monument in New York, and in my home State of Illinois, the Pullman National Monument.

It is rare for any national monument designation to be changed by another President. It happened once. The last time a President used the Antiquities Act to adjust the borders of a national monument was over a century ago, in 1915. Then-President Woodrow Wilson shrunk Washington State's Mount Olympus National Monument so they could harvest more timber resources from this land.

A lot has changed since 1915, including our views on conservation. Attacks on conservation seem to have remained consistent. One of our greatest conservation Presidents, Teddy Roosevelt—a proud Republican, I might add—faced a great deal of opposition to his designation of a national monument that most of us are familiar with—the Grand Canyon.

Most Americans can't imagine our country without the iconic Grand Canyon because it is truly a national treasure. At the time of its 1908 designation by President Roosevelt, groups were opposed to protecting that area. For years after its designation, oil and gas miners fought additional protections for the Grand Canyon.

The attacks on the Bears Ears designation doesn't seem all that different from the attacks on the Grand Canyon, but the attacks on the Bears Ears National Monument also attack the Native people who have worked so hard to get this area protected.

Let's be very honest. When we look at how Native Americans were treated by our government and the settlers, we certainly look back with some shame and some embarrassment. What the Tribes are asking for here is a protection of areas that are of special significance to them and special significance to the environmental legacy, which we should be leaving to future generations.

The President's decision to review these national monuments puts the future of these resources in jeopardy and threatens our culture, history, and heritage. If President Donald Trump decides to use the Antiquities Act to reverse one of these monuments, he would treading in uncharted water. Never before has a President used the Antiquities Act to repeal a national monument. For what purpose? For oil and gas exploration? For off-the-road vehicle use?

These monuments themselves help promote tourism and outdoor recreation. Regions with national monuments saw increased employment and personal income growth—exactly the opposite of what the critics promised. Specifically, rural counties in the West, with protected lands, saw jobs increase by 345 percent over areas without protected lands—345 percent. Despite the opposition from Utah's elected officials, many in the State, including the Tribes, want to protect those areas, and I want to help them.

Teddy Roosevelt once said:

It is also vandalism wantonly to destroy or to permit the destruction of what is beautiful in nature, whether it be a cliff, a forest, or a species of mammal or bird. Here in the United States we turn our rivers and streams into sewers and dumping-grounds, we pollute the air, we destroy forests, and exterminate fishes, birds, and mammals—not to speak of vulgarizing charming landscapes with hideous advertisements. But at last it looks as if our people were awakened.

That was said by that Republican President over a century ago. Since Teddy Roosevelt's time, we have made progress in protecting our lands and waters, but these recent attacks and this recent Executive order by President Donald Trump show that we still have a long way to go.

I urge this administration, this Republican administration, to heed the words of Teddy Roosevelt. Carefully consider the legacy they will leave to future generations. It would be foolish not to protect Bears Ears and other monuments, just as it would have been foolish to listen to the critics and refuse to protect the Grand Canyon.

These monuments are for all of us, and we must ensure that they remain in their current natural condition for future generations to enjoy.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 949. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to create a classification that more accurately reflects the vital role of wildland firefighters; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 949

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 "Wildland Firefighter Recognition Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management;

(2) the term "employee" has the meaning given the term in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) the term "Federal land management agency" means—

(A) within the Department of the Interior—

- (i) the Bureau of Land Management;
- (ii) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;
- (iii) the National Park Service; and
- (iv) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

(B) within the Department of Agriculture, the Forest Service;

(4) the term "wildland fire"—

(A) means any non-structure fire that occurs in vegetation or natural fuels; and

(B) includes prescribed fire and wildfire; and

(5) the term "wildland firefighter" means—

(A) an employee of a Federal land management agency, the duties of whose position are primarily to perform work directly related to the prevention, control, suppression, or management of wildland fires, including an employee of a Federal land management agency who is assigned to support wildland fire activities; and

(B) an employee of a Federal land management agency who is transferred to a supervisory or administrative position from a position described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 3. CLASSIFICATION OF WILDLAND FIREFIGHTERS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director, in cooperation with the Federal land management agencies, shall commence development of a distinct wildland firefighter occupational series that more accurately reflects the variety of duties performed by wildland firefighters.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The official title assigned to any occupational series established under paragraph (1) shall include the designation of "Wildland Firefighter".

(3) POSITIONS DESCRIBED.—Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any class or other category of positions that consists primarily or exclusively of forestry technician positions, range technician positions, or any other positions the duties and responsibilities of which include—

(A) significant prevention, preparedness, control, suppression, or management activities for wildland fires; or

(B) activities necessary to meet any other emergency incident to which assigned.

(4) CONSULTATION.—It is the sense of Congress that the Director should consult with employee associations and any other groups that represent wildland firefighters in carrying out this subsection.

(5) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) the Director shall complete the development of the wildland firefighter occupational series required under paragraph (1); and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall use the wildland firefighter occupational series developed under paragraph (1) in the advertising and hiring of a wildland firefighter.

(b) HAZARDOUS DUTY DIFFERENTIAL NOT AFFECTED.—Section 5545(d)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "except" and all that follows and inserting the following: "except—

"(A) an employee in an occupational series covering positions for which the primary duties involve the prevention, control, suppression, or management of wildland fires, as determined by the Office; and

"(B) in such other circumstances as the Office may by regulation prescribe; and".

(c) CURRENT EMPLOYEES.—Any individual employed as a wildland firefighter on the date on which the occupational series established under subsection (a) takes effect may elect to—

(1) remain in the occupational series in which the individual is working; or

(2) be included in the wildland firefighter occupational series established under subsection (a).

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 950. A bill to correct problems pertaining to human resources for career and volunteer personnel engaged in wildland fire and structure fire; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 950

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Wildland Firefighter Fairness Act".

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Single qualification and certification system.
- Sec. 3. Personnel flexibility relating to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.
- Sec. 4. Extension of service limits for seasonal hires.
- Sec. 5. Civil service retention rights.
- Sec. 6. Computation of pay.

SEC. 2. SINGLE QUALIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION SYSTEM.

(a) MERGING 2 SYSTEMS.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall work with States and the Workforce Development Committee of the National Wildfire Coordinating Group to merge the Incident Qualification System and the Incident Qualification and Certification System into a single system by September 30, 2025.

(b) ELIMINATION OF BUREAU ADD-ON REQUIREMENTS.—On and after October 1, 2021, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may not require a person to demonstrate additional competencies to obtain, make use of, or maintain a qualification or certification for a fire position, regardless of which jurisdictional agency employs the person.

SEC. 3. PERSONNEL FLEXIBILITY RELATING TO THE ROBERT T. STAFFORD DISASTER RELIEF AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT.

(a) DEFINITION OF TIME-LIMITED APPOINTMENT.—Section 9601 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) the term 'time-limited appointment' includes—

"(A) a temporary appointment and a term appointment, as defined by the Office of Personnel Management;

"(B) an appointment pursuant to section 306(b)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster

Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5149(b)(1)); and

“(C) an appointment pursuant to subtitle E of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12611 et seq.).”

(b) **COMPETITIVE SERVICE; TIME-LIMITED APPOINTMENTS.**—Section 9602 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively;

(2) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “Notwithstanding” and inserting “APPOINTMENTS TO LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES.—Notwithstanding”; and

(B) by inserting “described in section 9601(2)(A)” after “time-limited appointment”;

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) **APPOINTMENTS UNDER THE ROBERT T. STAFFORD DISASTER RELIEF AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT.**—Notwithstanding chapter 33 or any other provision of law relating to the examination, certification, and appointment of individuals in the competitive service—

“(1) an employee appointed under the authority described in section 9601(2)(B) and serving under a full-time, time-limited appointment is eligible to compete for a permanent appointment in the competitive service at the Federal Emergency Management Agency or any other agency (as defined in section 101 of title 31) under the internal merit promotion procedures of the applicable agency if—

“(A) the employee has served under 1 or more time-limited appointments for at least 2 years without a break in service; and

“(B) the performance of the employee has been at an acceptable level of performance throughout the 1 or more time-limited appointment periods referred to in subparagraph (A); and

“(2) an employee appointed under the authority described in section 9601(2)(B) and serving under an intermittent, time-limited appointment is eligible for a permanent appointment in the competitive service at the Federal Emergency Management Agency or any other agency (as defined in section 101 of title 31) under the internal merit promotion procedures of the applicable agency if—

“(A) the employee has served under 1 or more time-limited appointments;

“(B) the employee has been deployed at least 522 days;

“(C) the employee has not declined any deployments while in an ‘available’ status; and

“(D) the performance of the employee has been at an acceptable level of performance throughout the 1 or more time-limited appointments referred to in subparagraph (A).

“(c) **APPOINTMENTS UNDER THE NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ACT OF 1990.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION OF EMPLOYEE.**—Notwithstanding section 160(a) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12620(a)), in this subsection, the term ‘employee’ includes individuals appointed under subtitle E of title I of that Act (42 U.S.C. 16211 et seq.).

“(2) **COMPETITION FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT.**—Notwithstanding chapter 33 or any other provision of law relating to the examination, certification, and appointment of individuals in the competitive service, a member of the National Civilian Community Corps appointed under subtitle E of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12611 et seq.) who serves 2 consecutive terms is eligible to compete for a permanent appointment in the competitive service at the Federal Emergency Management Agency or any other agency (as defined in section 101 of title 31) under the internal

merit promotion procedures during the 2-year period beginning on the date of the expiration of the appointment under section 160(a) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12620(a)), if the performance of the employee has been at an acceptable level of performance throughout the period.”;

(4) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)), by striking “In determining” and inserting “WAIVER OF AGE REQUIREMENTS.—In determining”;

(5) in subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)), by striking “An individual” and inserting “TENURE AND STATUS.—An individual”;

(6) in subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “A former” and inserting “FORMER EMPLOYEES.—A former”; and

(B) by inserting “or the Federal Emergency Management Agency” after “management agency”; and

(7) in subsection (g) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)), by striking “The Office” and inserting “REGULATIONS.—The Office”.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF SERVICE LIMITS FOR SEASONAL HIRES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “covered Secretary” means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior; and

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(2) the term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management; and

(3) the term “pilot program” means the pilot program established under subsection (b).

(b) **PILOT PROGRAM.**—The Director shall establish a pilot program for seasonal or temporary Federal employees, the duties of which primarily involve being a firefighter.

(c) **EXPANSION OF SERVICE YEAR LIMITATIONS.**—Under the pilot program, each covered Secretary may expand a service year limitation to enable a seasonal firefighter to be employed for a period that exceeds 1,040 hours in a given year if the covered Secretary determines the expansion to be necessary to stage fire crews earlier or later in a year to accommodate longer fire seasons.

(d) **STANDARDS.**—The Director, in cooperation with each covered Secretary, shall establish standards and guidelines for the pilot program.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the pilot program is established, the Director shall submit a report that describes the use and impact of the pilot program to—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The pilot program shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date on which the pilot program is established.

SEC. 5. CIVIL SERVICE RETENTION RIGHTS.

Section 8151 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) **REGULATIONS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘covered employee’ means an employee who—

“(i) served in a position in the Forest Service or the Department of the Interior as a wildland firefighter; and

“(ii) sustained an injury while in the performance of duty, as determined by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, that prevents the employee from performing the physical duties of a firefighter;

“(B) the term ‘equivalent position’ includes a position for a covered employee that—

“(i) allows the covered employee to receive the same retirement benefits under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 that the covered employee would have received in the former position had the covered employee not been injured or disabled; and

“(ii) does not require the covered employee to complete any more years of service than the covered employee would have been required to complete to receive the benefits described in clause (i) had the covered employee not been injured or disabled; and

“(C) the term ‘firefighter’ has the meaning given the term in section 8331.

