



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2017

No. 195

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 30, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GARY J. PALMER 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. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

REAL TAX REFORM IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that real tax reform is absolutely necessary. In 2013, the Harvard Business School published a report that identified the most important Federal priorities to promote American growth and competitiveness.

Two of the eight priorities were tax related. First, to simplify the corporate Tax Code with lower statutory

rates and fewer loopholes; and second, to reform the taxation of foreign profits so we don't disadvantage American businesses and workers.

Many Democrats would work with the majority to achieve these progrowth tax reforms. That is how it worked so well in 1986 under President Reagan and Speaker O'Neill.

But we should not, and we don't need to, balloon the Federal debt to achieve these goals. That is exactly why Republican proposals in the House and the Senate are so harmful for our country.

We know that national debt itself is antigrowth. That is why the same Harvard study that advocated tax reform also prioritized a stable Federal budget. Public debt crowds out private investment. CBO estimates that every dollar in deficit crowds out 33 cents in private investment.

Debt gives us less flexibility to deal with emergencies. Debt increases the risk of another financial crisis, because when investors lose confidence in the government's ability to pay back borrowed funds, interest rates can spike. As interest takes up more of the budget, less is available for other programs, including roads, bridges, scientific discovery, and our national defense.

When Congress passed the Bush tax cuts, national debt was at a level equal to 32 percent of the U.S. economy. Today, it is 77 percent of GDP. These bills will put our national debt on track to be larger than our national economy.

We can point fingers at each other about how we got here, but if we are trying to get out of the hole, first we need to stop digging. We will not grow our way out of this hole.

According to the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, no estimate that accounts for the economic impact of higher debt has found that the bill would raise the growth rate by more than a quarter of

the Republicans' declared 0.4 percent growth target.

In a survey at the University of Chicago, known for its conservative economic theory, 37 of 38 economists agree that the GOP tax bills in Congress would cause U.S. debt to increase substantially faster than the economy.

At the University of Pennsylvania Wharton School, which the President himself trumpets as his alma mater, teaming with smart people, their dynamic scoring model found that the House bill would lose between \$1 trillion and \$1.7 trillion over a decade in revenue after accounting for growth.

What in the world has happened to the Grand Old Party and fiscal responsibility? How will we pay for infrastructure now? Will we really risk destabilizing the dollar, the world's economic currency? Will we ask China to lend us money so that we can defend ourselves from North Korea?

I have heard my Republican colleagues say again and again how important it is to pay for spending, to get our fiscal house in order, to get our national debt under control.

I asked one colleague why he had run for Congress in the first place, and he told me he was so concerned about loading his kids up with all this borrowing, that he had to do something. His eyes filled with tears as he talked about his children. Yet he and many like him voted in a rush to add at least \$1.5 trillion to the debt without a road or a Navy ship or one scientific grant to show for it.

Nobody seriously contends that this is wonderful policy resulting from serious deliberation through regular order. It is not. The only reason for this effort, and this is out of the mouths of the legislators themselves, is that there is political pressure from interest groups and donors to get something done. That is the definition of putting party before country. That is exactly what people hate about Congress.

□ 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.

H9519

This is not what your constituents really want. They don't want their tax breaks to expire while corporate breaks don't. They don't want students to suffer from even more debt. They don't want to lose their healthcare because of the premium spikes we know are going to be coming. They don't want their housing to be more expensive, even, than it is today, and they don't want to face automatic Medicare cuts forced by congressional spending limits.

If you are worried about the blowback from not doing something or taking the extra time to get it right, wait until you see the reaction when people realize what is really in this bill after it has already been passed.

We can do real tax reform without jeopardizing our children's future. Make the corporate rate 25 percent instead of 20 percent like the Business Roundtable and Mitt Romney both once suggested. That saves \$600 billion.

If you must lift the exemption for the estate tax, I wouldn't, but don't eliminate it. That saves \$50 billion.

Maintain the alternative minimum tax for high-earning families, but index it over time so it doesn't catch the middle class.

Work with Democrats to find ways to limit tax expenditures, but save the burden for those who can afford it.

If my Republican colleagues will commit to doing that, I will commit to working with you, and I will honestly and publicly thank you for putting country before politics.

RECOGNIZING SOUTH FLORIDA'S HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the Jewish Community Services of South Florida and the second generation of Miami-Dade Holocaust Survivors. Together, these two organizations will join forces to hold a Cafe Europa, a function that honors Holocaust survivors and their families. The name "Cafe Europa" is derived from a small lounge in Stockholm. Here, survivors from liberated concentration camps would search for family and friends after the war, share stories and experiences, and begin to rebuild their lives.

Today, the practice remains strong in its commitment to bring survivors together, where they can share insight and thoughts on topics surrounding our world today.

Cafe Europa also allows us to honor these individuals and gain vital knowledge about this dark period in history.

This event this year will be held at the Aventura Turnberry Jewish Center on Sunday, December 3, at 11:30. My constituents David and Irene Mermelstein, Herbie Karliner, Joe Sacks, Alex Gross, David Schaeter, and Wendy Rothfield will attend this im-

portant event. Holocaust survivors will share stories, grieve over loved ones lost, and recommit that these horrendous days of our history that they survived will never again be repeated.

Mr. Speaker, we must cherish the time that we have left with these brave souls, to listen and to learn about their tragic stories, stories that must be passed along to future generations about this brutal period of injustice, and ensure that no such tyranny ever happens again.

CONGRESS MUST ACT ON A LEGISLATIVE SOLUTION FOR OUR DREAMERS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as we quickly approach the month of December, we are reminded of the very few legislative days left on this calendar to debate and pass a permanent solution to protect our Nation's DREAMers from deportation.

I introduced, along with my dear friend, my colleague, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, H.R. 3440, also known as the Dream Act, to allow over 800,000 young immigrants living in our great country to remain here, the only home that they have truly known.

This bill will allow DREAMers to apply for conditional permanent residency, and eventually to citizenship. Each day of inaction by our body to pass the Dream Act or any legislative fix is a loss for our communities and our country.

Study after study demonstrates the reality that we already know: that failure to provide a solution for our DREAMers will result in hundreds of billions of dollars lost in GDP, a truly devastating blow to our economy.

The business community, faith leaders, colleges and universities, advocacy groups, all have joined a large bipartisan coalition standing behind these young immigrants, and that is because they recognize the positive contributions of these individuals, contributions that should not be imperiled by their legal status.

But they are looking at us, Mr. Speaker. They are looking at Congress. It is up to us. It is up to you and me and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to act. It is our responsibility, and we must not delay action any longer. These individuals who came to this country as children only want an opportunity to attend school, to work, to provide for their families.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation, our Nation, was born and continues to be built and made stronger by immigrants like these DREAMers, willing and determined not only to realize their dreams, but truly to love, serve, and protect this land with all of their hearts.

That is precisely why we must act now. This Chamber cannot and should not stand idly by while these young immigrants, who are already as American as anyone else in their hearts and their minds, live under fear and uncertainty in this country, a country that is a beacon of hope and a land of opportunity to those who seek it.

The lives of hundreds of thousands of bright, talented, and patriotic young

men and women depend on us, on this Congress. It is up to us to rise to the challenge to legalize the status of these DREAMers so they can truly make their dreams into a reality.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last Monday and Tuesday, I participated in the eighth annual Monte's March, a 43-mile walk from Springfield to Greenfield, Massachusetts, to raise awareness about hunger in our community and to raise money for the Food Bank of Western Massachusetts.

Monte Belmonte, a well-known and beloved local radio personality with WRSI, The River, in Northampton, led dozens of committed activists and community leaders on the walk.

This year, the march raised over \$236,000, a record, to help struggling families in western Massachusetts. This translates into about 708,000 meals that will go directly to individuals and families struggling with food insecurity.

As I am each year, I was deeply impressed by the stamina of all those who walked and by the generosity of community members looking to help those in need.

I would like to take a moment to thank those who joined us along the route for their dedication to the cause of ending hunger in this country once and for all.

Specifically, I want to thank:

Monte Belmonte and his entire crew from The River, including Mark Lattanzi, Dave Musante, and Rene Kane. They work incredibly hard each year to make this march a success, and it wouldn't have been possible without their determination and the extra hours they put in leading up to this event;

Sean Barry of Four Seasons Liquor in Hadley, Monte's right-hand man, marched the entire 2 days;

Andrew Morehouse, the executive director of the Food Bank of Western Massachusetts, and everyone at the food bank. They do inspiring work. They deserve to be supported;

All of the elected officials who joined us, including my colleagues Representatives RICHIE NEAL and JOE KENNEDY, State Senator Eric Lesser and Representative Aaron Vega, Northampton Mayor David Narkewicz, Greenfield Mayor William Martin, and Chicopee Mayor Richard Kos;

The representatives of several local colleges: Christina Royal, president of Holyoke Community College; my dear friend Bob Pura, president of Greenfield Community College; and a special appearance by Sam the Minuteman, UMass' beloved mascot;

Incredible advocates from the non-profit community: Tim Garvin of the United Way of Central Massachusetts;

also from the United Way was Brian Whitney and Kerry Conaghan; Ron Johnson, CEO of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Family Services Inc. in Springfield; Andrea Marion, executive director of Lorraine's Soup Kitchen; Shannon Rudder, executive director of Kate's Kitchen in Holyoke; Betty Medina Lichtenstein, founder and executive director of Enlace de Familias in Holyoke; Mindy Domb, executive director of the Amherst Survival Center; and Neftali Duran, the chef and food activist at Nuestras Raices in Holyoke;

The musicians who kept us entertained along the way: the Expandable Brass Band, Double Edge Theatre, and Hopkins Academy Band;

Western Massachusetts small businesses, including: BridgeSide Grille; Magpie Pizza; Ashfield Lake House; Union Station in Northampton; Berkshire Brewing Company, who kept us nourished along the way; Ben Clark of Clarkdale Fruit Farms; and Tea Guys of Whately, Massachusetts, for their wonderful tea in honor of the march, and for their continued generosity and friendship;

The Sheriff's Departments in Hampden, Hampshire, and Franklin Counties, as well as the Deerfield Police helped provide escorts for us during the entire 43 miles.

□ 1015

I am grateful to Mr. Michael Brooks and the students of Smith Vocational School in Northampton for making the shopping carts we used during the march.

I am grateful to the countless students—elementary, middle school, and high school students—who raised money and greeted us along the way; members of the Tibetan community who greeted us as well; and all the other incredible individuals from our community who joined us on the march, like my dear friends Chia Collins, Steve “the Hippie” Fendell, Georgiann and Rick Kristek, Kristen Elechko, Erin McKeown and Emily Lichter from the Ashfield Lake House, and so many others; as well as industry partners who helped support this effort through their generosity.

I want to thank two of my wonderful district staffers, Keith Barnicle and Seth Nadeau, for their efforts in helping to organize the march and for assisting me every step of the way.

Lastly, I want to thank my son, Patrick, who marched with me by my side during this entire time.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to join so many of my constituents and neighbors in western Massachusetts to bring attention to the issue of hunger and raise much-needed funding for The Food Bank of Western Massachusetts.

I am so honored to be part of this march each year, but I need to remind my colleagues in this Chamber that charities alone cannot end hunger. To do that, it will take further investments in our federally funded programs like SNAP, WIC, and school meals.

As we look toward the next farm bill, the next budget, and the upcoming appropriations cycle, I plead with my colleagues to maintain and increase investments and programs to help those struggling with food insecurity. Please don't do anything to make hunger worse in this country.

In the United States of America, the richest country in the history of the world, it is a disgrace that any child goes to bed hungry, that any senior has to choose between lifesaving medication and a decent meal, that any veteran who risked his or her life in the defense of our Nation doesn't have enough to eat, and that any individual suffers from hunger. But, still, 42 million Americans remain food insecure.

Food is a right, and it is up to this Congress to finally take a stand in supporting efforts to end hunger now.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO IGOR BIRMAN, CHIEF OF STAFF

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my gratitude to my chief of staff, Igor Birman, who will be leaving the House of Representatives on December 5 to begin a new career in financial management. He and his wife, Kim, are expecting their first child in April and will be moving to New York.

Igor Birman's story sums up the best of America and is testimony to the exceptionalism of American founding principles, how they beckon to oppressed people around the world, and how much those who come here legally bring to our Nation.

Igor was born in Moscow to parents who desperately yearned for the fundamental rights they were denied in the Soviet Union. At the time, they were called refuseniks, Russian Jews persecuted for their religious beliefs and denied exit visas because of their technical knowledge.

Finally, after many years, as the Soviet Union began to collapse, glasnost opened an opportunity for the Birmans finally to realize their dream. Igor remembers hurriedly learning English on borrowed phonograph records. A week before their departure, the family returned to their tiny apartment to find the place upended by a last-minute KGB raid. Igor's mother comforted her children by saying: “In a few weeks, we will be in America, where this can never happen.”

Igor was 14 when they arrived in California to begin a new life. He entered UC Davis, where he quickly rose to public prominence after a column he had written expressing his libertarian views was censored by the politically correct apparatchiks on the campus newspaper. The irony wasn't lost on anybody, and it became a prominent story on northern California talk radio.

That is where I first became aware of Igor, and that year, I was fortunate to have him work in my State senate office as an intern. He left to attend law school, and when he returned, he did an amazing job as my finance director in a hard-fought campaign for Congress in 2008. Hiring him as my chief of staff was the easiest decision I have ever made in my years in public office. He came to Washington at the age of 28—I believe the youngest chief of staff then serving.

He has ably run my congressional office for nearly a decade, and during those years, he has assembled the most competent team I have ever had the honor to serve with. I have found his judgment impeccable, his insight keen, and his honesty and integrity spotless.

Charles de Gaulle famously observed that the cemeteries are filled with indispensable men, but General de Gaulle had never met Igor Birman. I can say definitively some people truly are indispensable, and Igor is one of them.

I am obviously not the only person to hold this opinion. The founder of Cablevision saw these same qualities in him and, beginning next week, he will be placing his operations and foundations in Igor's capable hands.

Igor once ran a very credible race for Congress himself, and I hope that he will not give up on his ambition to serve our Nation. I believe a time may be coming when Americans may lose the memory of freedom and they will need to turn to leaders like Igor for a passionate reminder of just how valuable a commodity is our freedom.

“There is a time to every purpose under Heaven,” and for now the time has come for Igor and Kim to enjoy their new family, to enjoy the fruits of their new labors, and to embark upon a promising future together. I wish them the very best in their many happy years ahead.

NATIONAL NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the final day of National Native American Heritage Month.

I rise today to honor and celebrate the rich history and traditions of Native Americans and to note the work we are doing in Congress to invest in infrastructure, education, and healthcare across the entire Indian Country.

It is an immense privilege to work with Tribal communities across Arizona's First Congressional District. With more than 12 Tribes and nations in my district, I see the impact of Native American heritage in every town I visit, especially their strong commitment to family, community, and traditions—traditions, by the way, that people from all around the world come to see every year.

It has been inspiring to see the many tributes my colleagues have shared here with this body throughout the month. It underscores the immense and immeasurable contributions of Native Americans to this country. Yesterday I spoke about the Navaho code talkers and all the code talkers and the veterans who have come from Native American lands.

As a member of the congressional Native American Caucus, I am proud to work with Tribal leaders to strengthen the relationship between our country and their sovereign nations. There is a great deal to do to ensure rural, Tribal communities have access to 21st century infrastructure, education, and healthcare, but I am confident that the work we are doing will make these critical investments.

Mr. Speaker, one of the founding principles of this great country is the celebration of diversity of its people. When we recognize that as a strength, we truly are a more perfect union.

HONORING TROOPER DAMON ALLEN

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Texas Department of Public Safety Trooper Damon Allen of Mexia, Texas, who passed away on November 23, 2017.

Damon Allen was born in Morgantown, Kentucky, on October 4, 1976. His family moved to Mexia in 1984, where he lived until his passing.

In 1995, Damon graduated from Mexia High School, where he was a member of the varsity football team. Damon went on to marry his high school sweetheart, Kasey Pickett. Happily married for nearly 24 years, Kasey and Damon had three daughters and a son: Chelsea, Kaitlyn, Madison, and Cameron. Damon was also the proud grandfather to his grandson, Quest.

After graduating from Mexia High School, Damon worked for the Mexia State School, a rehabilitation school for students with learning impairments. He then worked for the Texas Department of Criminal Justice for 5 years before pursuing his passion to become a Texas DPS State Trooper.

Damon was an exemplary DPS Trooper for 15 years and was known to those in his unit as a model gentleman. He was fair and polite to all he came in contact with, and he treated all around him as if they were his life-long friends. His calling to serve in law enforcement came from a desire to be the man who people turn to in their time of need. Tragically, he was murdered by a criminal while serving the people of Texas on Thanksgiving Day.

In his free time, Damon enjoyed hunting, fishing, and off-road driving in his Jeep, especially over the dunes at the beach. He had a strong faith in God, attending both the Cowboy Church in Freestone and the First Assembly of God Church in Mexia.

Mr. Speaker, Damon Allen worked tirelessly to serve our central Texas communities. He is loved, and he has certainly left an enduring impression on the people of Mexia. He will be forever remembered as a great State trooper, a public servant, a community member, a husband, a father, a grandfather, and a friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Allen family. We also lift up the family and friends of Damon Allen in our prayers. I have requested that the United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and legacy of DPS Trooper Damon Allen.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise yet again because Americans are dying and this House is doing nothing. Correction, we aren't doing nothing. House Republicans are planning to make the situation worse.

Yesterday, the House Judiciary Committee considered the so-called Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, which should be called the "Exporting Gun Violence Across State Line Act."

In addition to threatening the safety of our communities, this bill, H.R. 38, is not only a threat to innocent citizens, but a direct threat to the brave men and women who protect and serve our communities.

So far this year, 42 law enforcement officers have been shot and killed in the United States.

I come from a law enforcement family. I have police officers—uncles, cousins, and nephews—serving in New York City and Chicago. I know the fear that law enforcement families feel, the constant worry that they may not come home, that you might get that call in the middle of the night or a knock on the door from the police chaplain.

If this House passes this dangerous bill, more law enforcement families will get these calls and get these late-night visits that no family should ever get.

H.R. 38 is opposed by many law enforcement organizations, including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Police Foundation, the Police Executive Research Forum, Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, National Associations of Women Law Enforcement Executives, the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of opposition from the National Law Enforcement Partnership to Prevent Gun Violence.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PARTNERSHIP TO PREVENT GUN VIOLENCE

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PARTNERSHIP TO PREVENT GUN VIOLENCE ON THE CONCEALED CARRY RECIPROCITY ACT OF 2017—S. 446 & H.R. 38

WASHINGTON, DC.—The National Law Enforcement Partnership to Prevent Gun Violence urges members of Congress to oppose both the House and Senate versions of "Concealed Carry Reciprocity"—The Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017 (H.R. 38), sponsored by Representative Richard Hudson (R-NC), and The Constitutional Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017 (S. 446), sponsored by Senator John Cornyn (R-TX), respectively.