“(2) **REGULATIONS.**—Under regulations issued by the Office of Personnel Management—

“(A) the department or agency that was the last employer shall immediately and unconditionally accord the employee, if the injury or disability has been overcome within 1 year after the date of commencement of compensation or from the time compensable disability recurs if the recurrence begins after the injured employee resumes regular full-time employment with the United States, the right to resume the former position of the employee or an equivalent position, as well as all other attendant rights that the employee would have had, or acquired, in the former position of the employee had the employee not been injured or disabled, including the rights to tenure, promotion, and safeguards in reductions-in-force procedures;

“(B) the department or agency that was the last employer shall, if the injury or disability is overcome within a period of more than 1 year after the date of commencement of compensation, make all reasonable efforts to place, and accord priority to placing, the employee in the former position of the employee or an equivalent position within the department or agency, or within any other department or agency; and

“(C) a covered employee who was injured during the 20-year period ending on the date of enactment of the Wildland Firefighter Fairness Act may not receive the same retirement benefits described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii) unless the covered employee first makes a payment to the Forest Service or the Department of the Interior, as applicable, equal to the amount that would have been deducted from pay under section 8334 or 8442, as applicable, had the covered employee not been injured or disabled.”.

SEC. 6. COMPUTATION OF PAY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 8114 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) **OVERTIME.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘covered overtime pay’ means pay received by an employee who serves in a position in the Forest Service or the Department of the Interior as a wildland firefighter while engaged in wildland fire suppression activity.

“(2) **OVERTIME.**—The value of subsistence and quarters, and of any other form of remuneration in kind for services if its value can be estimated in money, and covered overtime pay and premium pay under section 5545(c)(1) of this title are included as part of the pay, but account is not taken of—

“(A) overtime pay;

“(B) additional pay or allowance authorized outside the United States because of differential in cost of living or other special circumstances; or

“(C) bonus or premium pay for extraordinary service including bonus or pay for particularly hazardous service in time of war.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2019.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13—CALLING UPON THE PRESIDENT TO ISSUE A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING THE ABIDING IMPORTANCE OF THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT AND ITS RELEVANCE TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. UDALL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 13

Whereas the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) concluded on August 1, 1975 (in this joint resolution referred to as the “Helsinki Final Act”), established a comprehensive concept of security that encompasses political-military, environmental and economic, and human rights and humanitarian dimensions;

Whereas the Helsinki Final Act set out a declaration of ten fundamental Principles Guiding Relations Between States, which all participating States committed to respect and put into practice in their relations with each other, that have been the basis of the international order in the OSCE Region since its inception in 1975;

Whereas these Principles, adopted on the basis of consensus by all participating States and reaffirmed through the years, enshrine—

- (1) sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty;
- (2) refraining from the threat or use of force;
- (3) inviolability of frontiers;
- (4) territorial integrity of States;
- (5) peaceful settlement of disputes;
- (6) non-intervention in internal affairs;
- (7) respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief;
- (8) equal rights and self-determination of peoples;
- (9) cooperation among States; and
- (10) fulfillment in good faith of obligations under international law;

Whereas the Helsinki Final Act, for the first time in the history of international agreements, recognized that respect for, and implementation of, commitments to human rights and fundamental freedoms are integral to stability and security within and among nations;

Whereas, in the 1990 Charter of Paris for a New Europe, the participating States declared, “Human rights and fundamental freedoms are the birthright of all human beings, are inalienable and are guaranteed by law. Their protection and promotion is the first responsibility of government,” and committed themselves “to build, consolidate and strengthen democracy as the only system of government of our nations”;

Whereas, in 1991, participating States met in Moscow and unanimously agreed that “issues relating to human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law are of international concern, as respect for these rights and freedoms constitutes one of the foundations of international order;”

and declared “categorically and irrevocably. . . that the commitments undertaken in the field of the human dimension of the CSCE are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned”;

Whereas the CSCE was renamed the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in January 1995, reaffirming the continued relevance and applicability of previously made principles and provisions in a Europe no longer divided between East and West and as the number of participating States increased from the original 35 to 57 today;

Whereas the Helsinki Final Act, by making respect for human rights and implementation of commitments by participating States a permanent priority in the relations between States, provided an international foundation for the democratic aspirations of peoples throughout Europe and contributed to the peaceful end to the Cold War;

Whereas the seventh Principle confirmed the right of the individual to know and act upon his or her rights, which inspired citizens from the participating States to associate and assemble for the purposes of monitoring and encouraging compliance with the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent documents of the CSCE and OSCE;

Whereas, during the Communist era, members of nongovernmental organizations, such as the Helsinki Monitoring Groups in Russia, Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia as well as in Lithuania, and similar groups in Czechoslovakia and Poland, sacrificed their personal freedom and even their lives in their courageous and vocal support for the principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act;

Whereas members of nongovernmental organizations, civil society, and independent media across the region covered by the OSCE continue to risk their safety to advance the principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, often in the face of harassment and threats from their own governments who are OSCE participating States;

Whereas the United States Congress contributed to advancing the aims of the Helsinki Final Act by creating the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe to monitor and encourage compliance with its principles and provisions;

Whereas many countries continue to fall significantly short of implementing their OSCE commitments, particularly in the Human Dimension;

Whereas the Russian Federation is responsible for the clear, gross, and uncorrected violation of all ten Principles of the Helsinki Final Act;

Whereas, for many years, the Russian Federation has ignored its OSCE commitments related to the Human Dimension of comprehensive security by cracking down on civil society and independent media through harassment, intimidation, burdensome legal constraints, and violence, undermining the ability of its citizens to freely choose their leaders;

Whereas Russia’s internal repression is directly related to its external aggression, including in Ukraine, Georgia, and Syria;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has interfered through information warfare and cyber-intrusions and otherwise engaged in deliberate and malicious efforts to undermine confidence in the democratic institutions and processes of other OSCE participating States;

Whereas the first Principle recognizes the right of each participating State “to be or not to be a party to bilateral or multilateral treaties including the right to be or not to be

a party to treaties of alliance; they also have the right to neutrality”;

Whereas the OSCE’s participating States bear primary responsibility for raising violations of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents;

Whereas successive United States Administrations since the Helsinki Final Act was signed in 1975 have made the Act’s Principles Guiding Relations Between States a basis for United States policy toward Europe and the OSCE region as a whole; and

Whereas Congress has strongly supported and encouraged the United States to encourage improved compliance with these Principles, including by raising its concerns about non-compliance in a direct and frank manner and continues to do so today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress calls upon the President to—

(1) issue a proclamation—
(A) reaffirming the United States’ commitment to the Guiding Principles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe;

(B) reasserting the commitment of the United States to full implementation of the Helsinki Final Act, including respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, defense of the principles of liberty, and tolerance within societies, all of which are vital to the promotion of democracy;

(C) urging all participating States to fully implement their commitments under the Helsinki Final Act;

(D) calling upon all participating States to respect each other’s sovereign right to join alliances;

(E) condemning the clear, gross, and uncorrected violation of all ten core OSCE principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act by the Russian Federation with respect to other OSCE participating States, including Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine; and

(F) condemning all other violations of the Helsinki Final Act and its fundamental Guiding Principles; and

(2) conveying to all signatory states of the Helsinki Final Act that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democratic principles, economic liberty, and the implementation of related commitments continue to be vital elements in promoting a new and lasting era of democracy, peace, and unity in the region covered by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 26, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “A Review of the Technical, Scientific, and Legal Basis of the WOTUS Rule.”

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 26, 2017, at 1:30 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 26, in between votes in SD-430.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 26, 2017, at 10 a.m., in order to conduct a hearing entitled "Duplication, Waste, and Fraud in Federal Programs."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on April 26, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 26, 2017, at 10 a.m., in 428A Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, "The Challenges and Opportunities of Running a Small Business in Rural America."

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Wednesday, April 26, 2017 from 10 a.m. in room SD-106 of the

Dirksen Senate Office Building to hold a hearing entitled, "Nomination of Courtney Simmons Elwood to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPACE, SCIENCE, &
COMPETITIVENESS

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 26, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold Subcommittee Hearing on "Reopening the American Frontier: Reducing Regulatory Barriers and Expanding American Free Enterprise in Space."

KIDS TO PARKS DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 123 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 123) designating May 20, 2017, as "Kids to Parks Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 123) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 7, 2017, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
APRIL 27, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, April 27; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Acosta nomination; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Acosta nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:05 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, April 27, 2017, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE SMITHVILLE
POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I pause to thank and honor the Smithville Police Department for their efforts in serving Smithville following the March 6, 2017 tornado.

The EF-2 rated tornado left a trail of destruction up to 1,000 feet wide and 18 miles long. In Smithville, over 60 houses were damaged with several completely destroyed, resulting in over 65 tons of debris. Miraculously, no injuries were sustained during the storm.

After the storm, officers from the Smithville Police Department helped set up a perimeter, went door-to-door making sure residents were safe, and protected the neighborhood with a 24/7 presence in the days that followed. The effect of the police department on the neighborhoods affected by the tornado cannot be understated, whether through making the victims feel safe from scroungers or looters or by helping residents with their physical needs throughout the recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and the community of Smithville in thanking Chief Jason Lockridge and the officers and staff of the Smithville Police Department for their service following the March 6 tornado and wishing them God's blessings and protection in the years to come.

COMMEMORATING WWI

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today, the House of Representatives voted in support of the United States' entrance into World War I. The Great War was considered to be the war to end all wars.

Four million Americans, including 200,000 Texans, proudly served during World War I. Boys who grew up on Texas farms suddenly became men as they found themselves in the muddy, rainy, and bloody trenches an ocean away.

The life of a Doughboy was hard. Soldiers were constantly bombarded with artillery and machine gun fire. They often faced the danger of traipsing over the trenches and crossing no man's land, repelling the enemy.

In the midst of battle and in the face of the enemy, our men displayed tremendous gallantry. Four Texans were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for their heroic actions. Their names are: Daniel R. Edwards, David E. Hayden, Samuel M. Sampler, and David B. Barkley.

One hundred and one years later we still remember the brave warriors of WWI. World War I changed our nation, our people, and our world.

And that's just the way it is.

A GRATEFUL THANK YOU TO A
TRUSTED ADVISOR

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the professional achievements and dedication of Cindy Simms who recently began the newest chapter of her esteemed career of public service in the Executive Office of the President. Cindy was most recently my Director of Member Services and a Senior Advisor for the House Homeland Security Committee. Her insight was an invaluable asset to my Committee and Cindy's vision and determination allowed her to grow in her role as a vital part of the Committee's daily operation and strategy.

Cindy has been involved in politics at all levels of government which has contributed to her breadth of knowledge and keen political mind. A native Californian, Cindy began her career working for a state senator before joining the Schwarzenegger gubernatorial campaign and later working in the governor's office as a legislative analyst. Cindy then answered her professional calling and moved to the East Coast where she served in the George W. Bush White House at the Office of National Drug Control Policy. She later worked for both the Department of Homeland Security and Coast Guard, focusing her efforts on issues of national defense.

We relied heavily on Cindy's leadership and outreach as the Director of Member Services for the Homeland Security Committee. Cindy is a true professional and a trusted advisor. Her influence, however, extended across the Committee as she assisted the offices of all Republican Members. Cindy worked tirelessly to keep Members and staff engaged in Committee activities and went out of her way to facilitate opportunities for every single one of the 18 Republicans on the Committee. Her legacy lives on in the tremendous growth in outreach we have experienced during her tenure here. I will always be grateful for the personal relationships she built with the Members of this Committee, myself included, as well as the professional relationships she grew with outside coalitions and stakeholder groups to enhance the Committee's involvement and influence.

The White House is lucky to have Cindy on their team. Her political insight, professional demeanor, and strong relationships built during her time on Capitol Hill will be a great asset to President Trump. Her work ethic, determination to grow, and innovative vision

make Cindy an excellent fit to work in the highest office in the land.

TOM CLARK

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tom Clark for his leadership, vision and lasting impact on Denver and Colorado as the CEO of the Metro Economic Development Corporation and Executive Vice President of the Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce.

With more than 30 years of economic development experience at the state, regional, county and city level, Tom's unique perspective and wealth of knowledge is unparalleled. Tom's career spans four decades from Director of Commercial and Industrial Development for the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, through positions with the Fort Collins Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Denver Corporation, the Boulder Chamber of Commerce, the Jefferson Economic Council, and the Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce.

Tom was the founder and first president of the Metro Denver Network, the Metro Denver region's first economic development program, for which he received the Arthur D. Little Award for Excellence in Economic Development. In 2012, Tom was recognized as the Denver Post's Business Person of the Year as well as awarded the Denver Business Journal's Power Book Award for Economic Development and Government. He has also been recognized as one of the nation's top economic development professionals by the Council on Urban Economic Development.

I extend my deepest appreciation for Tom and his dedication to our great state, and wish him the best of luck in retirement and future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen travel delays, I missed the following votes on Tuesday, April 25, 2017:

Roll Call Vote No. 222: H. Res. 187, Relating to efforts to respond to the famine in South. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA".

Roll Call Vote No. 223: H.R. 876, the Aviation Employee Screening and Security Enhancement Act of 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA".

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE AND
THE 69TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
STATE OF ISRAEL

HON. SCOTT TAYLOR

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD on behalf of my constituent, Rabbi Dr. Israel Zoberman. Rabbi Zoberman is the Founding Rabbi of Congregation Beth Chaverim in Virginia Beach, Virginia. Born in Chu, Kazakhstan (USSR) in 1945, he is the son of Polish Holocaust Survivors. Rabbi Zoberman asked me to include the following remarks in the RECORD:

We remember lest the world forgets or denies the genocidal tragedy that befell the Jewish people at the hands of Nazi Germany and its collaborators of the greatest crime in human history. We dare not forget the six million innocent Jewish victims who were all begrudged their covenantal bond with Israel's God of compassion, caring and love, ever prodding the human family to rise higher and higher. So much that is precious has been forever lost. Nazi ideology sought to eradicate Western civilization's life affirming Judeo-Christian system. We remember the survivors whose numbers are now being naturally diminished, and their resilient spirit that allows them to rebuild their lives with the affirmation of life's undying goodness and the human capacity to overcome evil. We remember the rescuers, those righteous gentiles, who risked their own lives and the lives of their loved ones to protect and save vulnerable Jewish lives. Last but not least, we remember the liberators and heroes who paid the ultimate sacrifice, fighting to preserve human dignity.

My Jewish friend, Ed Shames, is one of the greatest of the Greatest Generation whose legendary legacy is captured in *Airborne* (the Combat Story of Ed Shames of Easy Company) by Ian Gardner. Edward David Shames was born on June 13, 1922, in Virginia Beach, when it was but a rural community. He was the youngest of the four children, of David and Sadie, who ran the "Shames Provisions" country store, with the family living above it. The father's sudden death at age 42 and the Great Depression challenged the family. He grew up rowing and fishing in Chesapeake Bay, target practicing with his father's pistols and learning navigation when hiking with a gift of maps and a compass from his sacrificial mother. Shames went to great length to firmly train his third platoon. Though his strictness was resented by some, it did pay in saved lives. Not only did Ed hold the best record for saved lives among the Division's 500 platoons, he also was the Division's first to receive a battlefield commission following D-Day. Furthermore, he was the first officer of his Division to enter Dachau a few days following its liberation and the horrors he faced are still with him today. The book's sales proceeds admirably go toward wounded warriors and their families. I can personally attest to Col. Shames' keen convictions, biting humor, and profound humility of a soldier's soldier and a hero's hero. He was honored by the French Government and the legislature in Richmond, Virginia.

As we celebrate Israel's 69th Anniversary, we look forward with lasting gratitude to the 50th Jubilee of the 1967 Six-Day-War miraculous victory, and the reunification of Jerusalem, the Jewish people's eternal capital. We recall the preceding gripping fear of another Holocaust, this time by the sur-

rounding and menacing Arab states begrudging the triumphant survival of European Jewry's remnant which includes my own family. At last, all of Jerusalem's holy sites are safeguarded and respected. We pray for Shalom's blessing of elusive peace to embrace Israelis and Palestinians with the latter finally accepting the exceptional return of an ancient people uprooted from its native land by the Roman sword's power. For two trying millennia, Israelis, never abandoned its divine bond with Zion and Jerusalem, thus proving the superiority of the human soul's power.

We marvel at Israel's world-class, astonishing accomplishments and innovations in its brief and challenging years of renewed sovereignty, even as it faces existential threats from a nuclear capable seeking Iran, its proxies, and the close presence of ISIS and Jihadist groups. The genocidal tragic Syrian scenario is entering its seventh year of massive human destruction and the greatest refugee crisis since WWII. President Trump's military response to the latest gas attack on the long abandoned Syrian civilians including children, reminiscent of the Holocaust, is deeply appreciated. New opportunities have emerged for rapprochement between Israel and the Sunni Arab states. We bemoan the precipitous and alarming global rise of anti-Semitism, the world's oldest hatred that made the Holocaust possible. The threats within the United States against Jewish institutions, the desecration of Jewish cemeteries and anti-Israel/Jewish activities in American schools make mockery of sacred memory, justice and truth, while enabling aggressors to persist and delay peace.

The United Nations, created in the wake of WWII and the Holocaust, has shamefully turned into a bastion of anti-Israel propaganda as we praise Israel's valiant defense as well as staunch opposition to the destructive BDS movement by American Ambassador Nikki Haley, a shining light in a house of darkness. The unique bond of genuine brotherhood with the United States, vital to both countries, is between the world's leading democracy and the only democracy in the Middle East. The constructive role of American Jewry cannot be overstated.

HONORING THE CLAY COUNTY
PARK RANGERS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I pause to thank and honor the Clay County Park Rangers for their efforts in serving Smithville following the March 6, 2017 tornado.

The EF-2 rated tornado left a trail of destruction up to 1,000 feet wide and 18 miles long. In Smithville, over 60 houses were damaged with several completely destroyed, resulting in over 65 tons of debris. Miraculously, no injuries were sustained during the storm.

After the storm, officers from the Clay County Park Rangers helped set up a perimeter, went door-to-door making sure residents were safe, and helped protect the neighborhood with a 24/7 presence in the days that followed. The effect of the rangers on the neighborhoods affected by the tornado cannot be understated, whether through making the victims feel safe from scroungers or looters or by helping residents with their physical needs throughout the recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and the community of Smithville in thanking Interim Park Security Manager John Davis and the rangers and staff of the Clay County Park Rangers for their service following the March 6 tornado and wishing them God's blessings and protection in the years to come.

PRAISING LAW ENFORCEMENT
AGENCIES INVOLVED IN SOLVING
THE MURDER OF CHIEF
DEPUTY CLINT GREENWOOD

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep appreciation and admiration to all of the Texas federal law enforcement officers who worked so diligently in getting to the bottom of the tragic and senseless murder of Harris County Precinct 3 Constable, Assistant Chief Deputy Greenwood.

My hat goes off to the Baytown Police Department, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), U.S. Marshals Service, Houston Police Department, Gulf Coast Violent Offenders Task Force, Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS), Texas Rangers, Harris County Sheriff's Department, and Harris County District Attorney. These men and women showed tremendous determination and commitment in their efforts to find this evil perpetrator and deliver justice. While we continue to mourn the loss of another one of our brave Texas law enforcement officers, their hard work and tireless efforts have helped bring healing and closure to the family and the entire law enforcement community.

My prayers continue to be with the family of Assistant Chief Deputy Greenwood.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY
OF EARTH FRIENDLY
PRODUCTS

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the outstanding public service of the Vlahakis family on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the founding of their family's company, Earth Friendly Products. The success story of the Vlahakis family is one of love, labor, and perseverance. This family owned and operated company began with the vision of Van Vlahakis, who immigrated to America from Greece with just \$22 in his pocket. He spoke little English, yet he made something of himself, studying chemistry at Roosevelt University and founding the company out of his garage in 1967.

Born out of Van's own experience suffering the effects of exposure to harsh chemicals, Earth Friendly Products was a green company before being green was fashionable.

The Vlahakis family's commitment to sustainability is evidenced by their decision to use safe ingredients, earning recognition as the 2015 EPA Safer Choice Partner of the Year. Just last year, they opened a new Carbon

Neutral Platinum Zero Waste manufacturing center, demonstrating leadership in the cause of sound environmental stewardship.

The Vlahakis' dedication to a healthier and happier planet applies not just to their corporate philosophy, but to their community. They have created good jobs and voluntarily implemented a \$17 per hour company-wide minimum wage, one of the highest in the nation. They also bring interactive educational programs directly to kids in schools, and host field trips at their facilities.

Although Van Vlahakis passed away in 2014, his legacy lives on under the leadership of his daughter and my friend, Kelly Vlahakis-Hanks. Kelly is a champion in the Greek-American community and she has been an inspiration to those in the green movement.

Fifty years after Van Vlahakis had the foresight to make products with safe ingredients and sustainable practices, much of America has caught up to his vision. We now expect the goods we purchase to be both effective and safe and we demand that companies not exploit the environment in pursuit of profits.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Kelly Vlahakis-Hanks and Earth Friendly Products as they celebrate this momentous anniversary.

IN HONOR OF MARK MARINI

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief Warrant Officer Five (CW5) Mark S. Marini, Sr. for his dedicated service to our Country, the United States Army, and the Connecticut National Guard.

This week, Mr. Marini retires from the Connecticut Army National Guard after 42 years of uniformed service. For over four decades, Mr. Marini has served the State of Connecticut and our Country with the utmost dignity and respect, and it is my profound honor to recognize him as he retires this Thursday from his position as the Command Chief Warrant Officer of the Connecticut Army National Guard.

CW5 Marini's accomplishments while serving at home and with his unit deployed into harm's way are extensive—his full engagement, leadership and contributions have had a significant and long lasting impact upon the numerous formations that make up our Connecticut National Guard. His dedication to his country, the National Guard, and the men and women of the state is unparalleled.

I extend my deepest congratulations to CW5 Marini upon his retirement, and extend my appreciation to him for enduring so much for so long on our behalf.

ISRAELI HOLOCAUST
REMEMBRANCE DAY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, Israelis commemorated Holocaust Remembrance Day. Carrying out what they

called their "final solution" to the "Jewish problem," the Nazis gassed millions of Jews at Auschwitz, and then collected their corpses like waste to be burned in the camp.

Mr. Speaker, this happened just 72 years ago, though many seem to forget. From the ashes of Auschwitz the Jewish people returned to their ancient homeland and established the sole democracy in the Middle East.

Unfortunately, the Jewish people of Israel are again targets of elimination. Iran, Hezbollah, Hamas, and a growing list of others have openly called to "eliminate" the Jewish state and "wipe it off the map."

We must honor the memories of the 6 million Jews murdered by the Nazis by vowing that Jews will never again stand alone before those seeking their extermination. The American people stand with Israel and with Jews everywhere remembering those that perished.

We remember. And we vow: never again.
And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE CLAY COUNTY
SHERIFF'S OFFICE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I pause to thank and honor the Clay County Sheriff's Office for their efforts in serving Smithville following the March 6, 2017 tornado.

The EF-2 rated tornado left a trail of destruction up to 1,000 feet wide and 18 miles long. In Smithville, over 60 houses were damaged with several completely destroyed, resulting in over 65 tons of debris. Miraculously, no injuries were sustained during the storm.

After the storm, officers from the Clay County Sheriff's Office helped set up a perimeter, went door-to-door making sure residents were safe, and helped protect the neighborhood with a 24/7 presence in the days that followed. Their experience and training in emergency management was crucial as the city and residents began to put their lives back together. The effect of the Sheriff's Office on the neighborhoods affected by the tornado cannot be understated, whether through making the victims feel safe from scroungers or looters or by helping residents with their physical needs throughout the recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and the community of Smithville in thanking Sheriff Paul Vescovo and the officers and staff of the Clay County Sheriff's Office for their service following the March 6 tornado and wishing them God's blessings and protection in the years to come.