The National Law Enforcement Partnership to Prevent Gun Violence (the Partnership) includes nine national law enforcement organizations dedicated to serving the Nation's more than 900,000 sworn and civilian law enforcement officers, executives, and professional staff.

The Partnership has opposed previous legislative attempts to mandate concealed carry reciprocity nationwide because such schemes severely undermine successful, well established state laws governing carrying concealed firearms.

H.R. 38 and S. 446 would require each state—even those with strong permitting standards and stringent training requirements—to allow anyone to carry a concealed firearm so long as the person's own home state allows it. These misguided bills would preempt local and state perspectives on what's best for communities by forcing states to accept weaker concealed carry standards of other states and eliminates every state's ability to determine who may exercise the enormous responsibility of carrying a firearm, concealed or otherwise.

Training is a vitally important aspect of carrying a concealed firearm. Law enforcement officers are extensively trained to understand responsible firearm use, including making split-second decisions about when deadly force is appropriate; they also attend periodic in-service training and regularly requalify with their service weapons, most at least semi-annually. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, states require an average 92 hours of firearms skills and judgment training before certifying someone to carry a gun as a police officer. While a majority of states require a minimum number of hours of training to be eligible for civilian concealed firearm permits, several states do not require any training at all to carry a firearm in public. No state should be forced to accept a person carrying a concealed firearm who has not received gun safety training.

In addition, during public contacts, police officers will face the daunting task of verifying the validity of different carry permits from the states that issue them. Twelve states require no permit whatsoever to carry a concealed gun, taking away an officer's ability to determine if a person is carrying legally. Reciprocity would leave law enforcement helpless to keep guns out of the wrong hands when a person claims "constitutional carry" authority. This obvious step in the wrong direction would sow chaos and uncertainty, making a cop's job harder and citizens less safe. Under the House bill (H.R. 38), attempting to verify a permit or identification card comes with potential legal liability for law enforcement, an outrageous outcome for an officer trying to protect his or her community.

The complete lack of consistent training standards, the different standards for identifying individuals that are too dangerous to carry, the uncertainty of a document's validity, and the exposure of agencies and police officers to civil liability create unacceptable risks to our nation's 900,000 police officers and the public at large. We reject the idea that one state's approach to carrying a concealed firearm will work across the country. States and localities should maintain their rights to legislate concealed carry laws that best meet the needs of their citizens.

The National Law Enforcement Partnership to Prevent Gun Violence urges you to respect and defend state laws while protecting and supporting our nation's police officers by opposing H.R. 38 and S. 446. Thank you for your support.

The Partnership Includes: Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association (HAPCOA), International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA), International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCCA), National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE), National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), Police Foundation (PF).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the letter, in part, states that the bill will create unacceptable risk to our Nation's 900,000 police officers and the public at large.

The Fraternal Order of Police has come out in opposition to a similar bill in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the police are telling us that it is dangerous to them and the public safety at large.

So why is the majority pushing it so hard?

Because, once again, the majority is putting the NRA's agenda above the lives of Americans and our law enforcement officers. This is simply unacceptable.

Why are we considering a bill that puts our officers at greater risk? Why should we take up legislation that we know will increase the number of gun deaths, including among law enforcement officers? Why would we make a dangerous job more dangerous just to satisfy the NRA?

Why is it cosponsored by one of my colleagues who demanded that a painting be taken down for disrespecting law enforcement, but he is willing to cosponsor a bill that puts their lives at greater risk?

I guess it is easier to complain about a picture than stand up to the NRA.

Mr. Speaker, once again, the NRA's checks are influencing this House. The victims of gun violence should matter more than their dollars.

Dollar 209, Deputy Sheriff Robert French, end of watch, August 30, 2017;

Dollar 210, Officer Miguel Moreno, end of watch, June 30, 2017;

Dollar 211, Trooper Joel Davis, end of watch, July 9, 2017;

Dollar 212, Agent Roberto Medina-Mariani, end of watch, September 11, 2017;

Dollar 213, Captain Bryon K. Dickson, II, end of watch, September 12, 2014;

Dollar 214, Special Agent Michael T. Walter, end of watch, May 27, 2017;

Dollar 215, Corporal Stephen J. Ballard, end of watch, April 26, 2017;

Dollar 216, Officer Miosotis Familia, end of watch, July 5, 2017;

Dollar 217, Lieutenant Kevin Mainhart, end of watch, May 11, 2017;

Dollar 218, Lieutenant Patrick Weatherford, end of watch, June 12, 2017;

Dollar 219, Sergeant Richard "Sam" Howard, end of watch, August 19, 2017.

□ 1030

Dollar 220, Deputy Sheriff Mason Moore, end of watch, May 16, 2017;

Dollar 221, Chief Steven Eric DiSario, end of watch, May 12, 2017;

Dollar 222, Master Sergeant Debra Clayton, end of watch, January 9, 2017;

Dollar 223, Deputy Sheriff William Durr, end of watch, May 27, 2017;

Dollar 224, Officer Eric G. Kelly, end of watch, April 4, 2009;

Dollar 225, Officer Gary Michael, end of watch, August 6, 2017;

Dollar 226, Corrections Officer Curtis Billue, end of watch, June 13, 2017;

Dollar 227, Agent Benjamin De los Santos-Barbosa, end of watch, April 21, 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I will jump to dollar 234, Trooper Damon Allen, whom we just heard about, end of watch, November 23, 2017.

We cannot let this bill pass. If we pass H.R. 38, that number will, tragically, grow.

Dollar 228, Officer Sean Clark, end of watch, March 31, 2007;

Dollar 229, Deputy Sheriff David Wade, end of watch, April 18, 2017;

Dollar 230, Lieutenant Aaron Allan, end of watch, July 27, 2017;

Dollar 231, Assistant Chief Deputy Clinton Greenwood, end of watch, April 3, 2017;

Dollar 232, Deputy Sheriff Mark Burbridge, end of watch, May 1, 2017;

Dollar 233, Officer Justin Terney, end of watch, March 27, 2017;

Dollar 235, Officer Alyn Beck, end of watch, June 8, 2014;

Dollar 236, Detective Sean Suiter, end of watch, November 16, 2017;

Dollar 237, Officer Justice Leo, end of watch, October 21, 2017;

Dollar 238, Officer Marcus McNeil, end of watch, October 13, 2017;

Dollar 239, Officer Stephen Mayhle, end of watch, April 4, 2009;

Dollar 240, Officer Floyd East, Jr., end of watch, October 9, 2017;

Dollar 241, Corporal Michael Paul Middlebrook, end of watch, October 1, 2017;

Dollar 242, Detective Kristen Hearne, end of watch, September 29, 2017;

Dollar 243, Officer Igor Soldo, end of watch, June 8, 2014;

Dollar 244, Officer Matthew Baxter, end of watch, August 18, 2017;

Dollar 245, Officer Paul Scullo, end of watch, April 4, 2009;

Dollar 246, Officer Deriek W. Crouse, end of watch, December 8, 2011;

Dollar 247, Deputy Sheriff Dwight Darwin Maness, end of watch, September 14, 2015;

Dollar 248, Officer Jeff Shelton, end of watch, March 31, 2007;

Dollar 249, Officer Thor Odin Soderberg, end of watch, July 7, 2010;

Dollar 250, Officer Brian David Shaw, end of watch, November 17, 2017.

Every year, more and more officers die from guns in the line of duty.

RECOGNIZING MASTER SERGEANT GILBERT HOWLAND

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Master Sergeant Gilbert Howland of Langhorne, Pennsylvania, one of my constituents and a member of Merrill's Marauders.

Merrill's Marauders was a top-secret unit of commandos who served behind Japanese lines in Burma, China, and India during World War II. The men of this magnificent unit volunteered to serve and faced some of the most vicious and consistent fighting of the war. Their commitment to service stands as a profound example of sacrifice for our Nation.

Master Sergeant Howland was an NCO in charge of 16 men and two heavy weapons in this unit. After being discharged in 1945, Ranger Howland did not sit idly by. Instead, he reenlisted to serve in Korea and for two tours in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, Master Sergeant Howland and the rest of the brave men in Merrill's Marauders should be recognized. I am proud to support H.R. 667, which seeks to award the Congressional Gold Medal to World War II's Merrill's Marauders.

WHAT MY CONSTITUENTS EXPECT OF ME

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I love my country.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, because I refuse to stand idly by as a billionaire bigot does irreparable harm to my country—a billionaire bigot who tolerates the KKK but won't tolerate Islam; a billionaire bigot who tolerates anti-Semitism, racism, sexism, ethnocentrism, xenophobia, and homophobia.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the consequences will be, but I do know this: the people who sent me here sent me to this Congress to fight hate, not to tolerate, not to mitigate, but to eliminate hate. The people I represent have an expectation of me.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the vote will be, but I do know this: Next week, there will be a vote to impeach. Next week, there will be a resolution brought before the Congress, and there will be a vote to either table it, send it to committee, or vote it up or down.

That is what the people I represent expect me to do, and I will do no less.

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

NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, during National Adoption Month, to encourage adoption and improvements in our foster care system across this land. Currently, there are roughly 428,000 children in America's foster care system, and nearly 112,000 of those children are waiting to be adopted into safe, permanent, and loving families.

According to Arkansas State data, the number of foster youth has outpaced the number of spots available in foster homes by over 1,200 children. Organizations around the State have been at the forefront of recruitment efforts for our foster families.

One such organization is The CALL, locally directed by Lauri Currier. She notes that a stable, loving home can make a huge difference in a child's life, specifically with regard to escaping the grasp of neglect and abuse.

I am proud to work with our majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, and my colleagues on the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth to shed light on the perpetuation of poverty and dysfunction in our current system. We all must continue to work together and move forward in addressing our foster care system, and I emphasize Ms. Currier's statement on the importance of a loving home for every child.

HONORING JUDGE TOM EISELE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of one of our Nation's great lawyers and judges and, for me, a mentor and a great family friend, District Court Judge Tom Eisele, who passed away this past Sunday at the age of 94.

Tom faithfully served our Nation as a private in the Army in World War II; as an adviser to Governor Winthrop Rockefeller in the 1960s; and for the past 41 years as a member of the Federal judiciary, following his appointment by President Nixon in 1970.

During his career, Judge Eisele was named Best District Court Judge in the Eighth Circuit by The American Lawyer and Outstanding Federal Judge by the Association of Trial Lawyers of America. He was a role model and a friend to many across the State of Arkansas and our Nation.

I extend my respect, affection, and prayers to his friends, family, and loved ones.

LOVE LITTLE ROCK INITIATIVE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Little Rock Regional Chamber of Commerce's "Love Little Rock" initiative.

This initiative is intended to both attract new business and encourage residents to become "Love Little Rock" ambassadors by sharing their pride using the #lovelittlerock hashtag.

As a part of the campaign, the Little Rock Regional Chamber created the lovelittlerock.org website to highlight the numerous advantages of doing busi-

ness in Arkansas' capital city. Led by Jay Chesshir, president and CEO of the Little Rock Regional Chamber, and Mayor Mark Stodola, this initiative is a powerful instrument for community development and business recruitment. Mayor Stodola proclaimed October 19 as Love Little Rock Day.

I extend my thanks to the city of Little Rock for spearheading this campaign. As a native son, I am proud to "Love Little Rock."

HAITI'S TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my outrage over the administration's unconscionable decision to terminate Haiti's temporary protected status designation on July 22, 2019.

This decision, which came just days before Thanksgiving, will force over 50,000 Haitians to return to a country that is still struggling to recover from the devastating effects of the 2010 earthquake and reeling from a cholera epidemic and food insecurity caused by Hurricane Matthew that decimated Haiti's agricultural sector.

Although Haiti has made extraordinary strides to overcome the impact of the deadly earthquake and subsequent events, including the cholera epidemic, food insecurity crisis, and Hurricanes Matthew, Irma, and Maria, it has killed over 10,000 people and hampered the recovery efforts.

The devastation of these events should have made the decision to redesignate Haiti for 18 months without setting an end date an easy call, a no-brainer. However, last week's disastrous decision to terminate Haiti's TPS status did not occur in a vacuum.

In the past few weeks alone, this administration has also announced its decision to terminate temporary protected status for Nicaragua and Sudan. These actions demonstrate the administration's clear departure from the bipartisan consensus that has always surrounded the TPS program which exists to protect human life. Instead, this administration has chosen to sow fear and division in our society to distract from its failed policies that benefit the wealthy at the expense of the vast majority of Americans.

Faced with this clear and credible threat, we must come together to pass bipartisan legislation that protects all TPS-eligible individuals from being forced to return home to countries experiencing famine, natural disaster, and outright civil war. That is why I have worked with Representatives ROS-LEHTINEN and JAYAPAL to introduce the bipartisan ASPIRE-TPS Act, which would provide meaningful protections to all TPS-eligible individuals.

I urge my colleagues in this body to cosponsor our legislation. I also urge House leadership to bring it to the

floor for a vote as soon as possible so that we can grant meaningful protection to the 300,000 TPS-eligible individuals at risk of being sent back to life-threatening conditions abroad. Now is the time to act for the sake of 300,000 TPS-eligible individuals and our standing in the world.

CIA RELEASES DOCUMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration recently made the important decision to release hundreds of thousands of documents in the possession of the CIA which were found in the May 2011 raid on Osama bin Laden's compound in Pakistan. These documents reveal a much more intimate relationship between Iran and al-Qaida than previously suspected.

While it will take time to analyze the extent of the 470,000 documents, some important conclusions can already be made:

The Obama administration selectively released 571 of these documents during his term, none of which identified the significant relationship between Iran and al-Qaida.

While President Obama claimed al-Qaida was "on the path to defeat," these documents showcase al-Qaida strategically reorganizing its operational base. One of these documents describes Iran as al-Qaida's "main artery for funds, personnel, and communications," and instructs members to "refrain from attacking Iran and devote your total resources . . . to the fight against the crusaders and the apostates."

On the one hand, al-Qaida would publicly declare all Shiites to be apostates; on the other hand, internal deliberations by the organization called for a transactional relationship with the mullahs of Tehran.

Another finding in a 19-page document written by senior al-Qaida operative Abu Hafs al-Mauritani outlines a detailed arrangement between al-Qaida and Iran. The relationship between al-Qaida and Iran was based on their mutual hatred of the United States. Iran agreed to provide shelter, financial support, and coordinate efforts with al-Qaida across the region.

In this document, a senior al-Qaida operative confirms that Iran and al-Qaida's "interests intersect." He goes so far as to describe the Iranian regime as "the best example . . . of pragmatism in politics. Anyone who wants to strike America, Iran is ready to support them with money and arms and all that is required as long as they are not directly and clearly implicated."

Iran offered al-Qaida everything it needed, including "money, arms," and "training in Hezbollah camps in Lebanon, in exchange for attacking U.S. interests in Saudi Arabia and the Gulf."

Al-Qaida operatives were safeguarded in Iran, with the consent of the military. In fact, the 9/11 Commission report confirms that 8 out of the 14 hijackers passed through Iran during the period from October 2000 to February 2001.

□ 1045

Iranian intelligence facilitated the travel of some operatives with visas while sheltering others. In these documents, there is even a wedding video of bin Laden's son with al-Qaida members in attendance in—you guessed it—Iran.

As Sun Tzu famously said in "The Art of War": "The enemy of my enemy is my friend." We are their shared enemy.

It is shameful that the Obama administration deliberately withheld this information. If these files exposing Iran's outreach and association with al-Qaida had been released, support for the Iran nuclear deal would have eroded even further, and rightfully so.

Since the JCPOA was entered into, Iranian aggression in the Middle East, including Iraq and Syria and elsewhere, has only increased. These bad activities have only gotten worse. Now it is even clearer why that is.

Any terrorist group that wants to attack U.S. interests will have Iran's financial and material support. By providing Iran with \$150 billion sanctions relief, we are giving Iran the resources it needs to carry out its bad activities threatening the United States and our allies.

While we already know of Iran's close ties with Hezbollah and political influence in Iraq, these documents exhibit the extensive reach that Iran has in the region. Keeping these documents hidden from the general public while the JCPOA was being debated and approved was blatant politicization of intelligence, and it was totally reprehensible.

Thankfully, the current administration has released these documents to let the American public know the truth. I commend the CIA Director, our former colleague in this House, Mike Pompeo, who has hit the ground running as the new CIA Director and made the bold decision to take these 470,000 documents and release them for the American public and for the world to see. They shouldn't have been hidden in the first place. They should not have been hidden for so long. Now we can know the truth of the relationship that absolutely existed between Iran and al-Qaida.

I encourage my colleagues to view these documents. I encourage the media to view these documents for the American public and the international community.

I thank, again, the administration for their leadership in this very important decision.

DECRYING GRADUATE STUDENTS' TUITION ASSISTANCE CLASSIFIED AS TAXABLE INCOME

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to decry a provision in this tax bill that would amount to shocking tax increases of thousands of dollars for struggling graduate students by reclassifying their tuition assistance as taxable income.

These students provide research and teaching services as work to offset tuition. I mean, we are talking about assistants in the dorms, teaching assistants for undergraduate courses, researchers in laboratories—all who contribute to universities for quite modest stipends and tuition credits to avoid going further into debt and to support themselves while completing their master's degrees and Ph.D.'s.

Taxing this so-called income would impose a profoundly negative impact on education. Schools across the country could lose half their current graduate students, and it would diminish the number of students who would even consider graduate school in the future.

Mr. Speaker, what is to become of the vital research and development in the fields of medicine and engineering and agriculture and information technology—things that have led to innovation and invention, things that have truly made America great—with this tax provision?

An example from my very own alma mater, Marquette University, raises the problems with parents. There is a maintenance mechanic who has three—three, triplets—college-age students. He receives \$40,000 of tuition assistance for each of these students. I mean, for real, Mr. Speaker, we are going to deem \$120,000 income to this maintenance person?

Be for real. My constituent, Tim, writes:

As a graduate student in the third year of a Ph.D. program, I am married, have a 4-month-old. My wife works full time as a high school teacher. My research focuses on investigating how persons who have suffered from a neurological disease such as a stroke or spinal cord injury are able to move. This tuition waiver is the only reason I can afford graduate school and do the research I am doing to help the disabled.

If this becomes taxable income, my wife and I would move into a higher tax bracket, and my tax liability would increase roughly 40 percent, without a single dime of an increase in income with which I could pay that. This equals roughly \$1,300 per month of taxes.

At the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, also in my district, graduate student Shandra is finishing her master's in library and information science. Under the Republican House bill, Shandra's income, in the eyes of the government, would effectively double.

Now, you know, doubling the standard deduction, letting people file on a postcard will not offset the draconian

tax cuts that these graduate students would experience. Taxing tuition credits would hurt lower and middle class, hardworking citizens who rely on this benefit to help them and their families achieve the American Dream.

I urge my colleagues and people in the public, Mr. Speaker, not to fall for this trick, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to oppose this harmful bill.