A BOW TO A LAWYER WITH APPEALING SKILLS—JOAN O'HARA JOINS VICE PRESIDENT PENCE'S 'RIGGEROUS' NATIONAL SECURITY CREW

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of gratitude for the service and friendship of

Joan O'Hara—formerly my General Counsel for the House Homeland Security Committee—who now holds the post of Deputy National Security Advisor to Vice President Mike Pence.

Joan would tell you she owes her professional success not to the Halls of Congress but to the skulls and shells of crew. In fact, the first 15 years of Joan's adult life were dedicated to competitive rowing—not law or politics. She approached rowing as she has since approached any obstacle or opportunity in her life: with genuine curiosity and an undeterrable will for success.

Joan took up rowing in her senior year at Loyola College in Maryland. Shortly thereafter, she won a national championship in the single scull competition and was part of a winning team in a quad scull. The former is a testament to Joan's individual determination and perseverance, the latter—her leadership and teamwork. Both of these qualities have since expressed themselves explicitly in Joan's political career.

After her own competitive career was over Joan coached rowing at the collegiate level. As a mentor to young women, she shared her personal experiences and insight to help others better themselves. Joan taught that it is not just the strength of one's back that contributes to rowing success but a cognizant awareness of the route to the finish line and humble understanding of what it takes to get there; and that when there are multiple people in the scull, it is not about how well any one person rows but how well they row as one.

This same mentality has guided her political career. In 2007, Joan noticed a political fervor at the grassroots level that she had never seen before. With her interest sparked, she decided to pursue a law degree and career in public service. Similarly to rowing, Joan excelled at an impressive rate. She joined the Homeland Security Committee as a legal intern and was hired on as a counsel—quickly ascending to General Counsel.

In her tenure as my General Counsel, she was a trusted advisor and close confidant. She positioned herself at the forefront of the encryption debate by drafting legislation to create a national commission to provide recommendations balancing privacy and security. She also played an integral part in facilitating the first congressional agreement to reauthorize the Department of Homeland Security.

Joan's insight, professionalism, and leadership are missed as she departs this Committee. She will be an outstanding advisor to the Vice President, and I am excited to see what she makes of this new opportunity. It will be a pleasure to watch Joan as she once again embarks on a new adventure and accepts nothing less than excellence along her journey.

HONORING DOCUMENTED ORIGINAL TUSKEGEE AIRMAN WALTER K. ROBINSON, SR.

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me

in honoring the service of Documented Original Tuskegee Airman (DOTA) Walter K. Robinson, Sr. Tomorrow, I will welcome Mr. Robinson and his family to my office to celebrate his extraordinary service.

Walter K. Robinson, Sr. was born in Baltimore, Maryland in 1920, the second son of Dr. John C. Robinson and Mrs. Clara Denning Robinson. In 1941, while attending Howard University in Washington, D.C., he volunteered for the Army Air Corps. He was sent to Camp Lee in Virginia, Keesler Field in Biloxi, Mississippi, and finally to Tuskegee Army Air Base in Tuskegee, Alabama. He began training at Tuskegee Institute for Basic Ground School, and after three months, continued in Pre-Flight, Primary, Basic, and Advanced Flight. During Primary Training, he had an accident in which he severed his Achilles tendon and was hospitalized for a year, enduring six operations and extensive physical therapy. When he was eventually able to return to full duty, he completed training, and while there, World War II ended. On November 8, 1945, Mr. Robinson returned to civilian life, a few years after marrying his high school sweetheart, Edmonia Bailey.

After his honorable discharge from the military, Mr. Robinson and his wife moved to Washington, D.C. in 1959. He worked for the U.S. Postal Service and retired after 35 years of service, rising through the ranks of the Post Office as Clerk, Station Manager and the second black Manager of Delivery and Collection for D.C. The Robinsons had one son, Walter K. Robinson, Jr. Sadly, Mr. Robinson's beloved wife, Edmonia Bailey Robinson, passed away in 2000, after 59 years of marriage. Today, Mr. Robinson still lives in Washington, D.C. and is a very active member of the East Coast Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen (ECCTAI, Inc.). Members of ECCTAI and the Tuskegee Airmen were well-deserving of the Congressional Gold Medal they collectively received in March 2007. It is an honor to have a Tuskegee Airman still living in the District, and I very much look forward to meeting and welcoming him and his family to my office tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in honoring the service of Walter K. Robinson, Sr. and the extraordinary service and sacrifice also made by his brothers and sisters in World War II.

HONORING MICHAEL AND TABITHA MARQUARDT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I honor my constituents, Michael and Tabitha Marquardt, on his upcoming retirement after more than 20 years of service with the United States Navy.

Michael's tireless dedication to duty, professionalism and sacrifice touched the lives of countless people and challenged all with whom he worked to be the best. His numerous commendations and awards, including the Marine Corps Achievement Medal, the Navy Good Conduct Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal and several others, are

a testament to his courage, work ethic and character. His enduring legacy of service to our Nation truly is commendable.

Michael would be the first to admit, however, that his service at home and around the world—to include the Persian Gulf and Mexico—would have been impossible without the sacrifice and service of his wife, Tabitha. Like thousands of other military spouses, her strength and perseverance played a critical role in our Nation's defense as she managed the family's affairs at home, which allowed Michael to focus on critical missions before him. We owe an enormous debt of gratitude for the service of our military families.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I commend and congratulate Michael and Tabitha Marquardt upon his retirement and for their family's service to the United States of America.

HONORING MILITARY ENLISTEES

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 67 high school seniors in Florida's 21st District who have decided to enlist in the United States Armed Forces.

Of the 67 from my district, 25 have joined the Army; their names are the following: Amon King, Anne Kwarteng, Ola Selwyn-Dudoit, Nicole Thornton, Alejandro Abrego, Jonathan Abresch, Jordan Amoedo, Lashawndra Bryant, Calvin Castro, Emilio Constante, Jordan Edwards, Kamron Flar, Jameal Hutchinson, Dexter Knowles, Jorge Lopez, Kamaal Matthews, Skyler Podhurst, Widmania Registre, Aaron Rodriguez, Andrea Santana, Sameh Sedrak, Matthews Silva, Sabrina Silver, Gregory Westpfahl, and Nicholas Whittington.

Twenty-seven have joined the Marines; their names are the following: Abbey Teitelbaum, Cherilyn Kranenberg, Kyran Russell, Erik Bruce, Daniel Mass, Cesar Bermudez, Ray Smith, Steele Holman, Ethan Brake, Climineda Charles, Clayton Shellard, Jake Sollecito, Michael Mero, Kaudriel Valce, Bernardo Rodriguez-Tomas, Manuel Reyes, Joel Pena, Raymond Findieson, Jaheym Hendrickson, Thai Tran, Jeremiah Brown, Lazaro Figuero, Kristiana Lombardi, Greson Ramos-Artiga, Ian Sorenson, Anthony Torres, and Jacob Smith-Mullaly.

Two have joined the National Guard; their names are the following: Shelby Cochrane and Emilie Ortiz.

Eight have joined the Navy; their names are the following: Jasmine Oliver, Edwin Velazquez, Maxwell Mulford, Benjamin Johnson Jr., Myles Jackson, Kenny Zamor, Richneider Blaise, and Marjorie Galvez.

Five have joined the Air Force; their names are the following: Dylan Delmastro, Anthony Camposeco, Roland Kupoluyi, Eric Reid, and Brian Bickle.

It is in thanks to the dedication of patriots like these that we are able to meet here today, in the United States House of Representatives, and openly debate the best solutions to the diverse issues that confront our country.

On behalf of myself and all of my constituents in Florida's 21st District, we thank them for their service, and wish them best of luck as they pursue this challenging endeavor.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF JEFFERSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENT CAROLE A. MCCOY

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable woman who has shown strong dedication to serving New York's 21st District.

Carole McCoy first came to Watertown, New York, in January 2007, when she was appointed as the fifth president of Jefferson Community College. During her ten years of service, Ms. McCoy has continually demonstrated her commitment to the students of the North Country. Under her leadership, the college saw the construction of a Collaborative Learning Center for the purpose of fostering academic curiosity and encouraging cooperation among students. Additionally, since 2007, enrollment at Jefferson Community College has increased by nearly 21 percent, seven times the typical growth rate at community colleges across New York State.

Ms. McCoy also received the 2016 ATHENA Award, which celebrates remarkable women as valued members and leaders of the community. She was recognized for professional excellence, providing valuable services to her community, and for supporting women to realize their potential.

In the 21st District of New York, we are proud of Carole McCoy's commitment to service and academia, and we honor the legacy she will leave at Jefferson Community College.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for roll call votes 222 and 223 Tuesday, April 25, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on both.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 25, 2017, I was not present for roll call vote 223. If I had been present for this vote, I would have voted: Yea on roll call vote 223.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF JUSTICE MICHAEL J. EAGEN

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael J. Eagen, former Chief Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court whose life will be commemorated by the Lackawanna County Historical Society with a History Marker. A shrewd legal mind, Eagen was a celebrated force for change in the Pennsylvania justice system before his retirement in 1980.

Michael J. Eagen was born on May 9, 1907 and grew up in Jermyn, Pennsylvania. In 1927, Eagen graduated from St. Thomas College, today the University of Scranton. Eagen then enrolled at Harvard Law School. After one semester, he returned to Northeast Pennsylvania following the loss of a family business. Eagen later enrolled in a law course in Philadelphia and passed the bar exam to start practicing law.

Eagen then set his sights on elected office and public service, beginning his illustrious judicial career. In 1933, at the age of 26, he was elected the youngest District Attorney in Lackawanna County. After two terms as DA, he became the youngest judge in Lackawanna County history at 34 years old. While on the bench, Eagen was outspoken against corruption, notably criticizing city police and Assistant City Solicitor Joseph V. Phillips in a 1943 case when a defendant claimed he was denied his right to testify.

In 1959, Eagen joined the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. In 1977, Eagen was named the Court's 38th Chief Justice. In his years on the Supreme Court, Eagen ordered a number of reforms to improve Pennsylvania's judicial system. Under his deft leadership, the Court was expanded, delays in resolving civil lawsuits were rectified and streamlined, and a system of accountability for judges was instituted requiring them to submit a monthly report on the status of their assigned cases.

After an impressive 21-year career on Pennsylvania's highest court, Chief Justice Eagen retired from the bench in 1980. Eagen passed away in 1987 at 80 years of age, leaving behind an impressive legacy and a reformed Pennsylvania judicial system. It is an honor to recognize his many contributions to Pennsylvania.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed Roll Call vote numbers 222 and 223. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both.

RECOGNIZING ADAM BLANKS

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Adam Blanks for his hard work and dedication to the people of Colorado's Fourth District as an intern in my Washington, D.C. office for the Spring of 2017.

The work of this young man has been exemplary, and I know he has a bright future. He served as a tour guide, interacted with constituents, and learned a great deal about our nation's legislative process. I was glad to be able to offer this educational opportunity, and look forward to seeing him build his career in public service.

Adam plans to continue pursuing his degree at the end of this internship. I wish him the best as he pursues his career path. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Adam Blanks for his service the last several months to the people of Colorado's 4th district.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I missed Roll Call Vote 222 (H. Res. 187) and 223 (H.R. 876). Had I been present, I would have voted YES on both.

RECOGNIZING NOLAN HENDERSON

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nolan Henderson, a true American hero and pillar of our community, who passed away earlier this month.

Henderson was born and raised in Glenford, Ohio in Perry County. Soon after his graduation from Glenford High School, where he was part of the 1941 State Championship basketball team, he made the decision to join the Army.

In the Army, Henderson served with the 101st Airborne "Screaming Eagles" Division as a paratrooper in the 907th Field Glider Artillery Battalion. He fought in the Normandy invasion on D-Day, and was awarded the Bronze Star, Distinguished Unit badge with 4 bronze stars, and the WWII Victory Medal. His Battalion would go on to become the most decorated Army division of WWII.