RHONEYMEADE SCULPTURE GARDEN & ARBORETUM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I had the opportunity to visit a true gem in Centre County, Pennsylvania: Rhoneymeade.

Rhoneymeade is a sculpture garden and arboretum farm, a historical site located between the Nittany and Tussey Mountains. The Rhone family owned this property for four generations, from 1794 to 1937. The land was settled in 1794 when Michael Rhone purchased the farmland from the Straub family, who received a grant of the land from the Penn family.

Third-generation Leonard Rhone was an important leader in the Grange movement in Pennsylvania. Many of the ideas for the movement were developed in the historic 1853 farmhouse that still sits on the property today.

Leonard Rhone founded the Grange Fair in 1874, the annual fair and camping event that remains a staple in the region. The fair is a proud Centre County tradition, much like Rhoneymeade. Rhoneymeade's slogan is: "Where art and nature meet."

That rings true, thanks to the works of Dr. Richard Morgan, a retired Penn State professor who purchased the property in 1984. Over several years, he transformed the grounds into an arboretum and sculpture garden. Dr. Morgan fell in love with Rhoneymeade: its historic home, views of Penns Valley, some of the oldest trees in central Pennsylvania. He restored the house on the property and landscaped the six surrounding acres. In 1985, the house was placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

In 1989, Dr. Morgan established Rhoneymeade as a private foundation with a mission to "preserve our farm, fields, and forest; to create an oasis of beauty, both natural and man-made; and to share this with all who wish to come."

Rhoneymeade has shared with the community and was shared with the community. In 1992, Dr. Morgan opened the property to visitors on select weekends. Since Dr. Morgan's death in 2015, Rhoneymeade is working towards becoming a public nonprofit organization.

Mr. Speaker, the property has thoroughly been cared for for more than 200 years, the 150 acres of breathtaking

land and its history that has been kept alive by the families who have owned it and, now, by all those who visit it.

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 54 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

Pastor Jon Lands, Fellowship Baptist Church, Vienna, West Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, I thank You for Your hand of providence that has guided our Nation and protected us over these past 241 years. We are thankful for those who have gone before us and paid the price for our freedom from tyranny.

Recognizing Your blessing in our history, we now ask for Your continued favor and grace. We ask that You will protect those who even now place themselves in harm's way to preserve the liberty of our land.

I especially thank You for these dedicated men and women who gather today to do our Nation's business. We pray for all in authority that we may live in peace, and we ask You to lead this Congress to follow Your instruction given to the prophet Micah: To do justice, to love mercy, and walk humbly with You.

These things we pray in Jesus' 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PANETTA 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.

WELCOMING PASTOR JON LANDS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to introduce today's guest chaplain from Vienna, West Virginia, Pastor Jon Lands. Since taking over as senior pastor of Fellowship Baptist Church in 1996, he has led the church through a period of tremendous growth. Attendance numbers have risen from 65 to approximately 740 with a membership of over 1,200. This is a testament to his dedication to faithfully serving our community.

He took his ministry to new heights when he started PraiseFM radio, FaithTalk 1450, and the Word for Life, a daily and weekly radio program now heard on 150 radio stations across the United States and two international stations.

His service to the community doesn't stop at the church's door. He is a member of the executive board of directors for the Wood County Christian School, a member of the board for the Family Policy Council, and serves on the board of the Women's Care Center of Mid-Ohio Valley, a crisis pregnancy center dedicated to offering alternatives to abortion and adoption services.

A husband and father of four, he is also a noted author, having written "Be Still: God's Strategy for Serenity," and "Life on the Level: The Balanced Christian Life."

I am honored to welcome Pastor Lands to the House of Representatives. He is a dedicated leader in the Parkersburg community, and his service to others is inspirational.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues today to welcome Pastor Lands. May God bless him, our Nation, and the church family at Fellowship Baptist Church.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

AMBASSADOR HALEY'S STERN WARNING TO NORTH KOREA

(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, on Tuesday, North Korea, ruled by a tyrannical dictator, tested an intercontinental ballistic missile that may have the capacity to reach the United States.

North Korea's latest nuclear missile test was its most provocative to date, putting American families at risk of nuclear attack, in addition to the families of South Korea and Japan, with also a threat to China and Russia of regional chaos.

During an emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council, Ambassador Nikki Haley issued a stern warning to North Korea: "We have

never sought war with North Korea, and still today we do not seek it. If war comes, it will be because of the continued acts of aggression like we witnessed yesterday."

Ambassador Nikki Haley was absolutely right when she urged China and its President, Xi Jinping, to do more to stop North Korea from pushing the world closer to a nuclear war.

Ambassador Haley and President Donald Trump are promoting peace through strength to keep American families safe, and we should support the call for China to cut off oil to North Korea.

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

THE TAX SCAM

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Franklin Roosevelt was a great President of the United States. He said once: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little." That is still true today for people who follow morality and Judeo-Christian thought.

Yesterday in Missouri, the President said that the tax bill, which is in the Senate now—and unfortunately passed this House—would not benefit him at all. He said: Believe me, it won't benefit me.

You can't believe that. It benefits the billionaires, the millionaires, and the wealthy, and that is what it is about. The disparity in wealth in this country is growing and growing, and we can't continue to have that. The middle class needs major tax relief, and the wealthy don't. We could draw a bill to do that, and we could do it together.

Our country is in danger. We need more help in the inner cities to fight crime. We need help all over to fight against natural disasters. People all over our country need help.

As Paul Simon said: A nation turns its lonely eyes to you. JEFF FLAKE, BOB CORKER, and JOHN MCCAIN, save America.

RECOGNIZING BILL GIBBS FROM SPRINGPORT, MICHIGAN

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bill Gibbs from Springport, Michigan, and congratulate him for being named Jackson County Veteran of the Year.

A few weeks ago, I had the privilege of meeting Bill at VFW Post 6056 during their Veterans Day ceremony. It was a special evening with a room full of heroes, none more so than Bill.

When our country called during the Vietnam war, Bill answered with tremendous bravery. For his heroism in

harm's way, Bill was awarded the Purple Heart, four Bronze Stars with valor device, and a number of other service medals.

Over the years, Bill has done it all at Post 6056, including serving as post commander, trustee, post historian, and quartermaster for 33 years. When called upon, he performs as an honor guard member at military funerals in the community.

Mr. Speaker, for all this and much more, Bill is incredibly deserving of the Veteran of the Year award, and our Nation is eternally grateful for his service and sacrifice. Thank you, Bill Gibbs, and welcome home.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT TRAINING

(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, yesterday this House took a step to establish and maintain an environment where sexual harassment and discrimination is neither tolerated nor swept under the rug.

When I got here a year ago, I was surprised that there was no antisexual harassment training that was mandated. In every professional position that I have held, there always was this type of training. In the Navy, as a law student, and as a prosecutor, antisexual harassment training was a given.

So this month—before yesterday—I had an ethics attorney come into my office and conduct that type of training with my entire D.C. staff. I am proud to have done that. I am proud to be an original cosponsor, and I voted for the legislation yesterday which makes antisexual harassment training mandatory in all offices for all Members and their employees.

Although this bill should have been passed a long time ago, it is a small step in the right direction in the large fight against sexual harassment, and I look forward to being a part of that fight.

WORLD AIDS DAY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, December 1 is World AIDS Day, so we celebrate our many accomplishments in the fight against HIV/AIDS around the globe.

As Americans, we can look back and be proud that our Nation has been a transformative force in the global fight against AIDS and a ray of hope for millions of lives around the world.

Globally, our efforts through programs like PEPFAR are currently supporting treatments for more than 1 million people and have averted more than 16 million HIV infections around the world. However, there is still much

work to be done. Currently, more than 36 million people in the world are living with HIV, and nearly 1,000 girls are infected with HIV every day.

Mr. Speaker, December 1, World AIDS Day, reminds us to redouble our efforts on behalf of those suffering from this terrible disease. Now more than ever, it is essential that we remain committed to creating a future without HIV/AIDS.

REPUBLICAN TAX SCAM

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is fact: the Republican tax scam is an attack on America's senior citizens. According to the AARP, 5.2 million senior citizens, many on fixed incomes, will see a tax hike under the Republican bill. Meanwhile, over 60 percent of the tax benefits go to the top 1 percent.

Plus, the bill will trigger an automatic cut to Medicare—\$25 billion in 2018 alone. In 2019, Americans 50 to 64 years old buying health insurance through the individual market will see their premiums increase \$1,500 on average, according to the AARP. For the first time, the bill changes the way Social Security COLA is calculated, reducing Social Security benefits.

Seniors lose in the Republican tax bill, and so does pretty much everybody else. Who wins? Millionaires, billionaires, and the wealthiest corporations. We should say no to the Republican tax scam. Americans deserve a better deal.

TERROR ATTACK IN EGYPT

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, just last week, Egypt experienced the worst terror attack in its country's history. Islamic terrorists set off explosives that took over 300 innocent lives and injured over 100 more.

What made this tragedy even worse is that it happened at a place of worship in the northern Sinai region. In their effort to wreak havoc on the Middle East and other parts of the world, the Islamic State and other terror groups have targeted Christians, Jews, and Muslims.

President Trump was right to say, after the attack in Egypt, that we should strengthen our efforts to defeat terrorism and extremism in all of its forms. In the past year, we have made progress in deterring the Islamic State's so-called caliphate in Syria and in Iraq, and while their shadow in those two countries isn't nearly what it was a couple of years ago, this doesn't mean a radical Islamic insurgency won't remain in that area.

Mr. Speaker, if military progress isn't coupled with a thought-out strategy of reconstruction, a vacuum will be

left for these groups to return. As the beacon of freedom around the world, the United States must stay vigilant in our ongoing war on terror.

THE TAX BILL

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the President said yesterday that these massive tax cuts for corporate America will be rocket fuel for the economy—rocket fuel for corporate America and for the Trump empire for certain, and a rocket-fueled hit to the heart of middle America for sure.

If you are in college and you are trying to become better and self-sufficient to thrive in the global economy, you are getting a big tax hike. If you have a medical illness that you were born into and your costs exceed your insurance coverage, you will be getting a big tax hike. If you are 1 of 13 million Americans to lose your healthcare coverage and the millions more who will see their premiums explode because congressional Republicans needed another \$300 billion for their deficit-exploding corporate tax cuts, you will be taking a big hit on top of a big tax hike.

Mr. Speaker, this tax cut bill is a massive takeaway from middle America and a massive giveaway to corporate America. The deficit will rise by \$1.5 trillion, and both the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation confirmed that, in less than 10 years, Americans making between \$40,000 and \$50,000 will pay \$5.3 billion more in taxes.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING RECIPIENTS OF THE 2017 MONTANA CONGRESSIONAL VETERAN COMMENDATION

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Montana veterans who have served our country and continue their service in our communities.

I recently asked Montanans to nominate a veteran for the 2017 Montana Congressional Veteran Commendation, a tribute to recognize those who have served honorably in uniform and in our communities. The response from Montanans was overwhelming. Fourteen veterans are receiving the 2017 Montana Congressional Veteran Commendation:

Richard Allgood of Big Sky;
Gene Bell of Belgrade;
William Charles of De Borgia;
Richard Gale of Bozeman;
Gary Germundson of Scobey;
Theron Gertz of Butte;
Michael Lawson of Butte;
Phillip Lyons of Butte;
Daniel Ritter of Bozeman;

Frank Stoltz of Miles City;
Kevin Strickler of Belgrade;
Kyle Sukhbir of Livingston;
Loice Trotter of Libby;
Stanley Watson of Forsyth.

On behalf of all Montanans, I thank the recipients of the 2017 Montana Congressional Veteran Commendation for their sacrifices and selfless service.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF JERLINE HARVEY

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of my friend, Jerline Harvey of Forest Hill, Texas.

Since making Forest Hill her home in 1975, Jerline was a true champion for the improvement of the city. Among her many accomplishments, she was the first Black female elected to the Forest Hill City Council. She played a critical role in establishing the first library in Forest Hill, serving as its first librarian and also on the board of directors.

During her tenure serving on the board, Jerline coordinated the purchase of over five acres of land for the library district, and dedicated the Forest Hill Community Garden in 2011.

Jerline also made a mark in the community by operating and serving as the community outreach coordinator for the food bank at the Love Sanctuary Church of God in Christ for 15 years.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honor of her life. While the community will be sad that we are losing Jerline, I know that she is probably happy right now with Coach Harvey in Heaven.

I want to thank her for being the driving voice to help get that library created. When I see those kids on the computers in the library reading those books and having a good time, I think of Jerline and her vision of Forest Hill having their own library.

RECOGNIZING FSU PRESIDENT JOHN THRASHER

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a decorated combat veteran and distinguished public servant as one of the newest inductees into the Florida Veterans' Hall of Fame.

This week, Governor Rick Scott and the Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs honored John Thrasher for his continued commitment to the State of Florida.

John currently serves as the president of Florida State University, where he earned his bachelor's and law degrees. John joined the United States Army after graduating from FSU and went on to receive two Bronze Stars while serving in Vietnam, eventually earning the rank of captain.

He has been an advocate for veterans throughout his entire life, especially while serving as the speaker of the house in Florida and later as senator. Under his leadership as president, FSU has become one of the top universities in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating FSU President John Thrasher for being inducted into the Florida Veterans' Hall of Fame and thanking him for his continued service to our veterans.

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOMALIA

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm about our deepening military operations in Somalia.

This Monday, the United States conducted its 30th airstrike in Somalia since Donald Trump took office. This number is almost greater than the amount of airstrikes President Obama conducted in 8 years in office. What is worse, we now have the largest United States presence in Somalia since 1993—some 500 United States troops—which has doubled in 2017 alone.

Mr. Speaker, why are we conducting so many airstrikes and ramping up our military presence in Somalia with no congressional oversight?

Why are we sending our troops to fight a war that the American people know nothing about?

Congress has been left in the dark about these operations. At a minimum, we should have some basic knowledge of the missions we are asking our servicemembers to risk their lives for.

But we know it is not just Somalia. These U.S. shadow wars are taking place all across the world, as we saw so tragically in Niger last month.

Mr. Speaker, we need to rip up the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force and hold a real debate and vote on these new, ongoing wars. The people deserve to know the costs and consequences of these wars.

Yes, Congress has been missing in action once again. We owe it to our servicemembers to do our job.

WELCOMING DUCKS UNLIMITED

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the more than 40 volunteers from 26 States representing Ducks Unlimited who are on the Hill today.

As an avid outdoorsman and waterfowler myself, as well as a member of Ducks Unlimited for over 25 years, I have seen the wonderful firsthand benefits this group provides. Ducks Unlimited has conserved more than 14 million acres of land in its 80-year history, 25,000 of which are in my home State of Kansas. I send a big

thank-you for all those folks up north of us who have done such a great job raising these ducks.

Work like this is vital to ensuring that the natural resources of our land are protected and monitored so that our children and grandchildren can come someday to rural Kansas, from Cheyenne Bottoms to the Quivira Wildlife Refuge, and enjoy those great outdoor moments.

I thank the folks at Ducks Unlimited for their work, and I welcome them to Capitol Hill.

SIKH AWARENESS AND APPRECIATION MONTH

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate California's Sikh American Awareness and Appreciation Month and to recognize the contributions that Sikh Americans have made not only in California, but throughout the country.

This community originally came from Punjab, India, like other immigrant groups from all over the world, to have a better life for themselves and for their children.

In 1910, the Sikhs had become a cornerstone in California agriculture's Sacramento, Imperial, and San Joaquin Valleys. In addition to sharing the rich culture and the contributions that they have made to our economy, they are farmers, businessowners, physicians, and in all walks of life.

Sikh Americans stand with all Americans in their patriotism and values. Beginning with World War I, Sikhs have served in all of the American wars. Sikh communities promote the values of diversity, equality, freedom, justice, and giving back to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and celebrating the many contributions of Sikh Americans, which have made us a stronger nation and play an integral role in the health of the San Joaquin Valley and our Nation.

VETERANS ESTEEM TEAM EVENT

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the veterans in my district and those who support them.

Earlier this month, I attended a Veterans Esteem Team event in Lapeer County. It is a dinner organized and prepared by local junior high and high school students from North Branch, Almont, and Dryden to honor area veterans. Those who served our Nation are the best 1 percent this country produces.

Words will never be adequate to capture the debt of gratitude owed to the

men and women of our military who have enabled our Nation to continue to be safe and prosperous. I am honored to serve with them and the students in my district who took the time to recognize and organize the veterans at this event.

GOP TAX SCAM

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the Senate's version of tax reform would increase the deficit by \$38 billion in 2018. By 2027, the debt would increase by a whopping \$1.4 trillion.

I stand here today calling for tax reform legislation that would help my constituents and millions of other Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the GOP tax plan is irresponsible governing. Many of my constituents say that their families have yet to recover from the great recession, and I hear them loud and clear.

I cannot stand by silently while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle rush through a bill for which it will take years for our economy to recover. This bill raises taxes on 82 million middle class households solely to create giveaways for the wealthy few.

We have only 9 legislative days left this calendar year. It is time to focus on legislation that will give Americans a better deal. We need commonsense, reality-based legislation that will create opportunities for all Americans, not just the select few.

WE NEED LOWER TAXES

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it has been proven all over the world that the most wasteful, least economical, least efficient way to spend money is to turn it over to the Federal Government. If this was not true, then places like Cuba, North Korea, and Venezuela would be heavens on Earth. Socialism simply does not work.

Money left in the private sector does much more to create jobs and hold down prices than does any money turned over to government. A business that continually wastes money and operates inefficiently will eventually go out of business.

A government agency that wastes money or operates inefficiently just uses that as an excuse to ask for higher appropriations. This is what the tax cut bill is all about: an effort to leave more money in the private sector, where it will create jobs and hold down prices.

Wealthy elitists come out ahead, even under our socialist, Big Govern-

ment systems. Lower income people come out better when more money is left in private hands to create jobs and hold prices down.

College graduates often wonder why they can't find good jobs. In large part, it is because our Federal, State, and local corporate taxes are too high, and this has caused us to lose millions of good jobs to other countries.

Mr. Speaker, we need lower taxes.

HBCU 9

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the HBCU 9, the nine Historically Black Colleges and Universities who are celebrating 150 years of academic excellence.

These schools hail from six States and count great African-American leaders such as Eva Clayton, JOHN LEWIS, and Martin Luther King, Jr., as members of their illustrious alumni.

The nine include: Alabama State University, Barber-Scotia College, Fayetteville State University, Howard University, Johnson C. Smith University, Morehouse College, Morgan State University, St. Augustine University, and Talladega College.

Their achievements for the past 150 years are remarkable. They have cultivated a long history as incubators of innovation and continue to produce the next generation of leaders.

Twenty-five percent of African-American STEM graduates, 40 percent of African-American lawyers, 50 percent of African-American teachers, and 21 current members of the Congressional Black Caucus are proud HBCU grads.

These schools were born out of necessity and have endured the test of time to spark a movement and create the African-American middle class, fundamentally changing this country for the better.

Please stand with me in recognizing the HBCU 9 for their years of leadership in African-American communities and their dedication to helping students realize their dreams.

CONGRATULATING STATE CHAMP PRAIRIE RIDGE WOLVES FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Prairie Ridge Wolves football team on their second straight Class 6A State Championship.

The team repeated last year's outstanding performance of finishing the season without losing a single game. Beating the Nazareth Roadrunners in the State final 28-21, the team now has a 28 game winning streak. Their last loss was in 2015.

The team is ranked second in the State overall by the Chicago Tribune. Coach Chris Schremp has been a critical and central figure in their success. A 21-year veteran at Prairie Ridge High School, he was named IHSA Football Coach of the Year and is now competing for the national recognition.

Another crucial part of the team is quarterback Samson Evans. He had a fantastic season. Dubbed "Superman" for his exploits on the field, Evans was named the Chicago Sun-Times 2017 Player of the Year. He will continue his career as an Iowa Hawkeye alongside teammate and lineman Jeff Jenkins.

Congratulations, Prairie Ridge Wolves, for your excellent season, and here is to a continued undefeated winning streak.

□ 1230

TAX REFORM BILL PRESERVES ADOPTION TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the importance of adoption and what Congress can be doing to help more kids get adopted into loving, caring families.

November is National Adoption Month, and it is time we talk about how the GOP tax reform bill, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, will help children in need of loving families by supporting those whose lives have been touched by adoption.

Our tax reform bill preserves the adoption tax credit, which allows taxpayers to claim expenses related to the adoption of a child, including fees, court costs, and travel expenses. This credit ultimately helps get more children into permanent, loving families, and the credit costs only about \$3.8 billion over 10 years, a small fraction of our overall budget.

Mr. Speaker, I worked tirelessly with my colleagues to ensure that this adoption tax credit was included in the House's tax bill, and I am pleased that the Senate's version also preserves it in their draft.

I urge my colleagues to work quickly to pass tax reform that preserves the adoption tax credit while bringing tax relief to all American families.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4182, ENSURING A QUALIFIED CIVIL SERVICE ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1699, PRESERVING ACCESS TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING ACT OF 2017

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 635 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 635

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. 4182) to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify probationary periods with respect to positions within the competitive service and the Senior Executive Service, 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 Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill 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. 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. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1699) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage, to amend the Secure and Fair Enforcement for Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 to modify the definition of a loan originator, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-42 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I just had a chance to visit with my colleague from New York. We were talking about, well, the same thing all Members talk about when they get together: those things they have in common, those things that make their day a little bit better, those things they are struggling with that make their day a little bit worse.

I regret that so often we come to the House floor and the debate that we are having seems like we just have absolutely nothing in common whatsoever. I am sure it has been your experience. I think you can ask any freshman Member of this institution, Mr. Speaker, "What is the biggest surprise you have had in your first year in Congress?" and they will say, "I am surprised at how hardworking and conscientious and diligent and committed absolutely every single one of my colleagues is, because I was reading in the local paper back home, and it sounded like it was a big cesspool there in Washington, D.C. I am pleasantly surprised at how sincere my colleagues are at working for their 700,000 to 800,000 constituents back home."

Mr. Speaker, we have two bills that this rule makes in order for debate today, and they are two bills that I will tell you are incredibly well intentioned. I plan to support them. I plan to enthusiastically support them, but they are on issues that are hard in their minutia.

The first bill that is made in order today under a closed rule, Mr. Speaker, is H.R. 1699. It is the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act. We had testimony in the committee yesterday, and the discussion was how do we protect buyers of manufactured housing from being exploited while still enabling those Americans who don't have other avenues for purchasing housing to get into that most affordable of housing, manufactured housing. We have common goals to protect people and to empower people, but how do we get that done?

This bill was worked through committee. I believe it is a good compromise. We didn't allow any amendments to this. There were no germane amendments presented in committee, so that is coming under a closed rule today.

This rule also would make in order a structured rule for H.R. 4182, the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when you go and read the headlines, it makes it sound like every discussion on Capitol Hill is among a bunch of partisan hacks. It is just not true.

The civil service, an incredibly important part of American Government, has dedicated men and women who

show up every day to institute the laws that you and I pass, to be the interpreters of the bridge between the laws that we pass and the way they hit folks on the ground. We all want those employees to be protected from the swinging pendulum of partisanship.

I don't want a Republican President to get elected and fire all the Democrats serving in government. There are some bright-minded scientists, some great folks in law enforcement, some really talented people in education. I don't want them to lose their jobs because of the partisanship of a President.

Similarly, I don't want to see a Democratic President get elected and fire all the folks who are Republicans. There are some fantastic Republican minds in our Department of Agriculture helping our farmers to succeed, our Department of Labor helping our workers to succeed. You go right on down the list, there are strong men and women helping folks to succeed.

But we are also facing a reality that that same civil service system that seeks to protect those hardworking, those exceptional workers trying to serve America, that same system that works to protect them also protects folks who are completely derelict in their responsibilities.

We had that discussion as a conference, as a House. In fact, in a bicameral discussion, it went to the President's desk for his signature, as it came to the VA, to say: Can't we do more to reform a civil service system, to reform Federal labor union provisions so that folks who need the protection, because they are exceptional, continue to be protected; but those folks who are failing our veterans, that those folks cease to be protected from a system that seeks to require accountability? We passed that together. We did that together here, Mr. Speaker. We sent it to the Senate. They did it together. The President signed it into law.

This Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act does one thing and one thing only: it extends the probationary period of a new civil service worker from the current 1 year to 2 years.

The Department of Defense has done this already, and it has been working exceedingly well for them. The concern is: Have I been able to adequately assess an employee's ability to perform in a 12-month period?

We are committed to trying to train people up, Mr. Speaker. Nobody is trying to run folks out before they have had a chance to learn their job. The question is: Is a year long enough to uncover the flaws in an employee or is 2 years a wider window?

You will hear folks on the other side say: ROB, why in the world can't you all figure out if an employee is talented in year one?

That is fair.

They will say: ROB, if you are going to train somebody up, why couldn't you get it done in year one?

That is fair.

But as the GAO has looked at this issue, what they found is managers aren't getting that done in year one. Whether it is because they are ineffective as managers or whether it is because they keep trying to give people a second chance and get them trained up is an open question. This bill mandates nothing, but it allows this 2-year window so that managers can give their new employees a good first, second, and third look.

The data suggests that once folks get fully protected by the civil service system, it is very difficult to move underperforming employees out. That work should be done during this probationary period. This bill aims to lengthen that probationary period to 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, reasonable men and women can disagree on these measures. I believe they are important steps in the right direction. But what gives me so much pleasure to come to the floor to bring this rule to you today is the earnestness with which these two bills were presented.

These are common challenges: How do we ensure the very best staff for the American people? How do we ensure access to homes and protection for home buyers for the American people? These are sincere concerns, legitimate disagreements.

If we pass this rule today, we will enable a debating period. We will bring these bills to the floor so that we can air our concerns and challenge our assumptions. I hope, at the end of the day, my colleagues will decide to support this rule and to support the two underlying pieces of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act was enacted in 1994 as an amendment to the Truth in Lending Act. It is designed to address predatory lending practices in refinancing and home equity loans with high interest rates or fees.

Loans that meet these high-cost triggers are subject to disclosure requirements and limitations on the loan terms. Borrowers are also provided enhanced remedies if it is violated.

Now, the first bill before us, H.R. 1699, would amend the Truth in Lending Act by exempting manufactured home retailers from being defined as mortgage originators. In the process, it would exempt these retailers from important consumer protection rules. That would perpetuate conflicts of interest and restore incentives for these retailers to steer customers into loans with high costs and fees. These are precisely the type of loans that are more profitable for the retailer even though they are bad deals for the customer.

My good friend from Georgia asked what could be wrong with this; how can we protect those customers? I submit:

You may not protect those consumers by taking all regulation off for them. Obviously, it was there for a reason, and we will see how it turns out.

Those may seem like arcane changes to existing law, but let me put the issue in better perspective.

According to the Manufactured Housing Institute, 22 million Americans live in manufactured homes today. That is equal to the entire State of Florida.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, why in the world is the majority prioritizing a bill that would undermine consumer protections for tens of millions of Americans. We know the legislation would create more access to affordable housing. It would only make the incredibly profitable manufacturing housing industry even more money through predatory lending.

Those who rely on manufactured housing as an affordable option deserve the same antipredatory lending standards as every other family. This bill fails that test. In fact, it was written specifically to take the protections away from the housing industry.

The second measure before us today, H.R. 4182, is completely unnecessary. It would extend the probationary period for members of the Senior Executive Service and members of the competitive service from 1 year to 2. That would double the time that new civil servants are essentially at-will employees without any employee protections or due process rights.

There is no evidence to support the need for doubling the probationary period for Federal employees. The bill would simply serve to delay employees' access to worker protection laws that ensure that they are treated fairly on the job. It would also undermine whistleblower rights and prevent them from coming forward.

These are the people who are essential to getting to the bottom of legal violations and waste and fraud in government agencies. Standing up for their rights used to be a bipartisan priority, but the majority is now prioritizing a bill that would undermine their rights and put the integrity of our Federal civil service at risk.

This comes on the heels of the majority bringing a separate bill, H.R. 3441, to the floor recently. That legislation threatened collective bargaining rights for employees and allows employers to evade liability for wage theft or even child labor violations. And just like the bill before us today, it chips away at workers' ability to do their job without retaliation or unfair treatment.

Mr. Speaker, there is a pattern here. The majority is bringing bills to the House floor that threaten worker protections while they work to advance a procorporate agenda at the same time.

There is perhaps no bigger giveaway on the agenda right now than their tax bill. Under the guise of so-called reform, the majority on the other side of the Capitol is crafting a tax bill that is

nothing but a giveaway to the rich and powerful.

And, please, don't take my word for it. On Monday, The New York Times published a piece entitled: "Senators Scramble to Advance Tax Bill That Increasingly Rewards Wealthy." The very first line of the piece gives away the majority's game plan. It said: "The Republican tax bill hurtling through Congress is increasingly tilting the United States Tax Code to benefit wealthy Americans. . . ."

I believe that is beyond dispute by now. In fact, I think every major economist and publication have told us that that is exactly what it is. The scam will raise taxes on tens of millions of middle class families in order to hand deficit-exploding giveaways to the wealthy and corporations that ship jobs overseas. In fact, I heard an economist last night, Jared Bernstein, saying that he thinks this bill encourages moving jobs overseas.

The Republican plan eliminates the alternative minimum tax, which is designed to prevent the very rich from gaming the system. And the bill passed by the Chamber eliminates the estate tax, which will benefit the wealthy, certainly—and very few of them, though, are even liable for paying that tax.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, the Congressional Budget Office, under the Republican plan, persons making \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year would pay an additional \$5.3 billion in taxes, combined, over the next decade. At the same time, those earning \$1 million or more a year would see a \$5.8 billion tax cut.

Note, please, the similarity of those figures. If that isn't taking money from the poor to give to the rich, I don't know of anything that could describe it any better.

This is the third time America has tried trickle-down theory. It didn't work with President Reagan; it didn't work under President Bush; and, certainly, it did not work in Kansas. There is a word for doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. That word is "insanity."

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to let my colleagues know that this bill passed out of committee by more than a 2-1 margin, a big bipartisan vote out of committee to reform manufactured housing to provide more access.

Mr. Speaker, I don't profess to be an expert on that, so I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), one of my colleagues from the Financial Services Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of this rule that would allow the House of Representatives to debate legislation I introduced, H.R. 1699, the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act.

Homeownership, for many, is part of the American Dream; however, overbroad and burdensome regulations arising out of the Dodd-Frank financial control law are limiting the ability of Americans to realize this dream.

Specifically, a one-size-fits-all regulation issued by the unaccountable Consumer Financial Protection Bureau makes it harder for lenders to offer mortgages to hardworking Americans who simply want to buy a manufactured home. By expanding the range of loan products considered “high cost” under the Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act, the CFPB has failed to recognize the unique nature of manufactured housing loans. Because of the increased legal liabilities and stigma associated with making a so-called high-cost mortgage, some lenders have simply stopped making these loans.

According to recent Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data, data that is submitted to the government, the number of manufactured homes of \$75,000 or less has plummeted by 22 percent since this regulation went into effect. As a result, the CFPB’s overzealous regulation harms lower and moderate-income families, particularly in rural areas, who just want to purchase a manufactured home but, now, cannot access the necessary financing. In addition, existing homeowners are harmed because they won’t be able to sell their homes.

These rules are hitting Americans in rural and suburban areas and those with modest means the hardest. Take, for example, the hospital worker, in Kentucky, who applied for a loan of \$38,500 to finance a manufactured home. He had an 8 percent downpayment. His monthly income was \$2,200 per month, plenty to cover the all-in housing costs of \$670 per month. The payment he would have been investing in his own home would have been less than what he was spending on rent, but he was unable to get financing. He contacted local banks and credit unions, but they no longer finance manufactured homes.

The reason for this crippling lack of lending is the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and its so-called high-cost loan regulations and the definitions of “mortgage originator” and “loan originator” established in Dodd-Frank. These regulations fail to take into account the unique circumstances associated with manufactured housing and the fixed costs associated with any home purchase, large or small. They fail to recognize the simple mathematical fact that fixed costs on smaller loans translate into higher percentages of the total loan.

Even if interest payments on manufactured homes are more than your average home, the payments are still more affordable than the all-in cost of a site-built home—or even rent, in many markets. That is not predatory lending. That is actually getting people into more affordable housing. This is especially the case when you consider that purchasing a manufactured home,

as opposed to renting, allows the owners to build equity, leading to financial stability for those Americans.

The Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act recognizes the unique nature of the manufactured housing industry, and it fixes these government-caused problems by modifying the definition of “loan originators” and “mortgage originators” to exclude manufactured housing retailers and sellers from the definition of “loan originator” so long as they are only receiving compensation for the sale of the home and not engaged in the financing of the loans.

The legislation also increases the thresholds for high-cost loans to accommodate manufactured home purchases of up to \$75,000 while still retaining tough restrictions on lenders to prevent any borrowers from being taken advantage of.

As Members of Congress, we have an obligation to protect the American people from regulations that harm their ability to purchase affordable homes for themselves and their families. We need to end government policies that are issued under the guise of consumer protection when those policies actually are protecting Americans right out of homeownership. Again, that is not consumer protection.

So, for these reasons and the fact that about 40 different proconsumer and probusiness trade associations support this legislation, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule.

This is not the only reason why we should vote for the rule. The other legislation, introduced by my friend from Kentucky, the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act, is another piece of legislation that will help ensure that the U.S. Federal Government has a competent workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman COMER for his hard work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her distinguished leadership and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus in particular on where we are and where we have been. I think it is important, as we discuss these issues dealing with the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017, that we really have the responsibility, as Members of Congress, to engage in safe and fair workplaces all over the Nation.

Certainly, I want to speak particularly about the Civil Service Act, which I am stunned that this would extend the period of time for a probationary period from 1 year to 2 years. But what is most striking, since I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, is that Federal employees will remain at-will employees for a period of time with virtually no due process protection.

I clearly want to try to understand an administration that, first of all, wants to make skinny the government to disallow it to do its work; and then, on top of that, it wants to have temporary employees with no due process rights.

Yesterday, we stood on the floor of the House to insist that there be mandatory training for sexual harassment and, as well, to recognize that there should be zero tolerance for sexual harassment and, of course, sexual assault.

As an African-American woman, over the years, historically, we, along with women all over the world, have seen the plight, or the devastation, of sexual harassment and sexual assault. I was disappointed that this floor could not vote on that resolution. I would really ask for that resolution to be called up again so that this House could go on record for supporting mandatory training.

At the same time, I think it balances, with due process, the work that we have to do to make sure that we have a workplace that is tolerable and allows women who feel insulted, harassed, and, God forbid, assaulted easy, quick access to a pathway of relief.

This legislation and the underlying bill on this rule specifically dealing with taking away due process rights from civil servant women strikes me as the wrong direction to go in light of where we are. So I am questioning this legislation. I think it is the wrong direction to go. I, frankly, believe it should be pulled.

And as that legislation is pulled, I believe that we would do ourselves well to reassert the resolution from yesterday and to cast a vote. Let’s get on the record of where we stand on the issues protecting women against sexual harassment and sexual assault.

Finally, let me indicate that we are in the middle of appropriations. We have not been compensated for the devastation of Hurricane Harvey. My constituents are suffering. They are suffering in Puerto Rico, in the Virgin Islands, and in Florida. The appropriation, or the recommendation from the White House, is insufferable, unacceptable, and it is time for us to move as a Congress to bring relief to the people who have suffered from the hurricane.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), a good friend and authority on the issue.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1699, the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act, and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this rule and the underlying bill.

As the vice chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee and a cosponsor of this legislation, I want to underscore the impact that passing the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act would have on hardworking Americans.

□ 1300

We all agree that we should work to ensure that everyone can afford a safe place to live. Representative BARR's bipartisan bill will remove misguided barriers that block access to affordable manufactured homes while preserving consumer protections.

In many parts of this country, manufactured homes represent a cost-effective and customizable housing option. It is important to keep in mind that the challenge of finding affordable housing is not exclusively an urban problem. Housing affordability is a challenge in many rural areas as well, and manufactured homes can be a solution.

This is an industry that offers millions, including many rural Americans with moderate incomes, a chance at home ownership. In fact, nationwide, 22 million Americans live in manufactured homes.

In my State of Pennsylvania, manufactured homes comprise almost 5 percent of the housing stock. Manufactured homes account for 73 percent of all new homes sold under \$125,000. The average income of a manufactured home purchaser is less than \$40,000 per year.

The manufactured housing business also sustains thousands of families. Sixteen thousand workers in Pennsylvania are employed in that industry.

Unfortunately, misguided rules from Washington, D.C., threaten to choke off access to manufactured homes. When Washington bureaucrats sought to implement Dodd-Frank, they put forward rules that led some manufactured housing retailers and sellers to be considered loan originators. They also expanded the "high-cost loan" definition and swept many manufactured housing loans into that category.

The increased restrictions, liability, and stigma that accompany these designations have led many in the industry to cut back on lending. As a result, fewer hardworking Americans will be able to afford a quality manufactured home for their families.

The Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act will address these harmful restrictions that are making manufactured homes unaffordable for prospective homeowners while preserving important consumer protections.

This bill clarifies that a manufactured home salesperson is not a loan originator unless he or she is being compensated by a lender, a creditor, or a mortgage broker. It also adjusts the high-cost mortgage designation thresholds so that many manufactured housing loans are once again not included.

It is important to keep in mind that the Truth in Lending Act and State consumer protection laws will still apply after the enactment of this legislation.