After returning home, Henderson began a long career of serving the Glenford community. He served nearly 40 years as the Mayor of Glenford and 35 years as a rural carrier for the U.S. Postal Service. He was an active member of multiple community organizations, touching nearly every aspect of the community. This included time on the Northern Local School Board, the Glenford Lions Club, and the Shelly Park Board. He even served with the Hopewell Volunteer Fire Department.

Throughout his life, there is no doubt of the impact he has had on our community and our nation. Thank you Nolan Henderson.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 222.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF UPLIFT FAMILY SERVICES

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend Uplift Family Services, the oldest charitable institution in Santa Clara County. Uplift Family Services, previously known as EMQFF, is a non-profit behavioral health organization for children and families and will celebrate its 150th anniversary this year. Today, Uplift Family Services is one of the largest family centered treatment programs in all of California; they serve 20,000 children in 30 different countries.

Uplift Family Services, founded in 1867, evolved from an orphanage and Chinese rescue mission to California's largest, most comprehensive provider of behavioral health services for children and families. In fact, in 1994, Uplift Family Services became the first agency in California to launch an innovative program called Wraparound. That program, which delivers mental health and trauma related services to children and families, is now mandated in every county in the State of California. Uplift Family Services and its directors have played a vital role in generating community awareness, and facilitating engagement for the communities they serve. In so doing, they assist individuals realize their hopes for behavioral health and emotional well-being.

Uplift Family Services' three-part Crisis Continuum of Services serve an average of 200 youth per month and successfully divert 70 percent of the youth from hospitalization. In addition, Uplift Family Services provide Foster Care and Adoption Services to 26 counties in California. Uplift Family Services was awarded the 2016 Agency Community Hero Award by the Santa Clara County Behavioral Health Board. Since its inception, Uplift Family Services has helped children and adolescents with complex behavioral challenges recover from trauma, cope with mental health disabilities, and lead happier and fuller lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Uplift Family Services, for its 150 years of service and advocacy to children and families in Santa Clara County.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF HORIZON BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Horizon Blue Cross Blue Shield of New Jersey as it celebrates its 85th anniversary this year. Since its founding, Horizon Blue Cross Blue Shield of New Jersey has provided quality, accessible insurance to its customers. Its commitment to the service and benefit of its policyholders is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

The oldest and largest health insurer in New Jersey, Horizon Blue Cross Blue Shield of New Jersey (Horizon) was established in 1932 as the Associated Hospitals of Essex County, Inc. and today serves more than 3.8 million residents. It is also New Jersey's largest Medicaid insurer, covering 841,000 patients. Additionally, Horizon provides a substantial impact on the economic growth of New Jersey as well as thousands of employment opportunities to New Jersey residents.

Horizon strives to fulfill its mission of improving the well-being of its members and the overall health care industry through a comprehensive approach to medical care. In addition to its medical, dental and prescription insurance coverage, Horizon offers patient support programs, case management, around-the-clock medical advice and lifestyle wellness resources.

Supporting local community organizations through the Horizon Foundation for New Jersey, Horizon aims to improve the health of individuals across New Jersey. Since its inception in 2004, the Horizon Foundation for New Jersey has given \$47.8 million in grants to various organizations, including the YMCA and the Boys and Girls Clubs of New Jersey. Horizon's employee Horizon Cares program also provides hands-on volunteer assistance to neighborhoods across the state.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in celebrating the 85th anniversary of Horizon Blue Cross Blue Shield of New Jersey. The company continues to uphold its mission to providing outstanding services to its customers and New Jersey's communities.

**U.S. WANTS TO COMPETE FOR A
WORLD EXPO ACT**

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 2017

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the U.S. Wants to Compete for a World Expo Act (H.R. 534).

World Expos are gatherings of millions of people from around the globe exploring ideas, innovation and international understanding. A World Expo is a six month long event that highlights the very best that the host city and nation has to offer in science, technology, innovation, and culture. It is no wonder that states and cities across the United States are

interested in competing on the global stage and hosting a World Expo. A city that hosts a World Expo instantly becomes a global destination.

My home state of Minnesota is competing against Buenos Aires, Argentina and Lodz, Poland to host the 2023 World Expo. Minnesota's bid intends to focus on health innovation based on the theme "Wellness and Well-Being for All." Minnesota's healthcare industry is advanced, global, and innovative—and it deserves the spotlight. Hosting the World Expo in 2023 would be a remarkable event for the people of my state.

Unfortunately, an American state or city competing to host a World Expo is currently at an almost insurmountable disadvantage because the United States is not a member of the Bureau of International Expositions (BIE)—the governing body for World Expos. Unless Congress affirmatively authorizes the State Department to rejoin the BIE, from which the United States withdrew almost two decades ago, it is unlikely that Minnesota or any other state or city will be awarded a World Expo.

The U.S. Wants to Compete for a World Expo Act is a bipartisan effort that levels the playing field. It authorizes the Secretary of State to take the steps to rejoin the BIE immediately. By ending this harmful self-imposed isolation from the BIE, the United States will once again be in a position to host a World Expo and showcase the innovation, culture, and beauty of our great nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 534, legislation that lets our country compete for the many benefits provided by hosting a World Expo.

**HONORING THOMAS KIBLER OF
PENNSYLVANIA**

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I honor my constituent, Thomas Kibler, for his retirement after 26 years in local law enforcement.

Mr. Kibler has served as a patrol officer and/or a criminal investigator with the Northern York County Regional Police, the North Middleton Township Police and finally with the Carroll Township Police. Mr. Kibler has earned numerous commendations and awards for his police work and also served our Nation honorably in the United States Army Reserve. He'll continue to serve our fellow citizens in a new role with the Pennsylvania Capitol Police.

Mr. Kibler's tireless dedication, professionalism and sacrifice touched the lives of countless people and challenged all with whom he served to be the best. His legacy of service to our community truly is admirable.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I commend and congratulate Thomas Kibler on his retirement from local law enforcement and wish him Godspeed in his future adventures.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL OFFICIALS RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT EQUALITY ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Federal Officials Residency Requirement Equality Act, a bill that would amend federal law to require certain federal officials who serve the District of Columbia to actually live within its boundaries. In nearly every other jurisdiction in the United States, federal district court judges, U.S. Attorneys, and U.S. Marshals are required by federal law to reside within the jurisdictions where they have been appointed—but these same officials appointed to serve the people of the District are not bound by these same requirements. Even in the territories that have such officials, the officials must live in those districts, other than the U.S. Attorney and U.S. Marshal appointed for the Northern Mariana Islands who at the same time are serving in the same capacity in another district. The only other exceptions exist for such officials appointed to the Southern District of New York and the Eastern District of New York, which are the only districts that serve different parts of the same city. My bill would put D.C. on equal footing with almost every other jurisdiction by ensuring that our Marshals, judges, and U.S. Attorney live among the residents they have been appointed to represent.

Clearly, the idea that these federal officials ought to live in the jurisdictions they serve is a significant one—which is why the residency requirement for other jurisdictions is enshrined in federal law. Yet, D.C. was exempt from this requirement based on the now-outdated notion that the District is too congested and small to house these appointed officials. The District is a vibrant and bustling city with a diverse populace who deserve direct engagement on the part of its federal judges, U.S. attorney, and Marshals. My bill recognizes the fact that D.C. deserves the same type of community involvement by these federal officials as nearly every jurisdiction.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

**AVIATION EMPLOYEE SCREENING
AND SECURITY ENHANCEMENT
ACT OF 2017**

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 2017

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the cost estimate from the Congressional Budget Office regarding H.R. 876. The cost estimate was not available at the time of the filing of the Committee report.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,

U.S. CONGRESS,

Washington, DC, April 26, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL McCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost

estimate for H.R. 876, the Aviation Employee Screening and Security Enhancement Act of 2017.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Megan Carroll.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, *Director.*

Enclosure.

H.R. 876—AVIATION EMPLOYEE SCREENING AND SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2017

As ordered reported by the House Committee on Homeland Security on March 8, 2017

SUMMARY

H.R. 876 would direct the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to pursue a variety of activities aimed at improving

aviation security, particularly by enhancing vetting and screening of aviation workers and controlling their access to secure areas of airports. Based on an analysis of information from TSA, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 876 would cost \$41 million over the 2017–2022 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts.

Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply. CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 876 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 876 would impose intergovernmental and private-sector mandates as defined in

the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) on airport operators and air carriers. Based on information from the TSA and airport officials, CBO estimates that the total costs of the mandates on public and private entities would fall well below the annual thresholds established in UMRA for intergovernmental and private-sector mandates (\$78 million and \$156 million in fiscal year 2017, respectively, adjusted annually for inflation).

ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary effect of H.R. 876 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 400 (transportation).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—						
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2017–2022
INCREASES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION							
Estimated Authorization Level	0	15	7	7	7	7	43
Estimated Outlays	0	11	8	8	7	7	41

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

For this estimate, CBO assumes that the legislation will be enacted near the end of 2017, that the necessary amount will be appropriated each year, and that outlays will follow historical spending patterns.

H.R. 876 would require TSA to identify, in collaboration with airport operators and the TSA’s Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC), advanced technologies—particularly biometric identification technologies—for entrances and exits used by employees to access secure areas of airports. Under the bill, TSA could pursue a qualified products list (QPL) of such technologies, which would require several full time staff and ongoing collaborative efforts to develop and implement systems to test the full spectrum of commercially available technologies and recommend products manufactured by specific vendors. Because the bill would not require TSA to develop an official QPL, CBO expects that the agency would fulfill the bill’s requirement by identifying broad types or categories of technologies that would serve airports’ security needs. That effort would still involve several staff to assess existing and emerging technologies, on an ongoing basis, in collaboration with airport operators and the ASAC. Based on an analysis of information provided by the TSA about the cost of similar efforts, CBO estimates the agency would spend between \$4 million and \$5 million annually—or \$23 million over the 2017–2022 period—to implement this provision.

CBO estimates that implementing other provisions of H.R. 876 would cost \$18 million over the 2017–2022 period. That amount includes \$2 million annually for increased covert testing of employee screening at certain airports—an increase of roughly 10 percent over existing funding levels. The remaining \$8 million would be for a one-time study of measures used to secure entrances and exits used by employees to access the secure areas of airports. That estimate is based on the historical costs of similar efforts.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS

None.

INCREASE IN LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING AND DEFICITS

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 876 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE-SECTOR IMPACT

H.R. 876 would impose intergovernmental and private-sector mandates as defined in

UMRA. The bill would require airport operators and air carriers to provide information to TSA about individuals who have had their security credentials revoked. Additionally, the bill would require airport operators to notify applicants for security credentials about screening procedures and to submit applicants’ social security numbers to TSA. Those provisions would impose an intergovernmental mandate on airport operators and a private-sector mandate on airport operators and air carriers. Based on information from the TSA and airport officials, CBO expects that affected entities would probably report information to TSA electronically and estimates that the costs to submit that information would be small. In total, CBO estimates that the costs on public and private entities would fall well below the annual thresholds established in UMRA for intergovernmental and private-sector mandates (\$78 million and \$156 million in fiscal year 2017, respectively, adjusted annually for inflation).

ESTIMATE PREPARED BY

Federal Costs: Megan Carroll; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Jon Sperl; Impact on the Private Sector: Amy Petz.

ESTIMATE APPROVED BY

H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

RECOGNIZING AND CELEBRATING THE BIRTHDAY OF BENJAMIN “BEN” MORRIS OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, VA

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 90th birthday of Benjamin “Ben” Morris of Westmoreland County, VA.

Born on May 6, 1927, Ben would attend grade school at Oak Grove School for first through eleventh grade. Upon graduating in 1945, Ben enlisted in the United States Navy to serve in World War II.

By the time Ben completed boot camp in Maryland, the war had ended but the mission to evade Japan was still to take place. He journeyed to California to board a troop ship

that would travel to the Marshall Islands where he would board the USS *Prairie*. The USS *Prairie* traveled the seas of the Pacific, stopping at many islands, until it reached Tokyo, Japan. Ben recalls being amazed at the destruction of the city from the bombing that had occurred. After his naval tour of 15 months, he returned to his home in Montross, VA to begin working with his father at L.A. Clark Company, producing railroad ties.