Representative BARR's bill is a narrowly focused, commonsense, and bipartisan effort to target a specific challenge facing prospective pur-

chasers of manufactured homes. This bill will preserve access to affordable housing for millions of American families.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge support for the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act and this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are Americans in every way except on paper.

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 (Mr. NORMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, this Congress faces a moral decision that we have put off making for too long, a decision that we cannot put off any longer: Will we stop the deportation of hundreds of thousands of young DREAMers or not?

This is not a partisan question. This is a question of who we are as Americans.

Are we willing to put partisan games aside? Are we willing to put to an end the fear that DREAMers have, the fear that they have been living with these past few months?

We are quickly approaching the year-end deadline for many items this body needs to address. Many of us are looking forward to seeing our families through the holidays.

What about the 122 DREAMers that lose protection every day that we don't act? Can they say the same.

This is unconscionable. This is not who we are.

When I am home, I hear from businesses, school leaders, public officials, religious leaders, and friends, and they all want us to act now, today. Failure to do so will result in tearing families and communities apart.

The fix is right here in front of us. H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, is a bipartisan, bicameral bill that will put this issue at rest once and for all.

We all know that the votes are here today in this body. Plenty of my Republican colleagues support this legislation. Plenty of my Republican colleagues stand with their business, religious, and community leaders to bring this dream to a reality for the DREAMers.

We have been clear. This Congress must not finish this year without providing a fix in certainty for DREAMers. Their families and the communities that depend on them expect that.

I ask my colleagues to allow us to vote and provide a vote against the

previous question so that we can immediately bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would share with the gentlewoman from New York that I have no further speakers remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, funding for the government expires on December 8. That is 8 days from now. We wonder why we are wasting time on unnecessary bills before us today and running us toward another shutdown.

Let me remind everyone watching here today about the last shutdown in 2013. The majority shut down the government rather than fund the Affordable Care Act, which was then and remains today the law of the land. The shutdown lasted 16 days. In just that short time, it cost our economy an estimated \$24 billion. The shutdown cost the government \$24 billion.

Federal facilities were not opened. The mom-and-pop stores and little restaurants in Federal buildings all closed. The processing of veterans' disability claims was stalled. Head Start grantees that serve an estimated 6,300 children were forced to close their doors for 9 days until some private philanthropists stepped in. Hundreds of patients were unable to enroll in possible lifesaving clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health.

Ninety-eight percent of the employees at the National Science Foundation, nearly 75 percent of the employees at the National Institutes of Health, and two-thirds of the employees at the Centers for Disease Control were furloughed. That brought new Federal research to a standstill.

An estimated \$4 billion in tax refunds were delayed, denying middle class families the money they expected and planned for. Even the National Transportation Safety Board was impacted, unable to investigate 59 plane accidents as swiftly.

Another shutdown will be devastating, but I am afraid that is what we are headed for under the leadership here.

The President recently tweeted that he doesn't see a deal on the horizon. This comes after he tweeted earlier this year that our country needs a "good shutdown."

Instead of doing anything about that here today, we are frittering away precious legislative time on bills that are, at best, not urgent and, at worst, completely unnecessary and even damaging.

The greatest Nation on Earth will be struggling to keep the lights on. This is no way to run the United States.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, on the rule, and the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman raises a lot of important points. I am absolutely concerned about funding the United States Government, but, sadly, in a way that has become systemic as we talk about who we are as a people, Mr. Speaker, we can either be glasses half full or we can be glasses half empty.

Is it true that the number of days we have left in this continuing resolution are limited?

It is.

Is it also true that this House has fully funded the government ahead of schedule for the first time since the good people of the Seventh District elected me to Congress?

It is.

This House has nothing to be ashamed of. In fact, this House should be shouting it from the rooftops:

The United States Constitution gives the United States Congress a job to do. The House has done its. Senate, get to work.

This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that we have been able to fund all the appropriations bills—there are 12 of them—before the end of the fiscal year since I was elected in 2011. The Senate has passed, I believe, zero appropriations bills so far this year.

Mr. Speaker, let's not give anybody a pass on getting the good work done. Let's do hold people accountable, but let's not chastise ourselves and create an atmosphere of failure.

Success begets success. We succeeded together for the first time in a long time. Let's not waste that opportunity to get that bill across the floor of the Senate.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about civil service protections today. There is not a man or a woman in this Chamber who doesn't want the absolute best Federal workforce that we could find; not one.

The question today is: Do we lock you in and give you all of those iron-clad protections that every American knows the civil service system offers?

We all know that it is hard to get fired from a government job. We all know that.

Should we extend the probationary period where folks can be monitored, trained up, disciplined, worked with from 1 year to 2 years?

If that gets us a better Federal workforce to serve the American people, the answer should be a unanimous yes.

I say to my friends who oppose this bill: If it doesn't end up in that result, I will vote with you to repeal it. But I believe it will end up with a more highly qualified workforce, that it will end up with an American taxpayer who feels like they are getting their money's worth.

I will tell you the best thing we can do for our civil service employees is to end the narrative that civil service is a place of failure instead of a place of success, it is to end the narrative that substandard people work for the Federal Government as opposed to exceptional people work for the Federal Government.

I represent employees of the CDC in my part of the world, Mr. Speaker. The Centers for Disease Control is second to no one in the intellectual firepower that they assemble to serve the American people. Those men and women put themselves in harm's way to battle those pandemics that scare the bejesus out of the rest of us. They do it as an act of service, and they should be praised for it.

The best thing we can do for them is to make sure folks don't slip through the cracks and they get saddled with a substandard partner. We want them to have access to an exceptional partner. This bill would do that.

Mr. Speaker, as to access to manufactured housing, the bill from my friend from Kentucky, it is absolutely true that every man and woman in this Chamber wants to protect the American consumer from predatory lending. That is undisputed. But as my friend in Kentucky stated, when do we protect someone right out of the opportunity to have a home? In the name of protecting people, when do we fail those very same people?

We had testimony in the committee yesterday, Mr. Speaker, presented credit union after credit union after credit union that would no longer loan money to its members to purchase a manufactured home. They wouldn't do it. They couldn't do it.

Talk about predatory lending if you want to; it is not your local credit union that is doing it. Talk about big Wall Street banks exploiting people if you want to; it is not your local credit union who is doing it.

Talk about people who want to build your community; it is your local credit union.

□ 1315

Yet credit union after credit union said: The men and women whom we strive to serve, we will no longer help access the American Dream. We can't. Why? Because of the regulations coming out of Washington, D.C.

Do we want to protect the American consumer? We do, and we can, but we can't protect them right out of home ownership. We shouldn't, yet we have.

Passing this bill today that my friend from Kentucky brings forward corrects that mistake, puts us back on track for protecting consumers and enabling consumers.

Mr. Speaker, you can pick any day of the week on Capitol Hill, and you can find a way to describe everything that goes on as nefarious, as misguided, as contrived. But, Mr. Speaker, you can also look at days on Capitol Hill and see the earnestness with which men and women work together to move this country forward. That is the day we have today. I hope it is the day we have tomorrow and the next day and the next day.

I urge my friends, support this rule. Support bringing this bill to the floor for manufactured housing. Support bringing this bill to the floor to improve the civil service system.

We can do that with a vote right now, Mr. Speaker.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 635 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the revolution, 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. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children 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. 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. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MINNESOTA'S ECONOMIC RIGHTS IN THE SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3905) to require congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or monument designation involving the National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota, to provide for the renewal of certain mineral leases in such lands, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

A motion to recommit, if ordered;

Passage of the bill, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 635; and

Adopting H. Res. 635, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 237, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 642]

YEAS—182

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

NAYS—237

Abraham	Babin	Bergman
Aderholt	Bacon	Biggs
Allen	Banks (IN)	Bilirakis
Amash	Barletta	Bishop (MI)
Amodei	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Arrington	Barton	Black

Blackburn	Hartzler	Perry
Blum	Hensarling	Peterson
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)
Brat	Higgins (LA)	Poliquin
Brooks (AL)	Hill	Ratcliffe
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Reed
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Reichert
Buck	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Huizenga	Richmond
Budd	Hultgren	Roby
Burgess	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Byrne	Hurd	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Rooney, Francis
Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Rooney, Thomas J.
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	Jordan	Roskam
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Ross
Comer	Katko	Rothfus
Comstock	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Royce (CA)
Cook	King (IA)	Russell
Costello (PA)	King (NY)	Rutherford
Cramer	Kinzing	Sanford
Crawford	Knight	Scalise
Culberson	Kustoff (TN)	Schweikert
Curbelo (FL)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Curtis	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Davidson	LaMalfa	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Shimkus
DeFazio	Lance	Shuster
Denham	Larson (CT)	Simpson
Dent	Latta	Sinema
DeSantis	Lewis (MN)	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart	Long	Smith (NJ)
Donovan	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Duffy	Love	Smucker
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Stefanik
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Dunn	MacArthur	Tenney
Emmer	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Estes (KS)	Marino	Thornberry
Farenthold	Marshall	Tiberi
Faso	Massie	Tipton
Ferguson	Mast	Trott
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Turner
Fleischmann	McCauley	Upton
Flores	McClintock	Valadao
Fortenberry	McHenry	Wagner
Fox	McKinley	Walberg
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Walden
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Walker
Gaetz	McSally	Walorski
Gallagher	Meadows	Walters, Mimi
Garrett	Meehan	Walz
Gianforte	Messer	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Mitchell	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Westerman
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Gosar	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Gowdy	Newhouse	Wittman
Granger	Noem	Womack
Graves (GA)	Nolan	Woodall
Graves (LA)	Norman	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Yoho
Griffith	Olson	Young (AK)
Grothman	Palazzo	Young (IA)
Guthrie	Palmer	Zeldin
Handel	Paulsen	
Harris	Pearce	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridenstine	Jayapal	Renacci
Collins (GA)	Kennedy	Stivers
Conyers	Khanna	Taylor
Gutiérrez	Pocan	Webster (FL)
Harper	Posey	

□ 1342

Messrs. RUSSELL, DENT, GOSAR, MOONEY of West Virginia, MEADOWS, COLLINS of New York, GOODLATTE, WITTMAN, ROTHFUS, BRADY of Texas, and ROYCE of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. COSTA and MOULTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Vote 642, I had intended to vote "nay" when I voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). 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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 204, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 643]

AYES—216

Abraham	Fleischmann	Marino
Aderholt	Flores	Marshall
Allen	Fox	Massie
Amodei	Franks (AZ)	Mast
Arrington	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy
Babin	Gaetz	McCaul
Bacon	Gallagher	McClintock
Banks (IN)	Garrett	McHenry
Barletta	Gianforte	McKinley
Barr	Gibbs	McMorris
Barton	Gohmert	Rodgers
Bergman	Goodlatte	McSally
Biggs	Gosar	Meadows
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Messer
Bishop (MI)	Granger	Mitchell
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Mooleenaar
Black	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Blackburn	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Blum	Green, Gene	Newhouse
Bost	Griffith	Noem
Brady (PA)	Grothman	Nolan
Brady (TX)	Guthrie	Norcross
Brat	Handel	Norman
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Nunes
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Olson
Buchanan	Hensarling	Palazzo
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Palmer
Bucshon	Hice, Jody B.	Pascarella
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Pearce
Burgess	Hill	Perry
Byrne	Holding	Peterson
Calvert	Hollingsworth	Pittenger
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Poe (TX)
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Poliquin
Cheney	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Coffman	Hunter	Roby
Cole	Hurd	Roe (TN)
Collins (NY)	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Comer	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (KY)
Comstock	Jenkins (WV)	Rohrabacher
Conaway	Johnson (LA)	Rokita
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Costa	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Cramer	Jordan	Ross
Crawford	Joyce (OH)	Rothfus
Cuellar	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Royce (CA)
Curtis	King (IA)	Russell
Davidson	King (NY)	Rutherford
Davis, Rodney	Kinzing	Scalise
Denham	Knight	Schweikert
Dent	Kustoff (TN)	Scott, Austin
DeSantis	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	LaHood	Sessions
Donovan	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Duffy	Lamborn	Shuster
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Simpson
Duncan (TN)	Lewis (MN)	Smith (MO)
Dunn	Long	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Estes (KS)	Love	Smucker
Farenthold	Lucas	Stewart
Faso	Luetkemeyer	Tenney
Ferguson	Marchant	Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden

Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—204

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.

Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)

Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn

Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist

Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio

DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
DeSaulnier

Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.

Ellison
Engel
Espino
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans

Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Bridenstine
Chabot
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Harper

Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa

Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee

Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating

Cartwright
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi

Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)

Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebback
Lofgren

Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur

Maloney, Sean
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin

McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore

Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Halleran

O'Rourke
Jayapal
Kennedy
Pocan
Posey
Renacci

NOT VOTING—13

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Wenstrup
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Pallone
Panetta
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rooney, Thomas J.

Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sanchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter

Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas

Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. McCARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I intended to vote "yes" and realized my error after the vote was over on rollcall No. 643.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, Members are advised that votes are now expected in this House on Monday, December 4, at 6:30 p.m. Members should be prepared to vote on the motion to go to conference and the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

I strongly encourage all Members to be here present and voting. If there are any further changes to the schedule, I will be sure to let all Members know.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding.

As the majority leader knows, we have 9 days remaining under the present schedule. I understand that an extension of that to the 22nd may be contemplated, but we have 9 legislative days remaining.

The gentleman has now just indicated that we are going to be voting on Monday. I would join the gentleman in urging every Member to be present on Monday. We are going to be casting very consequential votes over the next few days. Whether we are voting on them in a timely fashion or not, they will all be critically important, so I would urge all my Members to be here.

We have much that needs to be done in the days that remain, as the gentleman knows.

I want to raise two issues. Obviously the gentleman has indicated that we are going to vote to go to conference on the tax bill if the Senate passes the tax bill.

In addition to that, of course, there are two major pieces of legislation and, frankly, many more, and I am not referring to, obviously, the omnibus or a CR so that we can keep the government funded, which everybody on this side of the aisle and I am sure everybody on that side of the aisle wants to do. I hope we are able to keep the government funded in a nondramatic way.

But as I have indicated to the majority leader on numerous occasions, we feel very strongly, as the gentleman knows—and we have had positive discussions on this—that we need to also pass before the end of the year—and many of my friend's Members have raised that issue as well and urged that we pass before the end of the year a resolution for the children who were brought here as minors, some as young as 1 or 2 years of age and who know no other country but the United States of America, that we resolve their status

□ 1350

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

before the end of the year so they do not continue to twist in the wind and agonize about whether they are going to be sent to a place they do not know and they do not perceive as their country. They perceive themselves to be American. So I would hope that we can deal with that.

In addition, my friend and I have had a discussion—there has been much over the last 11 months—about healthcare. I think one of the things that I think the gentleman and I agree on in a bipartisan way is that we all believe that the children of our country ought to have assurance of access to affordable, quality healthcare.

We passed the CHIP bill through the House. As the gentleman knows, it was passed not in a bipartisan way. It sits now in the Senate and has not moved yet in the Senate. I would hope that those two issues at the very least—and there are many others, including the fiscal bills and the omnibus—that need to be moved. I would hope, whether we are 9 days or 13 days, however many days that we have remaining, that those two issues in addition to others will be resolved before we leave.

I thank the gentleman for his announcement and giving us a heads-up about Monday, but I would hope that we would also in the few days that remain to us work very hard to try to get those issues and others resolved before we leave for the year.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does know—we have talked many times—about our issue not only just on security but also when it comes to DACA, and we know that deadline is not approaching by the end of this year.

My good friend does know the deadline of government funding that affects all Americans. I take my friend in a serious manner, but I would say my severe disappointment in what transpired this week when an opportunity to meet with all leadership—my friend talked about the number of days we have. This is not a time to play politics. This is not about one party or the other.

I would be glad to hear the support and opposed. You just have to show up for the meeting. I think more outcome would happen if you show up to the meeting.

Tomorrow I will be announcing a full legislative schedule. I am excited about the opportunity to let America keep more of their hard-earned money and get us working again.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend, the majority leader, with all due respect we raise a lot of heat in this town. Unfortunately, on

the cusp of a meeting that was convened to try to reach some agreements on very important issues to the American people, the heat was raised very, very substantially by the President of the United States. That was unfortunate.

Anybody who thinks that the heat wasn't raised and was saying that there was not going to be a deal I think is incorrect.

But that is not why I asked for the 1 minute. Why I asked for the 1 minute is, Mr. Speaker, the American people are relying on us to come together and agree on things they know are very important to them: their families, their community, and their country.

Let us not accuse one another back and forth of bad faith, and let's lower the heat and let's try to get that work done.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman wouldn't yield to me, but I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. McCARTHY. My friend is correct on a lot, but understand one thing. In this job and when we run, we are passionate about our beliefs. My parents always told me: If you can't handle the heat, you probably shouldn't run.

But the one thing that should happen here is, if we want to come to a conclusion, just as you and I and my good friend sat yesterday in my office talking with the White House on our concerns about the hurricane that came to the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, the only way you solve a problem is you come together. The only way you come together is you show up in the meetings and you can air your differences.

But at the end of the day, when we walk into this House, we don't walk in as Democrats or Republicans. We walk in as an American. It is about time we put the people before politics.

We have got a shorter time to do our job. I look forward to seeing people here Monday. I look forward to seeing us get our work done.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4182, ENSURING A QUALIFIED CIVIL SERVICE ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1699, PRESERVING ACCESS TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 635) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4182) to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify probationary periods with respect to positions within the competitive service and the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes, and

providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1699) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage, to amend the Secure and Fair Enforcement for Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 to modify the definition of a loan originator, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 189, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 644]

YEAS—229

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

Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman

Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—189

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

NOT VOTING—15

Bridenstine
Buchanan
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Harper

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1408

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 226, nays 186, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 645]

YEAS—226

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester

Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Loftgren
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
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson

NOT VOTING—21

Bilirakis
Brat
Bridenstine
Buchanan
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Courtney
Gottheimer

□ 1415

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 645.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance of a close friend's funeral, I missed the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 642, “yea” on rollcall No. 643, “yea” on rollcall No. 644, and “yea” on rollcall No. 645.

BROWNFIELDS ENHANCEMENT, ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT, AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 631, I call up the bill (H.R. 3017) to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response,

Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to reauthorize and improve the brownfields program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Pursuant to House Resolution 631, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-40 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3017

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 “Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. REDEVELOPMENT CERTAINTY FOR GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES.

Section 101(20)(D) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(20)(D)) is amended by striking “ownership or control” and all that follows through “by virtue” and inserting “ownership or control through seizure or otherwise in connection with law enforcement activity, or through bankruptcy, tax delinquency, abandonment, or other circumstances in which the government acquires title by virtue”.

SEC. 3. PETROLEUM BROWNFIELD ENHANCEMENT.

Section 101(39)(D)(ii)(II) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(39)(D)(ii)(II)) is amended by amending item (bb) to read as follows:

“(bb) is a site for which there is no viable responsible party and that is determined by the Administrator or the State, as appropriate, to be a site that will be assessed, investigated, or cleaned up by a person that is not potentially liable for cleaning up the site under this Act or any other law pertaining to the cleanup of petroleum products; and”.

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION OF LEASEHOLDER INTEREST.

Section 101(40) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(40)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “(or a tenant of a person) that acquires ownership of” and inserting “who acquires ownership of, or a leasehold interest in,”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or the leasehold interest in the facility” before the period at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (ii), by inserting “with respect to a person who acquires ownership of a facility. The Administrator shall establish standards and practices with respect to a person who acquires a leasehold interest in a facility” before the period at the end; and

(B) in clause (iii), by inserting “, or acquisition of a leasehold interest,” after “time of purchase”;

(4) in subparagraph (H)(i)(II), by inserting “, by the instruments by which the leasehold interest in the facility is acquired after January 11, 2002,” after “financed”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(I) LEASEHOLDERS.—In the case of a person holding a leasehold interest in a facility—

“(i) the leasehold interest in the facility—

“(I) is for a term of not less than 5 years; and

“(II) grants the person control of, and access to, the facility; and

“(ii) the person is responsible for the management of all hazardous substances at the facility.”.

SEC. 5. EXPANDED ELIGIBILITY FOR NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 104(k)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(I) an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code;

“(J) a limited liability corporation in which all managing members are organizations described in subparagraph (I) or limited liability corporations whose sole members are organizations described in subparagraph (I);

“(K) a limited partnership in which all general partners are organizations described in subparagraph (I) or limited liability corporations whose sole members are organizations described in subparagraph (I); or

“(L) a qualified community development entity (as defined in section 45D(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(i) by striking “or nonprofit organizations”; and

(ii) by striking “entity or organization” and inserting “eligible entity”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(i) by striking “or other nonprofit organization”; and

(ii) by striking “or nonprofit organization”; and

(2) in paragraph (6)(A), by striking “or nonprofit organizations”.

SEC. 6. TREATMENT OF PUBLICLY OWNED BROWNFIELD SITES.

Section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN PUBLICLY OWNED BROWNFIELD SITES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an eligible entity described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (H) of paragraph (1) may receive a grant under this paragraph for property acquired by that eligible entity prior to January 11, 2002, even if such eligible entity does not qualify as a bona fide prospective purchaser, so long as the eligible entity has not caused or contributed to a release or threatened release of a hazardous substance at the property.”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(E) EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN PUBLICLY OWNED BROWNFIELD SITES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an eligible entity described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (H) of paragraph (1) may receive a grant or loan under this paragraph for property acquired by that eligible entity prior to January 11, 2002, even if such eligible entity does not qualify as a bona fide prospective purchaser, so long as the eligible entity has not caused or contributed to a release or threatened release of a hazardous substance at the property.”; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(B)(iii)—

(A) by striking “up to 25 percent of the”; and

(B) by inserting “described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (H) of paragraph (1)” after “eligible entities”.

SEC. 7. REMEDIATION GRANT ENHANCEMENT.

Section 104(k)(3)(A)(ii) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(3)(A)(ii))

is amended by striking “\$200,000 for each site to be remediated” and inserting “\$500,000 for each site to be remediated, which limit may be waived by the Administrator, but not to exceed a total of \$750,000 for each site, based on the anticipated level of contamination, size, or ownership status of the site”.

SEC. 8. MULTIPURPOSE BROWNFIELDS GRANTS.

Section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (12) as paragraphs (5) through (13), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “Subject to paragraphs (4) and (5)” and inserting “Subject to paragraphs (5) and (6)”;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) MULTIPURPOSE BROWNFIELDS GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (D) and paragraphs (5) and (6), the Administrator shall establish a program to provide multipurpose grants to an eligible entity based on the criteria under subparagraph (C) and the considerations under paragraph (3)(C), to carry out inventory, characterization, assessment, planning, or remediation activities at 1 or more brownfield sites in an area proposed by the eligible entity.

“(B) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

“(i) INDIVIDUAL GRANT AMOUNTS.—Each grant awarded under this paragraph shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

“(ii) CUMULATIVE GRANT AMOUNTS.—The total amount of grants awarded for each fiscal year under this paragraph may not exceed 15 percent of the amounts made available for the fiscal year to carry out this subsection.

“(C) CRITERIA.—In awarding a grant under this paragraph, the Administrator shall consider the extent to which the eligible entity is able—

“(i) to provide an overall plan for revitalization of the 1 or more brownfield sites in the proposed area in which the multipurpose grant will be used;

“(ii) to demonstrate a capacity to conduct the range of activities that will be funded by the multipurpose grant; and

“(iii) to demonstrate that a multipurpose grant will meet the needs of the 1 or more brownfield sites in the proposed area.

“(D) CONDITION.—As a condition of receiving a grant under this paragraph, each eligible entity shall expend the full amount of the grant not later than the date that is 5 years after the date on which the grant is awarded to the eligible entity, unless the Administrator provides an extension.

“(E) OWNERSHIP.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this paragraph may not expend any of the grant funds on remediation of a brownfield site until such time as the eligible entity owns the brownfield site.”; and

(4) by striking “(2) or (3)” each place it appears and inserting “(2), (3), or (4)”.

SEC. 9. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS FOR GRANT RECIPIENTS.

Paragraph (5) of section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) (as redesignated by section 8 of this Act) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking subclause (III); and

(ii) by redesignating subclauses (IV) and (V) as subclauses (III) and (IV), respectively;

(B) by striking clause (ii);

(C) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii); and

(D) in clause (ii) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph), by striking “Notwithstanding clause (i)(IV)” and inserting “Notwithstanding clause (i)(III)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity may use up to 5 percent of the amounts made available

under a grant or loan under this subsection for administrative costs.

“(ii) *RESTRICTION.*—For purposes of clause (i), the term ‘administrative costs’ does not include—

“(I) investigation and identification of the extent of contamination of a brownfield site;

“(II) design and performance of a response action; or

“(III) monitoring of a natural resource.”.

SEC. 10. RENEWABLE ENERGY ON BROWNFIELD SITES.

Paragraph (6) of section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) (as redesignated by section 8 of this Act) is amended by adding at the end of subparagraph (C) the following:

“(xi) The extent to which a grant would facilitate the production of renewable energy on the site.”.

SEC. 11. SMALL COMMUNITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 128(a)(1)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9628(a)(1)(B)) is amended—

(I) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) assist small communities, Indian tribes, rural areas, or disadvantaged areas in carrying out activities described in section 104(k)(7)(A) with respect to brownfield sites.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) *SMALL COMMUNITIES, INDIAN TRIBES, RURAL AREAS, AND DISADVANTAGED AREAS.*—

“(I) *IN GENERAL.*—To make grants to States or Indian tribes under clause (ii)(III), the Administrator may use not more than \$1,500,000 of the amounts made available to carry out section 104(k)(7) in each fiscal year.

“(II) *LIMITATION.*—Each grant made under subclause (I) may be not more than \$20,000.

“(iv) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this subparagraph:

“(I) *DISADVANTAGED AREA.*—The term ‘disadvantaged area’ means a community with an annual median household income that is less than 2/3 of the statewide annual median household income, as determined by the President based on the latest available decennial census.

“(II) *SMALL COMMUNITY.*—The term ‘small community’ means a community with a population of not more than 10,000 individuals, as determined by the President based on the latest available decennial census.”.

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—Section 104(g)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(g)(1)) is amended by inserting “or section 128(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III)” after “under this section”.

SEC. 12. BROWNFIELDS FUNDING.

Paragraph (13) of section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) (as redesignated by section 8 of this Act) is amended to read as follows:

“(13) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022.”.

SEC. 13. STATE RESPONSE PROGRAM FUNDING.

Section 128(a)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9628(a)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) *FUNDING.*—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally di-

vided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3017.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3017, the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act of 2017. This legislation has broad bipartisan support, and I would like to thank Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Members PALLONE and TONKO.

I would also like to specifically thank a few of my colleagues who have exhibited leadership and commitment on this issue, Congressman DAVID MCKINLEY, my fellow Energy and Commerce Committee member, who introduced this important bill, and my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Congressman JOHN KATKO and Congresswoman ELIZABETH ESTY who guided a similar bill through their committee.

We have been working closely with our colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee over these past few months, and the bill that we will vote on today reflects compromise on both sides.

The bill takes a very important step in reauthorizing the Environmental Protection Agency's brownfields program for the first time since the law was enacted, and so I would like to also thank Chairman SHUSTER for his leadership and support as we move forward.

The bill we are voting on today makes several important changes to the brownfields law that will result in more contaminated sites being cleaned up and returned to productive use, such as the creation of multipurpose grants, which will allow communities to use grant funds for both assessment and remediation, as well as allow communities to clean up more than one site in a designated area.

The bill also provides liability relief to States and municipalities who voluntarily acquire brownfields property through their authority as a sovereign, which will allow local units of government to address contamination on property they acquire through tax delinquency, bankruptcy, and/or abandonment.

The bill expands grant eligibility for nonprofit organizations and for publicly owned brownfields sites that acquired the property prior to January

11, 2002, which will put more parties into the mix of persons eligible for grant funding, which will result in more sites being assessed and cleaned up.

The legislation increases the limit for remediation grants from \$200,000 to \$500,000. As we learned from witnesses at our hearings, this will result in more brownfields sites being cleaned up because many of the sites that remain to be addressed are more complicated and, therefore, more expensive.

The bill provides for a limited amount of grant funds to be used for administrative costs, which will allow small and rural communities to be able to receive and utilize grant funds, and it carves out grant money to assist Indian Tribes in small, rural, and disadvantaged communities as they work to assess and clean up contaminated properties.

The EPA brownfields program is critical to States and local communities as they address contaminated industrial and commercial properties and return them to productive use. Cleaning up these sites is great for the economy because brownfields grants can be directly leveraged into jobs, additional redevelopment funds, and increased residential and commercial property values.

In fact, the brownfields program, on average, leverages over \$16 in private investment for every Federal dollar spent and leverages 8½ jobs for every \$100,000 of brownfields funds expended on assessment and cleanup.

The brownfields program is a proven results-driven program that has changed the way contaminated property is perceived, addressed, and managed. A visible, national example of the brownfields program at work was the Houston Astros and the Los Angeles Dodgers facing off in game three of the World Series at Minute Maid Park in Houston, Texas. Minute Maid Park sits on a former brownfields site that the city of Houston redeveloped and obviously returned to a very productive reuse, especially for the Astros.

The EPA brownfields program is uniquely positioned to protect the environment and spur the economy. You can tell, from the broad bipartisan support that H.R. 3017 enjoys, the support for the EPA brownfields program is unqualified. The program has strong support from local and State governments, private developers, and all sectors of the economy.

Because brownfields funding is so important to States and local communities across the country, I want to encourage my colleagues on the appropriations committee to fully fund this important and successful program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, November 9, 2017.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

I write concerning H.R. 3017, the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act of 2017. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego action on the bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that foregoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Further, this is conditional on our understanding that mutually agreed upon changes to the legislation will be incorporated into the bill prior to floor consideration. Lastly, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

I would ask that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest as well as the mutually agreed upon changes to be incorporated into the bill be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor, to memorialize our understanding.

I look forward to working with the Committee on Energy and Commerce as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, November 4, 2017.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 3017, Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act of 2017, on which the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure received an additional referral.

I appreciate your committee's willingness to forego action on H.R. 3017 so that this legislation may be brought before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner. I agree that foregoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice your committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within your committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Further, I agree that our mutually agreed upon changes to the legislation will be incorporated into the bill prior to floor consideration. Lastly, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I will support your request for the appropriate appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

I will place a copy of your letter and this response into the Congressional Record dur-

ing consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, EPA's brownfields program has changed the way contaminated property is perceived, addressed, and managed. I was proud to work with the late Republican Congressman Paul Gillmor in creating the brownfields program back in 2002, and I am proud to be here once again today as we bring up a bipartisan reauthorization of this law.

I want to thank our Environment Subcommittee, Chairman SHIMKUS, Ranking Member TONKO, our full committee chairman, Mr. WALDEN, for all their work in getting us to this point today, and, also, my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

By almost any metric, the brownfields program has been a remarkable success. Since the program's inception, more than 27,000 contaminated sites have been assessed or remediated, allowing communities to create new developments.

Removing public health hazards by cleaning up contaminated sites is incredibly important for the surrounding communities. With financial help from the Federal Government, communities can clean up contaminated sites and prepare them for development for parks, commerce, housing, or a number of other uses that can benefit a local community.

The EPA has found that cleaning up underutilized or abandoned brownfields properties reduces health risks, decreases pollution, and reduces storm water runoff. But this is not just a program that provides environmental benefits. It is a job creator that primes the pump for local investment and development. All told, the brownfields program has leveraged over \$45 billion in investments surrounding these sites and almost 130,000 jobs, which is a stunning return on the Federal Government's modest investment in the program.

Simply put, it provides tremendous value to the Federal Government and a boost to the economy in local communities. The brownfields program has been an incredibly important tool for protecting public health and spurring economic growth in New Jersey and throughout the country.

The original authorization for the program expired in 2006, and while Congress has continued to appropriate resources for the program, funding has declined. Last year, there was a question as to whether the President would request any funding for this important program.

So it is important that we reauthorize the brownfields program. I stress the need for continued funding. H.R. 3017 is a bipartisan bill that reauthorizes the program until 2022, at \$200 million annually, and reinstates a \$50 mil-

lion annual authorization for grants to assist States and Native American Tribes. And it makes important reforms to improve the flexibility of the brownfields program: authorizing multipurpose grants; raising the limits for grants per site; and removing some funding caps in current law.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also allows EPA to reserve as much as \$1.5 million in brownfields funding each year to assist small communities, Tribes, and rural or disadvantaged areas. Grants could be used for training, research, and technical assistance. Additionally, H.R. 3017 would require the EPA to consider the potential for renewable energy production when ranking applications for brownfields grants to incentivize green energy projects.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a compromise. I would have liked to include more funding for this important program, but I believe this bill will improve the program and bolster the Federal Government in cleaning up these sites, and I support the bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3017, the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act of 2017, sponsored by our fellow Energy and Commerce Committee member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY). We thank him for his leadership on this.

I especially want to thank JOHN SHIMKUS, the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee, for his leadership in getting this done, along with Mr. PALLONE and Mr. TONKO, who played key roles, along with other members of the committee to bring this legislation to the floor and bring it here with unanimous support from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

What are brownfields? Well, they are vacant, underused, and often contaminated properties that are a blight on local communities across our Nation. The EPA's brownfields program is a successful, results-oriented program, and it provides grants to assess and clean up these polluted areas.

Since the brownfields program's inception, more than 27,000 contaminated sites have been remediated, allowing communities across the country to return them to productive use. Cleaning up brownfields sites increases local tax bases, facilitates job growth and wage increases, promotes the development of new infrastructure, improves and protects the environment—all really good public policy goals.

Over 129,000 jobs have been leveraged because of the brownfields program, and almost 70,000 acres have been made ready for reuse. The brownfields program has leveraged over \$24 billion, a

significant return on the Federal investment in the program. I read somewhere it was a 16-to-1 rate of return based on Federal investment compared to what we get out of the program.

□ 1430

A 2017 study concluded that cleaning up brownfield properties led to a residential property value increase of up to 15 percent within a mile of these brownfield sites. Another study found an estimated \$29 million to \$97 million in additional tax revenues for local governments in a single year after the cleanup, which is two to seven times more than the \$12.4 million the EPA contributed to the cleanup of those brownfields. So, property values go up, local tax revenues go up, communities are improved, and we create jobs with this very important program.

In my home State of Oregon, we have had a very active and effective brownfields program, and we have seen some great success in my own district. The Old Mill District in Bend—which is pictured here; this is the site of an old lumber mill—was one of those sites. It is easy to see—as the debris was here and the mill was crumbling and we lost all of those jobs—it was transformed into this incredible place with great recreation. With the reopening of the Deschutes River, we have movie theaters and restaurants and offices and residential housing all in this complex now, and it is a showplace. It is a gem of Deschutes County.

Bend isn't alone. In The Dalles, where I was born, Google broke ground on an expansion to their data center there on 26 acres of former mill land that was cleaned up under this program. That expansion of the Google data center is a \$600 million investment, expected to create 50 new jobs.

Also, in my hometown of Hood River, the Port of Hood River just finished a brownfields cleanup of another former mill site. That opened up 12 acres of land for future business opportunities in the area.

And in southern Oregon, the city of Grants Pass is in the early stages of working towards a similar goal. They have successfully secured assistance through the brownfields program to begin planning the cleanup and redevelopment of the old Spalding Mill site.

The Energy and Commerce Committee unanimously voted to move this bipartisan legislation out of the committee. We worked closely with our friends and colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to make additional improvements on the way to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the authorization for the brownfields program expired in 2006. It is well past time we do our job as Congress to modernize and reauthorize successful programs like this. At the end of the day, this bipartisan legislation creates jobs, promotes infrastructure and economic development, and cleans

up our communities. It is a winning scenario for everyone involved.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues who put so much time and effort into modernizing this program, and I urge them all to support H.R. 3017 as we pass it into law.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the ranking member of the Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, our ranker, who has done great work on this bill, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today represents what we can accomplish when we work together for the good of our local communities.

My district includes the confluence of the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers. These rivers were at the heart of our Nation's early industrialization. Along the river banks, factories manufactured carpets, collars, leather goods, and many other products.

Many of those manufacturers have since left these mill towns, but the legacy of contaminated land continues, and many of those sites remain vacant. The contamination, or the perception of contamination, makes developers avoid investing in these very important parcels and properties. Assessing and remediating these sites is critical for environmental revitalization and economic redevelopment.

The Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act would improve an already successful EPA program. This legislation would reauthorize EPA's brownfields program, which expired in 2006. This would extend the program through 2022.

Since 2002, with EPA's support, tens of thousands of acres of idle land have been made ready for productive use, increasing nearby property values and helping to preserve greenfields. These properties have been brought back onto local tax rolls, helping to support local economic development. In the process, more than 130,000 jobs have been created and some \$24 billion has been leveraged from this Federal investment.

Local governments are realizing that, through this program, we can turn a liability into a golden opportunity; but, unfortunately, there are many more sites yet to be assessed or remediated.

More than 450,000 brownfields exist across our great country. Many of the easiest, low-hanging fruit sites have already been cleaned up. The more difficult ones will require more funding. In recognition of this, the bill increases the maximum individual grant from \$200,000 to \$500,000, which will enable more complex sites to be remediated.

The bill creates multipurpose grants, enables nonprofits to receive grants, allows a small portion of grants to be used to cover administrative costs, and makes certain publically owned sites eligible for funding. These are impor-

tant improvements to the program, supported by a wide array of stakeholders.