In 1950, Ben and his older brother built a lumber mill. He was married that year and him and his wife would have three boys and a daughter together. In 1951, Northern Neck Lumber, Inc. opened for business in Warsaw, VA. After his brother’s death, Ben continued to run the business as President until 1995 when he retired. Ben’s two sons continue to run the business today.

Ben served on the Board of The Bank of Montross for 34 years until it was sold. Ben is a member of St. James Episcopal Church where he has served on the Vestry several times.

Ben has enjoyed the pleasures of the Northern Neck: golfing, fishing, boating, and hunting. He is proud of his three children from his first marriage who have blessed him with nine grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren. Ben and his current wife of 33 years live in Montross, and her two children and five grandchildren have been part of an ever growing family.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of knowing Ben for many years and am honored to recognize him and to celebrate his 90th birthday. On behalf the millions of Americans that he has selflessly served through his military service and service to his community, I thank him and wish him the happiest of birthdays.

TRIBUTE TO COACH KEN SPARKS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, many Tennesseans care about the Three “F’s” in life: Faith, Family, and Football.

One outstanding Tennessean in particular, Coach Ken Sparks, incorporated his love for all three of these into his amazing life.

Ken Sparks devoted his life to his alma mater, Carson Newman University, as an inspirational coach for almost 40 years.

While his record setting list of wins and accomplishments with his football teams might give someone else a big ego, Coach Sparks always kept the focus on someone else.

I had the honor of celebrating his impact on my district, thousands of student athletes, and other coaches just a few months ago at his retirement ceremony.

Coach Sparks spoke of success, wins, and achievements, but he did it while giving all the credit to the Lord. He spoke of his gratefulness to God through his amazing life experiences.

The life that Ken lived was one that was devoted to building up the success of others while remaining humble through each level of success he achieved himself. He had an amazing ability to connect with players in a way that gave them purpose on and off the field.

The love he had for his faith, family, and football were given deeper meaning with the devotion he had to his wife Carol, and their four children and 14 grandchildren.

Even though he was diagnosed with cancer five years ago, he continued to work hard to bring glory to God.

Although Tennesseans are greatly saddened by his loss, we should reflect on his life and the legacy he left behind.

I encourage all my Colleagues and others to celebrate the amazing life of Coach Sparks.

I would also like to call attention to the article that appeared in the Knoxville News Sentinel on March 31, 2017, entitled "Ken Sparks, A Life Well Lived".

NEWS SENTINEL EDITORIAL BOARD, PUBLISHED
MARCH 31, 2017

A wave of sadness washed over East Tennessee on Wednesday with the word that Carson-Newman University football icon Ken Sparks had succumbed to cancer.

Carson-Newman and Sparks were inseparable, venerable institutions.

He had dedicated nearly four decades to shaping young men's lives who played football for the university. That was more important to him than any of the championships, the trophies, the accolades, the numbers.

"I'm grateful to be part of a profession where you can teach about life while you're teaching blocking and tackling," Sparks said in 2010 when he was honored with the Robert R. Neyland Trophy. "The Lord has blessed me.

"I hope that through things like this I can honor the Lord and that it has more meaning than what's on the scoreboard at the end of the field."

Sparks, 73, a Knoxville native, retired after the 2016 season after courageously battling through his cancer diagnosis in 2012.

Polite, warm, always smiling, Sparks coached 37 seasons, recorded 338 wins, made 25 playoff trips, won 21 South Atlantic Conference titles and 5 national titles for the university where he graduated in 1967. He coached in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics and the National Collegiate Athletics Association Division II as well as at several high schools before returning to Carson-Newman in 1980.

In addition to the Neyland Trophy, Sparks has been honored with the Fellowship of Christian Athletes Lifetime Achievement Award. Sparks was elected president of the American Football Coaches Association in 2007. In 2002 he received the All-American

Football Foundation's Johnny Vaught Lifetime Achievement Award.

Sparks earned NAIA coach of the year honors in 1984 and was voted SAC coach of the year 12 times.

A forgiving man, he gave troubled players who had lost their way at other institutions a second chance.

"You're going to have influence, whether you like it or not," Sparks said last November when he retired. "Everyone of us is an example of something. We can talk all we want to, but our walk is what tells people who we are.

"The Lord has put us in a position where we've been able to have an audience of players and people that want to know the message. That's what I hope I've been true to, the Lord's message."

When Sparks announced his retirement, Carson-Newman athletics director Allen Morgan called it a sad day.

"It's a day we honor Ken and the legacy he is leaving for how he has touched young men's lives in a way far greater than wins on a football field.

"He has molded boys to become Christian young men, husbands and community leaders where they too can give back. So today, it's Ken Sparks' day. The entire Carson-Newman community gives thanks for what he has done not only for Carson-Newman but for the greater good of mankind."

HONORING MARLENE "MARTI" HOLLENBACK

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Marlene "Marti" Hollenback, a resident of Spokane and owner of Dishman Dodge, a local car dealership. Marti passed away at the age of 74 on April 15 after a short illness.

Marti's influence in the Spokane community extends well beyond the car dealership family. She started her career as a registered nurse, spending 25 years working as the head nurse in pediatrics at Valley Hospital and ultimately the director of community programs for Empire Health Systems. In 1995, her father convinced her to join the family business at Dishman Dodge, where she was initially the general manager. Marti was passionate about the dealership, knew every employee by name, and made a point of attending employee recognition events.

Marti also served on numerous community boards over the years, including Red Cross, Children's Home Society, Spokane Valley Community Center, Vanessa Behan Crisis Nursery and other business organizations. She was honored on several occasions and was a recipient of the Everyday Heart Award from Kiwanis in 2003. Her giving spirit was not only extended to these community boards, but also through philanthropic donations both personally and on behalf of the dealership, including a donated van to the Meals on Wheels program.

Marti is survived by her four children and numerous grandchildren. She surely will be missed by them and the Spokane Community.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JAY DICKEY

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today to honor the life and legacy of one of Arkansas's great leaders—Congressman Jay Dickey, who passed away last week after a battle with Parkinson's disease at the age of 77.

Jay represented the 4th District of Arkansas after becoming the first-ever Republican to hold the seat.

He was a great public servant who made many contributions to Arkansas and our Nation as a whole.

I have always admired his irrepressible enthusiasm for lower Arkansas and his dedication to his constituents.

We are all fortunate to have had someone with such a strong character be a leader for our state.

Jay leaves behind a legacy of warmth and passion, and his contributions to the Natural State will continue to live on for generations to come.

I extend my respect, affection and prayers to his family and loved ones.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE TRINITY CHRISTIAN ACADEMY OF CAPE COD

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th Anniversary of the Trinity Christian Academy of Cape Cod in Hyannis, Massachusetts.

Originally established in January 1967 as the Trinity School of Cape Cod by a group of four ministers and three laymen, the Trinity Christian Academy of Cape Cod was created as a nonprofit independent school without affiliation to any church or denomination. The school was established for the purpose of providing a strong academic education centered in historic Christianity and founded on the basic tenets of the Bible.

Trinity first opened its doors with a pre-school and kindergarten program in South Yarmouth using two buildings owned by the Evangelical Baptist Church. Since then, the school has moved to a new campus located on Mary Dunn Road in Barnstable. It has expanded to teach students all the way through high school, preparing them for higher education. Their current enrollment is 164 students, of which 53 percent receive some level of financial aid. Further proving their dedication to academic excellence, 100 percent of Trinity Christian Academy of Cape Cod graduates are accepted into their college of choice.

In addition to a strong academic program, the Trinity Christian Academy of Cape Cod's high school leadership development program guides their students to embrace the message of Christ in their daily lives and to go on and become influential and compassionate leaders. This program provides ample opportunity

for students to reach out and serve those who are marginalized in their community resulting in empathetic leadership skills. Trinity students actively mentor elementary students at local public schools and have partnered with local daycares which service lower income families, providing Christmas gifts, activities, and story time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Trinity Christian Academy of Cape Cod on its 50th Anniversary. I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the school's five decades of service and commitment to academic excellence and I look forward to seeing all that they are able to accomplish in the next 50 years.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BERGMANN'S CLEANING

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to use this time to recognize a local business on its 100th year in operation. Bergmann's Cleaning, whose main plant is located in Virginia's 10th District in Sterling, Virginia, provides a variety of cleaning services and is one of the oldest family-operated businesses in our region. Now managed by fourth generation family members, Bergmann's Cleaning is truly a staple in our community and region, and I commend the Bergmann family on their exemplary business practices and ability to adapt and grow throughout the years.

In 1917, W.C. Bergmann decided to supplement his income as a lamplighter in Washington, D.C. by starting a small laundry service, where he, with his horse drawn truck, would pick up the clothes of his customers, clean and press them, and then deliver them back to their homes. His services quickly gained recognition, and with the help of his sons, he opened the first Bergmann's Cleaning store within a year of starting the horse drawn truck business. The number of inner city stores increased, but many people were moving out to the suburbs of Washington, D.C. and also required new services. Accordingly, Bergmann's Cleaning not only continued their convenient and free pick-up and delivery service, which garnered thousands of new customers in the D.C. suburbs, but also expanded its cleaning offerings to include clothing, rugs, draperies, linens and more.

Today, Bergmann's Cleaning's day-to-day operations are managed by E. Peter Bergmann, the President, and Larry M. Bergmann Jr., the Vice President of Sales and Operations. Under their leadership, the company has 20 efficient delivery and pick-up routes, ranging from Reston, Virginia, to Columbia, Maryland, and has a staff of 125 people, many of whom are constituents of Virginia's 10th District. In addition to the successful door-to-door service, Bergmann's Cleaners serves more than 25 hotels in our region, uses ecofriendly and biodegradable cleaning products, and is responsible for the most successful annual coat drive in the nation. In fact now in its 17th year, the annual "Share the Warmth, Coats for Kids and the Needy" drive has delivered nearly 500,000 coats to those less fortunate.

In today's society, family owned businesses are essential to the future of our nation. It is families, like the Bergmanns, who help foster strong local economies by establishing successful business practices that can be carried out for multiple generations. While the services provided have changed and expanded over the years, the entrepreneurial attitude of the Bergmann family and common goal of serving their community has remained the same.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Bergmann's Cleaning for its dedication to serving our community for 100 years. I wish E. Peter Bergmann, Larry M. Bergmann, Jr., and the entire company the best in their future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO HON. NELSON JAEGER BECKER

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a prominent Hoosier leader and my close friend, Mr. Nelson Jaeger Becker, who passed away on April 7, 2017 surrounded by his loving family.

Nelson was born in Logansport, Indiana on September 16, 1940. He graduated from Logansport High School, received his Bachelor of Business Administration from Tulane University, and his Doctor of Jurisprudence from Tulane University Law School. He also graduated from the Culver Summer Naval School and served in the United States Air Force as a JAG officer where he attained the rank of captain.

Nelson was passionate about the law, the legislative process, serving the community, and politics. He practiced law in Logansport from 1968 up until his passing. He dutifully served the residents of Carroll and Cass Counties as their State Representative for over a decade in the Indiana House of Representatives. During that time, he served as Majority Whip and Speaker Pro Tempore. Nelson continued to serve the state legislature as a government affairs professional for several industries providing the part-time legislators with facts to help them make decisions on policy issues facing the General Assembly. Nelson's service to the great State of Indiana did not go unnoticed. He was a recipient of Indiana's highest civilian award, The Sagamore of the Wabash.

Nelson truly cared about the City of Logansport and it showed through his actions. He was a former member of the Board of Directors of Logansport Savings Bank and the Board of Directors of the First National Bank of Logansport. He was also the former President of the Cass County YMCA Board of Directors and held memberships with the First United Methodist Church, the Elks, and American Legion.

I had known Nelson for many years and always appreciated his advice and council on a variety of issues. Nelson was one of the very first people to support me in my bid for public service. And he was quite literally the first person to turn his verbal support into concrete action. I will never forget that . . . or the small

group of Logansport leaders who met with me in Nelson's house one evening in 2001 to support my goals for public service.