Strengthening EPA's brownfields program will continue to create jobs, remediate contaminated land, and promote sustainable economic development. It is also a key factor in creating aesthetics for neighboring parcels, thereby enhancing the entire regional aspect of certain given regions across our communities. This reauthorization will give communities the resources, the capacity, and, indeed, the flexibility to turn more liabilities into opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of the majority, including Mr. MCKINLEY; Chairman SHIMKUS, who is the Environment Subcommittee chair; and Chairman WALDEN, who is the Energy and Commerce chair; as well as our colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for working with us to produce this bipartisan bill, a golden opportunity for us to come together, work together, and accomplish.

Finally, I want to thank the efforts of our Energy and Commerce ranker, Representative FRANK PALLONE. It was his great work that helped us get here also.

I want to also acknowledge the tremendous work done by staff on both sides of the aisle. In particular, let me please recognize the efforts of Jackie Cohen, Rick Kessler, and Jeff Carroll, along with other members of the Energy and Commerce minority staff who worked so diligently on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), the author of this legislation.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise today in strong support of H.R. 3017, the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act, and I am pleased to be a sponsor of this bipartisan effort along with my colleagues, Chairman WALDEN, especially Chairman SHIMKUS, and Ranking Members Pallone and Tonko for their work. I also want to thank the work of my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee who also were cosponsors of this legislation, Mr. KATKO and Ms. ESTY.

The bill represents a broad, bipartisan compromise that will reauthorize the brownfields program for the first time since 2006. In addition to the reauthorization, the bill makes several key improvements that you have heard about here today that will result in more brownfield sites being cleaned up and returned to productive use.

A little history can explain why this bill was so important to pass.

When America's industrial manufacturing facilities and factories were being constructed, they typically were located on prime property along rivers, railroads, and roads. But, over the years, technologically there were

changes that took place that transformed how our economy operates. It also had to deal with unfair imports coming into America. As a result, many companies failed and the sites became abandoned.

Rusting hulks of former factories and weed-infested sites have become an eyesore and deter investment in downtown and urban areas. Today, these locations could still prove to be valuable in creating jobs, and that is what our prime responsibility is here. We need to improve this negative stigma that these sites pose to communities and restore these brownfields into productive resources.

America has, indeed, been identified as having 450,000 brownfield sites across the country, but only 27,000 have been cleaned up. This reauthorization is long overdue.

One great success story is Pietro Fiorentini, a supplier to the natural gas industry who recently broke ground at a new manufacturing facility in Weirton, West Virginia, that was cleaned up through the brownfields program. Pietro Fiorentini spent 5 years preparing this site because of the level of contamination.

I especially want to give a shout-out to Pat Ford, the executive director of the Business Development Corporation in the northern panhandle. His efforts have been tireless, working to do great things like creating jobs in the First District of West Virginia.

His corporation, the Business Development Corporation, has already received \$2.5 million over the years in brownfields grants and has leveraged those projects into \$75 million in private sector money. It has resulted in over 1,250 new jobs, and another 128 have been preserved.

You heard earlier from Chairman SHIMKUS, talking about the 16-to-1 ratio. Pat Ford's group has a 35-to-1 ratio. For every dollar that we put in for the Federal Government, Pat Ford's group has created \$35 of investment.

In the future, as businesses develop the Appalachian ethane storage hub that is under way now in the Appalachian area, these newly reclaimed properties will allow for even more industries and create more jobs throughout this area.

This bipartisan bill makes very important classifications to CERCLA liability and petroleum sites. It expands eligibility for nonprofit organizations. It, indeed, increases the limit for remediation grants from \$200,000 to \$500,000. It creates the multipurpose grants. But, more importantly, it makes it easier for small, rural, or disadvantaged communities to participate in this program.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, however, to fully fund this vitally important brownfields program. Although \$250 million is authorized, the appropriators have only allocated \$153 million to this program. Con-

sequently, revitalization of these former abandoned sites is delayed, and they remain a stigma, deterring development in our downtown communities.

Overall, this bipartisan bill—and I thank my friends on the other side of the aisle for how we are all working together on this—will make great strides toward achieving the goals of getting more contaminated sites cleaned up, promoting infrastructure, and, importantly, creating jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, we had joint jurisdiction over this legislation, and, for the most part, this is a good product.

I was actually the ranking member on the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee 16 years ago when the initial brownfields legislation passed and later became law. We expected that the targeted reforms and Federal grant funds in the initial law would spur redevelopment of blighted areas and be of great benefit, and we were right. It has a proven record of success, assisting States and communities in redevelopment of abandoned or underutilized properties, leveraging Federal seed money with State, local, and private dollars, and creating jobs.

Now, here is an example.

In 2013, the city of Eugene, Oregon, got a \$680,000 brownfield site assessment grant to improve the environment and spur economic development. The city used this funding for the assessment of 15 specific properties and for the development of a local redevelopment plan.

One of the results of this work is that the Ninkasi Brewery—as co-chair of the House Craft Brewers Caucus, I had to bring beer into the discussion—now sits on the site of a former Eugene brownfield. In a decade, they have 100 employees, and it is sold right here in Washington, D.C., today.

This year, Eugene was selected for an additional \$500,000 in brownfield site assessments. I am hoping that they can replicate the success they had with their earlier grant from the Federal Government.

I am pleased that we are considering this bill to extend the program through 2022. It will increase the funding limit from \$200 to \$500 per grant, authorize EPA to award multipurpose brownfields grants for projects consisting of multiple elements, and make nonprofit entities eligible for mediation assessment grants under the program. It will also allow local governments to apply for site assessment grants for properties acquired prior to the creation of the program.

□ 1445

Unfortunately, it falls short in two areas. The final version of this legisla-

tion that passed committee contained a provision ensuring that State and local governments that acquire brownfields properties continue to take steps to protect people from coming into contact with contamination on the property. In fact, I have a letter here from the Conference of Mayors where they say they would agree if there were two clauses: that they did not cause or contribute to the contamination and exercises due care with regard to any known contamination at the site.

Unfortunately, this bill strikes out the words “due care,” and with the liability exemption, there is the possibility that properties would be acquired that are dangerous for entry that wouldn't be properly fenced or secured because of removing the “due care.” I don't know why that had to come out, since the Conference of Mayors had supported it.

Second, nearly every stakeholder that testified before our committee stated that the current level of funding for the program is well below need, so we should be increasing the authorized and appropriated levels. Again, unfortunately, the bill under consideration today only reauthorizes flat funding levels for the program, which is, I think, a missed opportunity.

I hope, as we move forward and resolve any differences with the Senate, that we can make improvements in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the chairman, the ranking member, as well as committee staff for all of their hard work bringing this bipartisan bill to the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, the EPA's brownfields program is an important grant program for the State of Michigan and, more specifically, the district I represent, Michigan's Seventh District.

Because of Michigan's rich manufacturing history, there are a number of former industrial sites that are ripe for revitalization. These sites can range from large industrial manufacturing sites to local corner gas stations.

This program provides communities the chance to take abandoned and vacant sites and once again turn them into economic assets, all the while cleaning up our beautiful environment.

Just this summer, the EPA announced that the historic former Tecumseh Products site in Tecumseh, Michigan, received a \$500,000 grant to revitalize this 53-acre industrial site. This \$500,000 grant will go towards cleaning up the former manufacturing facility site and create more jobs in the process.

In Monroe, the brownfields program played a key role in restoring land for the River Raisin National Battlefield Park, which is one of the leading historic attractions in our area, and one

that I am delighted to say I was involved with former Congressman John Dingell in making an impact for this great district.

The positive impact for these communities and many others is invaluable. Revitalizing these blighted areas encourages economic redevelopment, injects new tax revenue into our local economy, and assists local governments with the support they need to address these projects.

H.R. 3017 reauthorizes the vital brownfields program so that more positive work can be done in Michigan and in every one of our districts. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3017, the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act of 2017.

The bill before us today is a good bipartisan, compromise bill that will reauthorize \$250 million in funding for the brownfields program under the Environmental Protection Agency for each fiscal year through 2021.

The EPA's brownfields program has a long history of empowering States, local communities, and other stakeholders to work together to prevent contaminated sites from endangering public health and the environment.

Brownfields grants continue to serve as the foundation of the EPA's brownfields program. These grants support revitalization efforts by funding environmental assessments, cleanup, and job training activities nationwide.

Additionally, this bill makes a number of overall improvements to the law that will strengthen brownfields remediation into the future.

In 2013, the Downriver Community Conference in my district received a brownfields funding grant to clear out asbestos and other hazardous materials from a hangar at the Willow Run Airport. Once the original home of Rosie the Riveters during World War II, today the site of the Arsenal of Democracy is now the home of the American Center for Mobility, a national DOT proving ground for the testing and validation of connected and automated vehicles, autonomous vehicles.

There are many success stories like this one and all across the country that would not have been possible without brownfields grant funding. This matters.

Mr. Speaker, I thank every member of the Energy and Commerce Committee for working across the aisle to find a bipartisan way forward on reauthorization. We need to do more of this.

This program has proved its merits again and again and has historically had strong bipartisan support. It is my sincere hope this will carry over to today's vote and will continue through the appropriations process.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New

Jersey (Mr. LANCE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the great work of the Energy and Commerce Committee on the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SHIMKUS for leading another environmental victory to the House floor.

The brownfields program has worked and it must be reauthorized. Over 59,000 sites nationwide and 419 in New Jersey have been transformed by remediation and redevelopment, freeing our land and water of harmful chemicals and other hazards. This is a tremendous win for environmental protection, economic development, and for communities that have struggled with contaminated sites.

In the district I serve, facilities in Dover, East Amwell, Phillipsburg, Roxbury, and Somerville are slated for revitalization.

This public-private partnership has been a winning formula, as the brownfields program has already prompted \$22 billion in private investment across this Nation, a major return on a minimal, though important, Federal investment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 16½ minutes. The gentleman from Illinois has 13½ minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the brownfields program has been a notable success in our Nation's history, and I want to applaud all of the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee as well as the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for supporting this legislation.

The brownfields program has helped to transform and clean up countless abandoned, idled, or potentially contaminated commercial and industrial sites all across the United States. These once blighted areas within our communities are now valuable tracts of land thanks to the brownfields program.

As a Congresswoman from north Texas, I have seen firsthand the benefits that brownfields redevelopment brings to a community. A 72-acre site in my district now known as Victory Park was transformed by the brownfields program from an industrial wasteland populated by an old paint factory and an abandoned packing house. Since then, and thanks in large part to the brownfields program, this same plot is now home to the American Airlines Center and other retail and

commercial space and high-level housing.

This is just one example in my congressional district and across the country of how successful we can be in converting depressed, decaying areas into vibrant economic and cultural centers that can increase employment and productivity in a region, placing sites on the tax roll rather than the tax dole.

This is why I stand together with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 3017.

The bill will take the important step to reauthorize brownfields approval through 2022. While the bill represents a flat reauthorization, it makes crucial changes to the program that will improve the way States, cities, counties, and other stakeholders are able to utilize brownfields sites.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will support this legislation.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), a cosponsor of the legislation and also a major leader on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, representing central New York, the issue of blighted properties and contaminated land that remain from previous industrial hubs is all too familiar to me.

The brownfields program has been pivotal in the redevelopment and reuse of previously uninhabitable and unusable properties throughout my district.

Earlier this year, I worked with Congresswoman ESTY to advance brownfields reauthorization legislation through the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I am proud to now see this bipartisan comprehensive bill advancing through the House.

This measure contains many of the important reforms authored by Representative ESTY and myself, including language clarifying liability for local governments and lease holders, and expanding eligibility to assessments and remediation grants.

These provisions are intended to increase the effectiveness of brownfields grants and will lead to faster cleanups.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman ESTY, Chairman SHUSTER of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, his staff, and Representative MCKINLEY for working to advance this important legislation to preserve and enhance this critical program.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PALLONE and Mr. SHIMKUS for their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of the Environmental Protection Agency's brownfields program, H.R. 3017, a highly successful program by all accounts.

In the past two Congresses, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment has evaluated the program

in multiple hearings. What we have learned each time is that the program continues operating, as it has since its creation, very efficiently and successfully.

Data provided by the EPA shows that, since its inception, the brownfields program has leveraged more than 122,800 jobs and over \$23.6 billion in cleanup and redevelopment funding. For every dollar of brownfields funding—Federal funding—more than 16 other public and private dollars are leveraged on a national level, and more than eight jobs are leveraged for every \$100,000 of EPA brownfields funds expended.

It is undeniable that this program is working as it should and that communities across the Nation are benefiting from the investment of the Federal dollars in this program.

The changes made to the program in this bill before the House today will improve it and increase the flexibility with which communities will be able to utilize the program.

Although I support the bill, I am puzzled by this body's reluctance to increase the funding for a very successful program for the brownfields. This program's successes have been continually hindered by insufficient funds, as you have heard from other speakers.

By the EPA's own estimates, over the past 5 years, funding deficiencies have caused 1,676 viable proposals to go unfunded. These sites are not only sitting idle and unproductive, but we are missing out on the return on the investment that these sites could realize. In fact, had these proposals received funding, it is estimated those grants would have leveraged approximately 54,680 jobs and over \$10.3 billion in public and private financing.

This begs the question: Why aren't we investing more in the redevelopment of brownfields space?

If this is the success rate of an underfunded program, imagine the potential economic impact and potential for job creation that could come from fully funding the program.

Nevertheless, the program received bipartisan support, and I am pleased to support the legislation to reauthorize the program and improve its success.

I also plan to continue working on the issue of ensuring that local governments maintain their existing obligation to exercise care in preventing potential exposure of our citizens to hazardous substances found on brownfields sites.

□ 1500

In reconciling the differences between H.R. 3017 and H.R. 1758—the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's reported brownfields reauthorization bill—a provision in H.R. 1758 requiring communities to maintain an appropriate level of care in association with the liability protections was dropped from the bill.

I will continue to push for the restoration of this protection, and will

continue to move through Congress. Again, I support the program.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), who is a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3017, the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act of 2017.

There is bipartisan support for the EPA program that proves when the Federal-State partnership operates as intended, work gets done.

Brownfields cleanup and redevelopment benefits the environment, the community, and the local economy. This legislation reauthorizes the brownfields program and expands eligibility for nonprofit organizations to receive grants.

In my home State of Ohio, the brownfields program has leveraged over \$1 billion for property revitalization. In my district specifically, brownfields funding was used to restore a former industrial manufacturing site, now used as Chesapeake Energy Company's office complex.

I thank the sponsors for introducing this bill and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act of 2017.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Congressman MCKINLEY and Congressman PALLONE, for their bipartisan work to advance a brownfields reauthorization bill to the floor today.

I also want to thank my friend and colleague, Congressman KATKO, for his partnership in working with me to drive the momentum behind the brownfields remediation authorization in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to pass a bill that is a win-win for our cities and towns all across America. The bill before us today increases the funding and makes important changes to the EPA's brownfields program, changes that are 15 years in the making.

Since 2002, the EPA's brownfields program has been an engine for job creation and economic growth in every single congressional district across this country. We have cleaned up local eyesores and contaminated sites, putting these properties back onto the tax rolls. That is good for the economy and it is good for the environment.

In essence, brownfields grants help us do the ultimate recycling, the recycling of land. This bill makes important changes to make the brownfields program work even better. It allows grants to be used for assessments. It allows grants to be used by nonprofits, and for multipurpose grants, and it in-

creases the grant limits from \$200,000 to \$500,000 per project.

In Waterbury, Connecticut, they will now be able to use grants previously that they could not use to put valuable land back into productive use.

In the cities of New Britain and Meriden, they will now be able to use Federal funding for multipurpose grants. Previously they have had to rely on State and local money to do these important transformative projects in our former industrial powerhouses across the northeast.

My district alone has 66 EPA-identified brownfields sites. And with over 450,000 remaining brownfields sites across the country, the need for more brownfields funding and for greater flexibility is manifest and important to every Member of this Chamber.

For every acre of brownfields that is redeveloped, approximately 10 jobs are created. Let me repeat that: 10 jobs.

Our voters send us here to get things done. They want us to make our towns more beautiful and safer, and they want us to create jobs, and this bill does both. So I am very proud of the bipartisan work and dual committee work to bring this important bill to the floor after 15 years.

It is an opportunity for us to show to the American people that bipartisan work and committees work when we are allowed to do our work together. So, again, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both committees for their wonderful work here today. It is a win for America.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO), a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

(Mr. FASO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SHIMKUS for his leadership in this regard. I thank the Speaker and my colleagues for the opportunity to speak in support of H.R. 3017, the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, my district has numerous former industrial sites that have benefited directly from brownfields grant funding.

Shortly after the program was authorized, the EPA selected the City of Oneonta as a recipient of a \$200,000 brownfields assessment grant to prepare reuse plans for a 100-acre heavy industrial area. This modest assessment grant helped accelerate ongoing efforts to support site enhancement by providing essential financial support to the city.

Similarly, Montgomery County has been able to utilize designations to assist it in the redevelopment of the former Beech-Nut manufacturing facility in the Village of Canajoharie.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my full support for this bipartisan legislation because

it works to better the lives of families and communities throughout my district and across America. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this critical legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to enter into a colloquy.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are voting on today makes several important changes to the brownfields law that will result in more contaminated sites being cleaned up.

The changes we are making also bring more parties into the process by clarifying their eligibility to receive funding under the brownfields program, including making nonprofit entities eligible to receive all forms of brownfields funding.

Unfortunately, the Environmental Protection Agency provided us technical assistance a week ago, telling us that the definition we used for how to delineate which nonprofit organizations should be included was too limited, and would exclude a number of important organizations that the EPA currently provides funding to through the brownfields program, including the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials, commonly known as ASTSWMO, and other entities organized under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code that are involved in the cleanup of brownfields sites around the country.

We need to address this issue as this process moves forward. We need to figure out how to ensure that these organizations do not lose the funding that they rely on to make significant contributions to the brownfields program.

Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. PALLONE. Yes. And I thank the gentleman for raising this drafting issue. The bill's provisions on nonprofit entities were meant to reflect the EPA's current practice. It now appears that we have inadvertently excluded some organizations that receive grants under that current practice.

It is unfortunate that the technical assistance bringing this issue to our attention was provided so late in the process, but I hope we can work together to ensure that the EPA is providing testimony and technical assistance in a much more timely fashion moving forward.

So I want to thank the gentleman for working with Democrats to develop this legislation, which will provide significant environmental and public health benefits. I believe we can continue to work together as we move this bill into law to address this drafting issue.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank the gentleman for his courtesies.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this very important bill.

Mr. Speaker, Maine is vacationland. We have a population in Maine of only 1.3 million people, but every year we have about 40 million visitors to our great State.

We have thousands of sparkling, clean lakes and ponds, hundreds of miles of swift-running rivers, and we have 3,600 miles of stunningly beautiful coastline. I have never, ever, met anybody who has vacationed in Maine who did not leave without a smile. It is just a great place to live and bring up kids.

Now, the tourist industry employs about 150,000 people directly in the State of Maine, and it is critical that we have a pristine environment in Maine to further this industry.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 40 years, sadly, most of our paper mills, our textile mills, and our shoe factories in the great State of Maine have closed and, in many cases, they have left behind contaminated brownfields contaminated with heavy metals and chemicals.