Nelson leaves Dixie, his beloved wife, five sons, and fifteen grandchildren to carry on his legacy of service to fellow Hoosiers. Anyone who knew him well knows what a great loss his passing is for our community and the State of Indiana. May he rest in peace, he will not be forgotten.

IN HONOR OF DEAN AND ANGIE WYSNER'S 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the 50th wedding anniversary of Dean and Angie Wysner on May 5th.

Dean and Angie met at Woodland High School and dated only a short time before he enlisted in the Army. Dean was assigned and stationed in California and they were married after he had been gone for a year.

Dean and Angie have been blessed with three children: Deena, Chad and Lori. Additional blessings include their four grandchildren: Tanner, Abby, Brittany and Mason and great-grandchildren: Rayleigh, Kayleigh and AnaLeigh.

Dean is the son of Moulton and Josie Wysner of Graham, Alabama and graduated from Woodland High School in 1964. He worked in manufacturing after high school and then served as a Military Police in the Army. After his service, he went back to manufacturing for a few short years until he became a self-employed farmer and has continued for 45 years. He has served with the Farmer's Federation for 18 years advocating for the family farm and also served as a Randolph County Commissioner.

Angie is the daughter of Marvin and Earla Spradlin of Woodland, Alabama and graduated from Woodland High School in 1965. She worked in manufacturing after high school until having children and then working full-time on the family farm. Once the children had all graduated from high school, she began a career with the U.S. Postal Service as a Rural Letter Carrier which she continues today.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the 50th wedding anniversary of my friends, Dean and Angie Wysner.

ANZAC DAY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the anniversary of the ANZAC Day. On this day, 102 years ago, while horrific trench warfare was taking place in Europe, half a continent away, the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps, came together for a noble cause. Together they set out to capture the Dardanelles and Gallipoli to open a route for the allied navies.

The combined forces were met by fierce resistance from the Ottoman Turks. What was originally intended to quickly eliminate Turkey from the war turned into a bloody, 8-month battle. More than 8,000 Australians and 2,400 New Zealanders died in that campaign.

The tragic losses of so many brave soldiers caused Australians and New Zealanders to remember the sacrifice of all those who died on ANZAC Day. On this national day of remembrance I am humbly inspired by how Australians show gratitude to their fallen warriors.

Today I ask my colleagues to join our friends and allies, the Aussies and the Kiwis, across the sea, as they honor their fallen and reflect on the many different meanings of war.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE 52ND
ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the Head Start organization on its 52nd Anniversary.

Since its establishment, Head Start has been working to serve the country's most vulnerable families. In addition to working with organizations that provide learning, nutrition and general health assistance for children, Head Start has also helped to provide training, job development, and volunteer opportunities for low-income parents. These efforts are critical for establishing an environment in which every American is equipped to reach their full potential.

In my district, the Warren County Head Start Center has strengthened our community by working with over 250 families to provide learning opportunities for children and parents alike. While focusing on early childhood development programs, these centers also offer assistance to parents seeking higher education, lessening their burden so that they may work towards a brighter future for their family.

I would like to thank Head Start for 52 years of commitment to children and families across the country. In New York's 21st District, we are grateful for their work to make sure every child has the opportunity to succeed. I wish Head Start a prosperous future and I am confident that it will continue making a positive impact on the lives of many Americans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on roll call vote 222 and 223, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "AYE."

HONORING ERIC STILES OF
PENNSYLVANIA

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I honor my constituent, Eric Stiles, for earning a 2017 Governor's Victim Service Pathfinder Award, Pennsylvania's most prestigious award for a victim service professional or program.

Mr. Stiles is a sexual assault survivor who has devoted his career to advocacy and activism on behalf of others. At the National Sexual Violence Resource Center, Mr. Stiles has helped to develop best practices in sexual violence intervention and prevention. He's led efforts to support sexual violence victims at all stages of life. His colleagues rave about a man who they say ". . . leads with passion and heart for the work, which only grows with his visionary ideas and creative outlets for engaging others," and who ". . . has an uncanny knack for helping people to move and grow into a better version of themselves."

As a member of the House Victims' Rights Caucus, and simply as a person who empathizes with and prays for the plight of sexual violence victims, I'm truly moved by Mr. Stiles' strength and compassion. His dedication has touched the lives of countless people and his legacy of service to others is exceptional.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LOW-WAGE
FEDERAL CONTRACTOR EM-
PLOYEE BACK PAY ACT OF 2017

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Low-Wage Federal Contractor Back Pay Act of 2017, to grant back pay to federally contracted retail, food, custodial and security service workers who may be furloughed if there is a federal government shutdown this fiscal year. The bill would apply to all three branches of the federal government. The idea for the bill was brought to my attention by federally contracted service workers, some of whom work here on the Capitol grounds providing Members of Congress and congressional staff with daily services, in 2013 when the federal government shut down.

Many federally contracted workers in federal agencies earn little more than the minimum wage with few, if any benefits, and while others are unionized with a little better wage, all are the lowest paid workers in the federal government and should not be punished because Congress fails to do its job and keep the government functioning. Congress has historically provided back pay to federal employees, who work in the same buildings as these low-wage service workers, furloughed during government shutdowns—but not low-wage contract workers. However, both groups of workers deserve to be made whole after these shutdowns. I recognize, of course, that contract workers are employees of contractors, but the distinction between federal workers and at least the lowest-paid service workers who

serve the federal government and its employees and keep, for example, their premises clean, fails when it comes to a deliberate government shutdown. Unlike many other contractors, those who employ low-wage service workers have little latitude to help make up for lost wages. Low-wage federally contracted service workers could least afford the loss of pay during a shutdown, and should not have to go to work every day with everyone else in their federal buildings likely receiving back pay except for them.

The nation's capital is the high-profile home of the federal government's collusion with contractors that pay low wages through leases and contracts with federal agencies. At least this legislation would provide some parity to their low-wage federal contractor workers.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

CELEBRATING MARK! LOPEZ, RE-
CIPIENT OF THE 2017 GOLDMAN
ENVIRONMENTAL PRIZE

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate mark! Lopez, a tireless environmental advocate and the executive director of East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice, on his receipt of this year's Goldman Environmental Prize for North America. mark! has played an integral role in the fight to test and clean up the contaminated homes of families living near the former Exide battery recycling plant, which is situated in my 40th Congressional District. Though mark! is just 32 years old, his activism and passion have already made a clear and positive mark on our community, richly deserving of this global recognition.

mark! was born to a family of activists, and was raised in the midst of the activities of Madres del Este de Los Angeles Santa Isabel (Mothers of East LA Santa Isabel), an organization cofounded by his grandparents, my good friends Juana Beatriz Gutierrez and Ricardo Gutierrez, and continued by his mother, Elsa Lopez. Protesting and organizing were familiar sights to him from an early age, and during his years as an environmental studies major at UC Santa Cruz, he showed his commitment to this family tradition as a community organizer and activist for the needs of minority students and service workers. His dedication to advocacy and the environment foreshadowed his work in the fight to close the Exide plant and clean up the polluted lands surrounding the facility.

Exide finally agreed to shut down this plant in 2015, but properties for miles around remained contaminated with high levels of lead and arsenic. The work of mark! and his colleagues at East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice was invaluable in compelling the California Department of Toxic Substances Control to expand its testing of properties around the plant, and in helping secure a state commitment of \$176.6 million to test and clean up contaminated homes.

All families, regardless of their background, regardless of their neighborhood, deserve to raise their loved ones in a safe and clean environment. Activists like mark! Lopez not only

help to make that goal a reality, they inspire other citizens to act through their example. As testing and cleanup efforts around Exide continue, I have no doubt that mark! will be at the forefront of the fight to support and protect families imperiled by this terrible contamination, and to ensure a pristine environment for all.

Mr. Speaker, as mark! Lopez is honored with the Goldman Environmental Prize, I hope all of my colleagues will join me in commending him on receiving this prestigious award and in saluting his commitment to environmental justice.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, April 27, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED
MAY 2

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the United States-European Union covered agreement.
SD-538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold an oversight hearing to examine federal payments to local governments provided through the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act and the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program and the need to provide greater fiscal certainty for resource-dependent communities with tax-exempt federal lands.
SD-366

Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Terry Branstad, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China, Department of State.
SD-419

10:30 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine responses to the increase in religious hate crimes.
SD-226

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine United States European Command, focusing on theater assessment and European Reassurance Initiative (ERI) progress; to be immediately followed by a closed hearing in SVC-217.
SD-124

MAY 3

10 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities
To hold hearings to examine Department of Defense laboratories and their contributions to military operations and readiness.
SR-222

Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy
To hold hearings to examine global philanthropy and remittances and international development.
SD-419

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold hearings to examine defense innovation and research funding.
SD-192

Committee on the Budget
To hold hearings to examine the economy and private sector growth.
SD-608

MAY 4

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine United States Special Operations Command.
SD-G50

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the threat posed by electromagnetic pulse and policy options to protect energy infrastructure and to improve capabilities for adequate system restoration.
SD-366

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense policies and programs.
SR-232A

MAY 8

2:30 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism
To hold hearings to examine Russian interference in the 2016 United States election.
SD-226

MAY 10

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine S. 772, to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants, and S. 825, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska.
SD-628

Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine aging with community, focusing on building connections that last a lifetime.
SD-562

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2539–S2564

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 942–953, and S. Con. Res. 13. **Pages S2553–54**

Measures Passed:

Kids to Parks Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 123, designating May 20, 2017, as “Kids to Parks Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to.

Page S2564

Acosta Nomination—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of R. Alexander Acosta, of Florida, to be Secretary of Labor.

Pages S2541–47

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 61 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. 115), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Pages S2544–45

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, April 27, 2017; and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business and Leader remarks count post-closure on the nomination.

Page S2564

Messages from the House:

Page S2550

Measures Referred:

Page S2550

Executive Communications:

Pages S2550–53

Additional Cosponsors:

Page S2554

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S2554–63

Additional Statements:

Pages S2549–50

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Pages S2563–64

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—115)

Pages S2544–45

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 2:05 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 27, 2017. (For Senate’s program, see the re-

marks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S2564.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine review of National Guard and Reserve programs and readiness, after receiving testimony from General Joseph L. Lengyel, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Lieutenant General Charles D. Luckey, Chief of the Army Reserve, Lieutenant General Maryanne Miller, Chief of the Air Force Reserve, Vice Admiral Luke M. McCollum, Chief of the Navy Reserve, and Lieutenant General Rex C. McMillian, Commander of Marine Corps Forces Reserve, all of the Department of Defense.

AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE IN SPACE

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness concluded a hearing to examine reopening the American frontier, focusing on reducing regulatory barriers and expanding American free enterprise in space, after receiving testimony from Robert T. Bigelow, Bigelow Aerospace, LLC, North Las Vegas, Nevada; Robert Meyerson, Blue Origin, Kent, Washington; George Whitesides, Galactic Ventures, Mojave, California; and Andrew Rush, Made in Space, Inc., Moffett Field, California.

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES RULE

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the technical, scientific, and legal basis of the Waters of the United States Rule, after receiving testimony from Major General John Peabody, USA (Ret.), Arlington, Virginia; Misha Tseytlin, Wisconsin Solicitor General, Madison; Michael Josselyn, WRA, Inc., San Rafael, California; Ken Kopocis, American University Washington College of Law, Washington, D.C.; and Collin O’Mara, National Wildlife Federation, Reston, Virginia.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Tulinabo Salama Mushingi, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, and Todd Philip Haskell, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo, both of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

DUPLICATION, WASTE, AND FRAUD IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine duplication, waste, and fraud in Federal programs, including opportunities to reduce fragmentation and achieve other financial benefits, after receiving testimony from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; J. Russell George, Inspector General for Tax Administration, Department of the Treasury; Keith D. Repko, Medical Center Director, St. Louis Health Care System, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and Rebecca M. Blank, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 652, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 849, to support programs for mosquito-borne and other vector-borne disease surveillance and control, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 916, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

S. 920, to establish a National Clinical Care Commission.

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Amul R. Thapar, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Department of Justice, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator McConnell, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

RUNNING A SMALL BUSINESS IN RURAL AMERICA

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the challenges and opportunities of running a small business in rural America, including S. 203, to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, S. 929, to improve the HUBZone program, and S. 444, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption from the definition of an investment company, after receiving testimony from John Lettieri, Economic Innovation Group, Washington, D.C.; James E. Hobart, Alpaca Direct LLC, Hayden, Idaho; and Rob Riley, Northern Forest Center, Concord, New Hampshire.

NOMINATION

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Courtney Elwood, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency, after the nominee testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 38 public bills, H.R. 10, 2146–2182; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 99; and H. Res. 279, 281–285 were introduced.

Pages H2894–97

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H2898

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

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 (H. Rept. 115–96). **Page H2894**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Woodall to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2851**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:43 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2856**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. Michael D. Gutierrez, St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, Baldwin Park, CA. **Page H2856**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 161 nays with 2 answering "present", Roll No. 228. **Pages H2856, H2877–78**

Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act of 2017: The House passed H.R. 1695, to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide additional responsibilities for the Register of Copyrights, by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 378 yeas to 48 nays, Roll No. 227. **Pages H2860–77**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–13 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of 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. **Page H2860**

Agreed to:

Judy Chu (CA) amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 115–95) that specifies that nothing in the bill shall impact the mandatory deposit requirements of title 17; and **Pages H2875–76**

Deutch amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–95) that requires the Register of Copyrights to be capable of identifying and supervising a Chief Information Officer or similar official responsible for managing information technology systems (by a recorded vote of 410 yeas to 14 noes, Roll No. 226). **Pages H2874–75, H2876**

H. Res. 275, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1695) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 237 yeas to 186 noes, Roll No. 225, after the previous question was ordered by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 224. **Pages H2860–68**

Pursuant to section 2 of H. Res. 275, H. Res. 254 was laid on the table. **Page H2860**

Health Information Technology Advisory Committee—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Minority Leader, in which she appointed the following individual to the Health Infor-

mation Technology Advisory Committee: Dr. Steven Lane of Palo Alto, California. **Page H2880**

Recess: The House recessed at 6:22 p.m. and reconvened at 11:31 p.m. **Page H2893**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three ye-a-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2867, H2867–68, H2876, H2877, H2877–78. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:32 p.m.

Committee Meetings

OVERSIGHT ON U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held an oversight hearing on U.S. Pacific Command. Testimony was heard from Admiral Harry Harris, Commander, U.S. Pacific Command. This hearing was closed.

MILITARY ASSESSMENT OF THE SECURITY CHALLENGES IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Military Assessment of the Security Challenges in the Indo-Asia-Pacific Region". Testimony was heard from Admiral Harry Harris, Commander, U.S. Pacific Command.

CREATING A FLEXIBLE AND EFFECTIVE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT AND ACQUISITION SYSTEM: ELEMENTS FOR SUCCESS IN A RAPIDLY CHANGING LANDSCAPE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled "Creating a Flexible and Effective Information Technology Management and Acquisition System: Elements for Success in a Rapidly Changing Landscape". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1180, the "Working Families Flexibility Act of 2017". H.R. 1180 was ordered reported, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing on the "Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017". Testimony was heard from Senator Heller, Representatives Kihuen, Rosen, Titus, and Wilson of South Carolina, and public witnesses.

A LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL TO CREATE HOPE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR INVESTORS, CONSUMERS, AND ENTREPRENEURS

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “A Legislative Proposal to Create Hope and Opportunity for Investors, Consumers, and Entrepreneurs”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE QUESTIONABLE CASE FOR EASING SUDAN SANCTIONS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “The Questionable Case for Easing Sudan Sanctions”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CHINA’S TECHNOLOGICAL RISE: CHALLENGES TO U.S. INNOVATION AND SECURITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled “China’s Technological Rise: Challenges to U.S. Innovation and Security”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS AND THE U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the U.S. Marshals Service”. Testimony was heard from Thomas Kane, Acting Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons; and David Harlow, Acting Director and Deputy Director, U.S. Marshals Service.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 220, to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes; H.R. 497, the “Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act”; H.R. 660, the “Bureau of Reclamation Transparency Act”; H.R. 1073, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, and for other purposes; H.R. 1135, to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program; H.R. 1500, the “Robert Emmet Park Act of 2017”; H.R. 1654, the “Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act”; H.R. 1715, the “Medgar Evers House Study Act”; H.R. 1769, the “San Luis Unit Drainage Resolution Act”; H.R. 1807, the “Public Water Supply Invasive Spe-

cies Compliance Act of 2017”; H.R. 1873, the “Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act”; H.R. 1967, the “Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act”; and H.R. 2085, to approve an agreement between the United States and the Republic of Palau, and for other purposes.

UNFUNDED MANDATES: EXAMINING FEDERALLY IMPOSED BURDENS ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Affairs held a hearing entitled “Unfunded Mandates: Examining Federally Imposed Burdens on State and Local Government”. Testimony was heard from Wayne Niederhauser, President, Utah State Senate; Jim Davis, Senator, North Carolina State Senate; Gary Moore, Judge/Executive, Boone County, Kentucky; Jermaine Reed, Councilman, City of Kansas City, Missouri; and Jeff McKay, Supervisor, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia.

REVIEWING THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF THE FOREIGN ACCOUNT TAX COMPLIANCE ACT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “Reviewing the Unintended Consequences of the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act”. Testimony was heard from Senator Paul and public witnesses.

FANNIE AND FREDDIE OPEN RECORDS ACT OF 2017

Committee on Rules: Full Committee concluded a hearing on H.R. 1694, the “Fannie and Freddie Open Records Act of 2017”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–3, a structured rule for H.R. 1694. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–14, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report, and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report. 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. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. In section 2, the rule provides that it shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of April 29, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules and that the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section. Finally, section 3 of the rule waives clause 6(a) of rule 13 (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee) against any resolution reported through the legislative day of April 29, 2017.

ADVANCES IN THE SEARCH FOR LIFE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Advances in the Search for Life”. Testimony was heard from Thomas Zurbuchen, Associate Administrator, Science Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and public witnesses.

STORM WATCH: MAKING SURE SBA’S DISASTER LOAN PROGRAM IS PREPARED

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Storm Watch: Making Sure SBA’s Disaster Loan Program is Prepared”. Testimony was heard from James Rivera, Associate Administrator, Office of Disaster Assistance, Small Business Administration; Hannibal “Mike” Ware, Acting Inspector General, Small Business Administration; William Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office.

BUILDING A 21ST CENTURY INFRASTRUCTURE FOR AMERICA: THE STATE OF RAILROAD, PIPELINE, AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY REGULATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR REFORM

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a hearing entitled “Building a 21st Century Infrastructure for America: The State of Railroad, Pipeline, and Hazardous Materials Safety Regulations and Opportunities for Reform”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STOPPING DISABILITY FRAUD: RISK, PREVENTION, AND DETECTION

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing entitled “Stopping Disability Fraud: Risk, Prevention, and Detection”. Testimony was heard from Sean Brune, Assistant Deputy Commissioner, Office of Budget, Finance, Quality and Management, Social Security Administration; and Seto J. Bagdoyan, Director, Forensic Audits and Investigative Service, Government Accountability Office.

EXAMINING THE 2017 TAX FILING SEASON

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled “Examining the 2017 Tax Filing Season”. Testimony was heard from Kirsten Wielobob, Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement, Internal Revenue Service; Michael McKenney, Deputy Inspector General for Audit, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration; and Jessica Lucas-Judy, Acting Director, Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office.

Joint Meetings

DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN RUSSIA

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine democracy and human rights abuses in Russia, after receiving testimony from Vladimir Kara-Murza, Open Russia, and Daniel Calingaert, Freedom House, both of Washington, D.C.; and Rachel Denber, Human Rights Watch, New York, New York.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine preventing veteran suicide, 10:30 a.m., SD-124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine United States Pacific Command and United States Forces Korea, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, to hold hearings to examine cyber-enabled information operations, 2:30 p.m., SR-222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine countering Russia, focusing on further assessing options for sanctions, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine H.R. 339, to amend Public Law 94-241 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider the nomination of Scott Gottlieb, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine aging without community, focusing on the consequences of isolation and loneliness, 9:45 a.m., SD-430.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Member Day”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled “Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder/Traumatic Brain Injury”, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Strengthening Accreditation to Better Protect Students and Taxpayers”, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled “Outdoor Recreation: Vast Impact of the Great Outdoors”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance, hearing entitled “Safeguarding the Financial System from Terrorist Financing”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Syria After the Missile Strikes: Policy Options”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, hearing entitled “Afghanistan’s Terrorist Resurgence: Al-Qaeda, ISIS, and Beyond”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security, hearing entitled “Checkpoint of the Future: Evaluating TSA’s Innovation Task Force Initiative”, 2 p.m., HVC-210.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 115, the “Thin Blue Line Act”; H.R. 510, the “Rapid DNA Act of 2017”; H.R. 613, the “Lieutenant Osvaldo Albarati Correctional Officer Self-Protection Act of 2017”; H.R. 1039, the “Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017”; H.R. 1892, the “Honoring Hometown Heroes Act”; and H.R. 1761, the “Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act of 2017”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 220, to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes; H.R. 497,

the “Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act”; H.R. 660, the “Bureau of Reclamation Transparency Act”; H.R. 1073, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, and for other purposes; H.R. 1135, to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program; H.R. 1500, the “Robert Emmet Park Act of 2017”; H.R. 1654, the “Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act”; H.R. 1715, the “Medgar Evers House Study Act”; H.R. 1769, the “San Luis Unit Drainage Resolution Act”; H.R. 1807, the “Public Water Supply Invasive Species Compliance Act of 2017”; H.R. 1873, the “Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act”; H.R. 1967, the “Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act”; and H.R. 2085, to approve an agreement between the United States and the Republic of Palau, and for other purposes (continued), 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security, hearing entitled, “The Border Wall: Strengthening our National Security”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax, and Capital Access, hearing entitled, “Small Business: The Key to Economic Growth”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled “Building a 21st Century Infrastructure for America: Mitigating Damage and Recovering Quickly from Disasters”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, markup on H.R. 105, the “Protect Veterans from Financial Fraud Act of 2017”; H.R. 1328, the “American Heroes COLA Act of 2017”; H.R. 1329, the “Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2017”; H.R. 1390, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay costs relating to the transportation of certain deceased veterans to veterans’ cemeteries owned by a State or tribal organization; H.R. 1564, the “VA Beneficiary Travel Act of 2017”; and H.R. 1725, the “Quicker Veterans Benefits Delivery Act of 2017”, 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to receive a briefing on Russia’s human rights violations against Ukrainian citizens, 3 p.m., SVC-210.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, April 27

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, April 27

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of R. Alexander Acosta, of Florida, to be Secretary of Labor, post-cloture.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 1694—Fannie and Freddie Open Records Act of 2017 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Babin, Brian, Tex., E540
 Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E543
 Buck, Ken, Colo., E543
 Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E543
 Comstock, Barbara, Va., E547
 Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E545
 Frankel, Lois, Fla., E542, E548
 Graves, Sam, Mo., E539, E540, E541
 Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E542
 Hill, J. French, Ark., E546

Holding, George, N.C., E539
 Keating, William R., Mass., E546
 Larson, John B., Conn., E541, E542
 Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E543
 McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E539, E541, E544
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E544
 McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E546
 Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E543
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E541, E544, E548
 Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E544
 Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E539

Perry, Scott, Pa., E542, E544, E548
 Poe, Ted, Tex., E539, E541, E547
 Rogers, Mike, Ala., E547
 Rokita, Todd, Ind., E547
 Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E548
 Sherman, Brad, Calif., E540
 Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E543
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E542, E548
 Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E543
 Taylor, Scott, Va., E540
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E545



Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.