Now, those of us who have been blessed with children know how critically important their health is. My mother is 89 and had a great career as a nurse, and we grew up in our house with taking care of others. I raised my son as a single parent, taking care of my son. I understand how much easier it is to stay healthy and be healthy if you are in a clean environment.

Mr. Speaker, that is why H.R. 3017 is so important. It makes sure that we provide funding to clean up polluted contaminated brownfields industrial sites.

Mr. Speaker, since 1994, hundreds of brownfields across this great country have been cleaned up. When they are cleaned up, they are often repurposed into athletic fields, schools, and hospitals. This, at the same time, strengthens our local communities because they are put back, in many cases, on the property tax rolls, if they are a private sector development.

In the town of Millinocket, right smack in the middle of my district, Miller's Department Store is an old building, decaying and full of mold, and it is being benefited from a grant from this brownfields program.

The T.W. Dick property in Gardiner, in central Maine, used to be a steel fabricator. It is now contaminated with heavy metals and is experiencing a new life because of this program.

Mr. Speaker, cleaning up our environment to help our kids stay safe and healthy should not ever be a partisan issue. This is as bipartisan as you could possibly find. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am encouraging Republicans and Democrats alike to vote "yes" on H.R. 3017. Let's do something common sense, provide the funding to clean up these brownfields sites and repurpose this land for the betterment of our families.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, so I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by talking about how important this program has been to our Nation and, in particular, to my home State, since it was created back in 2002.

New Jersey has too many of these types of contaminated sites, and we need Federal help to clean them up and redevelop them.

For example, a former Dupont property on the waterfront in Carteret is being redeveloped to be a ferry terminal to carry commuters to New York City. That site is a great example of how a redeveloped brownfields site can be beneficial for the community.

Asbury Park, another town in my district, received two substantial Federal brownfields grants last year. One of those grants is being used to assess eight contaminated sites and prepare two cleanup plans. The other grant is going to assessing and redeveloping sites around the train station and the downtown area that were contaminated with petroleum.

Just this week, I visited another brownfields site being redeveloped in my district, the Woodbridge Waterfront Park. When completed, the waterfront park will include approximately 30 acres of restored wetlands, walking trails, a boardwalk overlooking the wetlands, and a viewing platform on the Raritan River. So Federal funds through the brownfields program help make these projects happen.

The brownfields program is proof that having a strong economy and protecting the environment is not an either/or issue. We can have both.

I am pleased to support this bipartisan bill. I would urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

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

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

I am just going to sum up, too, with thanking my ranking member of the full committee, Mr. PALLONE; obviously, my ranking member on the subcommittee, Mr. TONKO; the associated staffs on both that had been mentioned numerous times. They did a lot of work in this process. It was good to get to know the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee a little bit better, and we look forward to working with them more.

□ 1515

Mr. PALLONE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHIMKUS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I forgot to thank some of the staff who worked so hard on this on my side of the aisle: Jaqueline Cohen, who is sitting here; Rick Kessler; Tuley Wright; Mary Martin; and I know there were others.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield the time to the gentleman. They tell me what to do sometimes, also, even on that side of the

aisle; so, happy to yield. I just want to thank them.

Mr. Speaker, everybody has examples of brownfields in their district throughout the State. They are all pretty good stories about returning them to productive use.

I have one produced by the EPA from Danville, Illinois. There are eight sites. We can go through them.

The point is, here is a successful program that we have authorized. Our appropriators helped appropriate money that really leverages a little bit of Federal dollars with private or local community dollars to bring these locations back to productive use. It is a good effort.

Mr. Speaker, we have got other things on the horizon to work together on. I enjoyed the opportunity to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, I ask them to vote yes on the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3017, the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act.

This legislation will strengthen the Brownfields Program, an important program created by Congress and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in 2002 that assists communities with the cleanup of brownfields sites and encourages economic redevelopment.

The EPA has estimated that there are 450,000 brownfield sites nationwide. Through the lifetime of the program, nearly 64,000 acres have been revitalized. Every federal dollar spent on rehabilitating brownfields leverages over \$16 on average. To date, the Brownfields Program has leveraged nearly \$24 billion and created over 124,000 jobs across the United States.

Houston is home to one of the country's best known brownfields success stories, Minute Maid Park, home of the World Series Champion Houston Astros. Minute Maid Park was built on a former 38-acre brownfield site in Downtown Houston.

Our district, which is home to dozens of abandoned and former industrial sites in need of environmental cleanup and redevelopment, needs to see the expansion of the Brownfields Program so we can have more success stories like Minute Maid Park.

I hope that appropriators will fully fund the Brownfields Program at the authorized levels set in this bill, including \$200 million annually for grants to assess and clean up brownfields properties and \$50 million annually for grants to assist states and Indian tribes establish and enhance their own cleanup programs. We have seen funding for Brownfields drop steadily in recent years, which has impacted local communities' ability to assess and clean up sites in Texas and around the country.

This legislation received strong bipartisan support in the Energy and Commerce Committee and passed by voice vote.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me and vote in support of the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 228. An act to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 245. An act to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

S. 254. An act to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.

S. 302. An act to enhance tribal road safety, and for other purposes.

S. 343. An act to repeal obsolete laws relating to Indians.

S. 669. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 772. An act to amend the PROJECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants.

S. 825. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 1285. An act to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, the Klamath Tribes, and the Burns Paiute Tribes to lease or transfer certain lands.

The message also announced that pursuant to provisions of Public Law 115-77, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individuals to the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission:

Kay Cole James of Virginia.
Star Parker of California.

ENSURING A QUALIFIED CIVIL SERVICE ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4182.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 635 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. 4182.

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

□ 1518

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. 4182) to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify probationary periods with respect to positions within the competitive service and the Senior Executive Service, 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.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. Chairman, highly skilled Federal employees are essential to a government that serves its citizens. Skilled Federal workers ensure that functions of government, from delivering mail to protecting the homeland, are carried out successfully.

Federal jobs and the skills required to perform them vary significantly across government. Some employees review patents, some work in human resources, and others work in law enforcement.

While the jobs, skills, and training required may be different from job to job, the expectation that the Federal Government hires qualified candidates is universal.

One tool agencies and managers have to ensure a qualified workforce is the probationary period—a period of time used to evaluate whether a new hire

can effectively perform the duties of the position.

Under current law, most new hires are required to complete a probationary period of 1 year before receiving full employment status. Most new employees complete the probationary period and are hired as permanent employees.

New employees who fail to demonstrate that they are a good fit for the position, however, are transitioned out of government during the probationary period, but the current 1-year trial period is not sufficient for complex Federal occupations. Potential employees deserve ample time to learn about the job and demonstrate they are able to perform all critical aspects of a Federal position, and supervisors deserve ample time to evaluate new hires.

What is a manager supposed to do in this case? Does the supervisor take a gamble and offer permanent status to an untested employee or risk missing out on a potentially skilled employee? This is a real dilemma. Supervisors throughout the Federal workforce have described this exact scenario in their advocacy for this bill.

According to the Government Managers Coalition, managers tend to err on the side of releasing borderline employees in cases like this, and it can be a very frustrating decision for them to make. They have already devoted a significant amount of time and resources into training the new hire.

However, managers would rather not risk hiring an employee who is on the fence at the end of a probationary period. This is because a manager is pretty much stuck with an employee after the probationary period. It is difficult to remove a permanent employee for poor performance or misconduct.

According to the Government Accountability Office, the procedural hurdles to removing a permanent employee can take from 6 months to 1 year. The evidence is clear, the probationary period needs to be extended.

In 2015, the GAO reported that chief human capital officers throughout the Federal Government would benefit from an extension of the probationary period, especially in occupations which are complex or difficult to assess. Federal manager groups have been asking for a longer probationary period for years.

In congressional testimony earlier this year, the national president of the Federal Managers Association, Renee Johnson said: "FMA advocates extending the probationary period. This would benefit both the government and employees by allowing supervisors to make decisions based on the employees' performance as fully trained employees—not just guessing at how they will perform after the training is completed."

The Government Managers Coalition, a group of five organizations that represent the interests of over 200,000 supervisors, managers, and executives

serving throughout the Federal Government, supports an extension of the probationary period.

I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the Government Managers Coalition signed by the heads of the FAA Managers Association, Federal Managers Association, Professional Managers Association, National Council of Social Security Management Associations, and Senior Executives Association; and a letter from the Professional Managers Association.

GOVERNMENT MANAGERS COALITION,

November 29, 2017.

UNITED STATES CONGRESS,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the Government Managers Coalition (GMC), which is comprised of five major federal sector professional associations collectively representing the interests of over 200,000 supervisors, managers, and executives serving throughout the federal government.

Our coalition is supportive of H.R. 4182, the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017 (the EQUALS Act), introduced by Representative James Comer. We appreciate Rep. Comer's efforts to take the lead on this important legislation and the consideration earlier this month by the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. The GMC has advocated for an extended probationary period for over a decade. We encourage you to support the measure when it comes to the floor later this week.

The EQUALS Act would grant agencies the authority to extend the probationary period for competitive service appointments and supervisors. In addition, this legislation would align appointments under competitive and senior executive service with the two-year trial period served under excepted service appointments, bringing consistency to hiring throughout government.

Extension of the probationary period is supported by a 2015 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, GAO-15-191. Chief Human Capital Officers (CHCO) commented to GAO that often supervisors within federal departments and agencies are not given sufficient time to accurately review performance before the probationary period is complete. The CHCO recommended an extension of the probationary period to the GAO in order to accurately assess an employee's abilities in the federal workforce. In addition, Congress has already approved a two-year probationary period for employees at the Department of Defense, as part of the Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), P.L. 114-92.

The GMC's mission is to promote good government initiatives that foster effectiveness and efficiency throughout the federal government. We believe that this legislation will allow employees sufficient time on the job to demonstrate their abilities as well as allow for proper assessment. The measure will also ensure that supervisors have the opportunity and authority to fulfill their performance management responsibilities that may not be feasible under the current one-year probationary period.

The current one-year probationary period is often insufficient to assess an employee's performance in more technical and complex jobs, of which there are many in the federal government, and may in fact place an employee at risk of termination before having had the opportunity to effectively demonstrate their abilities. The reality is that many technical jobs require agency classroom training, mentoring and on-the-job training for employees to become proficient. Often, the supervisor does not see the em-

ployee during those times, and is unable to observe the employee's performance. In front-line public service roles, such as with the Social Security Administration (SSA) or the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), employees must not only learn material, but also need to be able to effectively interact with citizens. The EQUALS Act would ensure that employees are provided with the opportunity to not only receive training, but also to effectively demonstrate their abilities. Extending the probationary period will in no way penalize an employee who is performing well and progressing in their training and responsibilities.

The GMC would appreciate your support of this legislation. In light of ongoing agency reorganization efforts, it is now more important than ever to ensure federal managers making personnel decisions have a comprehensive toolset available that represents both flexibility for agencies and fairness for affected federal employees. We look forward to passage of this legislation, as well as other commonsense federal workforce reform bills resulting in an improved federal government that can better serve the American public. Should you require additional information or want to discuss this issue further, please contact Rachel A. Emmons with the National Council of Social Security Management Associations (NCSSMA).

Sincerely,

ANDY TAYLOR,
President, FAA Man-
agers Association.

RENEE M. JOHNSON,
President, Federal
Managers Associa-
tion.

THOMAS R. BURGER,
Executive Director,
Professional Man-
agers Association.

CHRISTOPHER DETZLER,
President, National
Council of Social Se-
curity, Management
Association.

BILL VALDEZ,
President, Senior Ex-
ecutives Association.

PROFESSIONAL MANAGERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, November 29, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Professional Managers Association (PMA) represents the interests of professional managers, management officials, and non-bargaining unit employees in the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and other federal agencies. On behalf of PMA's members, I write in support of H.R. 4182, the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017 (the EQUALS Act), introduced by Representative James Comer, and to offer a specific example—Revenue Agents at the IRS—for an example of a federal job that would benefit from an extended probationary period. PMA also signed onto a letter with our colleagues with the Government Managers Coalition (GMC) expressing our collective support for the EQUALS Act.

Following their hiring, IRS Revenue Agents go through an extensive training process that includes classes in tax law and procedures. They begin by learning the basics and the laws that deal with individuals, starting with several weeks of classroom training before moving on to work on actual cases in taxpayer service. After that, they move onto Schedule Cs and Partnerships, following the same process, but with less time spent in the classroom. They then return to the field or office for on-the-job training with those types of cases. Once they have completed this portion of training, they are assigned to an office where they receive an inventory of cases to work on. At this time, they are evaluated on each case they close.

All of this is just within the first year of training. In year two—if they are lucky—the agent will be sent to classes for small and then large corporations. Once the classroom training is completed, they are assigned more training cases. Again, each case closed is rated and evaluated based on all aspects: tax law interpretation, case write up, meet and deal qualities, etc.

There should also be managerial mentoring completed during this training process. The manager is meant to go on visits to observe how the agent deals with the taxpayer and how they are doing with regards to case write-ups. Yet, while managers are intended to be involved throughout the training process, many are spread extremely thin and may be forced to make a decision not in the best interest of the government or the agent. A longer probationary period would give managers more time to make an accurate decision on whether or not an individual is able to perform the necessary duties of an efficient, effective agent.

Two years of training is a very costly process, but it is costlier to make a hasty decision and keep an employee that would not be an asset to the organization or would be unable to best serve the public. I urge Members to support the EQUALS Act.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. BURGER,
Executive Director.

Mr. COMER. In the letter, the coalition members write that they have “advocated for an extended probationary period for over a decade,” and that this legislation will allow employees sufficient time on the job to demonstrate their abilities as well as allow for proper assessment.

The individuals they represent see the difficulties associated with the current system in their day-to-day lives. They understand the problems associated with the arbitrary nature of the current 1-year probationary period.

The EQUALS Act addresses these problems and moves toward a system better suited for the modern workforce. The bill will extend the probationary period for new hires in the competitive service and initial appointments for managers to 2 years after the completion of formal training or licensure.

The concept of a 2-year probationary period is not new. Congress extended the probationary period for new hires at the Department of Defense to 2 years in 2015. This bill brings the rest of the government in line with the Department of Defense standards. The EQUALS Act also recognizes the variety of positions and training requirements throughout the Federal Government. The EQUALS Act requires the 2-year period to begin upon the conclusion of the formal training or licensure process.

This is important, because under current law, time spent in training counts against the probationary period. This means that a Federal job with long training, by the time a probationary employee completes the training, the supervisor often has little or no time to evaluate the employee’s performance.

For example, training for new hires at the Internal Revenue Service takes 1 year. By the time a new IRS employee

completes training, the manager has to make a decision whether to keep the employee without having seen the employee do the job.

As Ms. Johnson testified before Congress: “New employees must often master broad and complex policies and procedures to meet their agencies’ missions, necessitating several months of formal training followed by long periods of on-the-job instruction. In occupations where training takes substantial time, supervisors may only have a few months of work to judge employees’ performance.”

According to data from the Office of Personnel Management, most formal training programs last less than 1 month. For those positions, the inclusion of formal training in the probationary period does not do any harm.

However, for those positions that have long training periods, the EQUALS Act will make a big difference. The EQUALS Act also helps ensure managers are doing their jobs. Under the bill, agencies must notify supervisors prior to the completion of a probationary period so that the supervisor is reminded to make a decision about a probationary employee.

The bill also requires agencies to certify that an employee has successfully completed a probationary period and to provide justification for that decision.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to make sure we are clear about what the EQUALS Act does and does not do. The EQUALS Act does not remove or change any due process rights for probationary period employees. Probationary employees will still have due process protections. Probationary employees have access to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Merit Systems Protection Board, and the Office of Special Counsel. Each of those offices are empowered to hear appeals from probationary employees, and that will not change when H.R. 4182 becomes law.

This bill is a much-needed fix to the Federal hiring process. It will allow the Federal Government to select the best and brightest civil servants to serve the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4182, the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act. This bill potentially weakens the Federal civil service by increasing the probationary period for career civil servants and those in the Senior Executive Service from 1 year to 2 years.

I might add, almost no private sector company I know of would have a 2-year probationary period because they know it would make it hard to recruit talented employees.

Unlike what has just been said in terms of protections that remain in place, during the probationary period,

Federal employees have very little due process or appeal rights if disciplinary action is taken against them, and the action we would take today would be to extend those diluted rights instead of providing them with robust rights of every civil servant beyond the probationary period. They can be fired without notice. They have limited rights to an attorney or representative, and they generally may not appeal their removal.

Due process protections are critical to ensuring the integrity of the Federal civil service. In fact, that is the very heart of having a professional civil service.

These protections help prevent the politicalization of the workforce and protect whistleblowers from retaliation, which our committee, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, has passionately documented as a very real danger in the past.

The Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act is a solution in search of a problem. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee has not held one single hearing to determine whether extending the probationary period an additional year for every single Federal job in the competitive and Senior Executive Service is something that agencies need or want to help them better manage their workforce. Not a single hearing, and this would have a profound impact on every Federal agency.

□ 1530

In February of 2016, the Government Accountability Office issued a report which my friend from Kentucky cited at the request of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. The request asked GAO to examine the rules and trends relating to the review and dismissal of employees for poor performance. Now supporters of this bill are using this report as a basis for extending the probationary periods of Federal civil service employees; however, nothing in this report calls for doing that. In fact, the title of the report is “Improved Supervision and Better Use of Probationary Periods Are Needed to Address Substandard Employee Performance.” The focus ought to be, the GAO says, on improving the supervision of the probationary period we have in place.

In conducting its study, GAO found that supervisors do not always have the skills necessary to do that and help address employee performance issues during the probationary period. GAO also found that supervisors sometimes do not even use the probationary period to make performance-related decisions about an employee’s ability to do their job and may not always know when the probationary period even ends.

The report’s recommendations were mainly focused on ensuring qualified supervisors have the training and skills they need to deal with poor performers

and making better use of the existing probation period for all new employees.

Instead of focusing on addressing the gaps identified by GAO and encouraging agencies to implement the recommendations made in that report, Congress is now attacking Federal employees and the merit-based system.

I am especially concerned about the bill's impact on recruiting the workforce of the future. Currently, 40 percent of the current Federal workforce is either eligible for retirement or soon will be—40 percent. Federal agencies need to be able to recruit their replacements and get the requisite skill sets we need for these challenging jobs, just like the private sector is challenged with that.

Extending the probationary period to 2 years, governmentwide, creates a climate of more uncertainty, less protection, and diminishes, clearly, the attraction of Federal service for many people, especially those whom we want to be attracted to the civil service, especially millennials.

Some of my colleagues have referenced the 2-year probationary period for Department of Defense civilian employees enacted in the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act of last fiscal year. They argue that it should serve as precedent for the rest of the Federal Government.

There are a few things I need to point out about that. First, the Department of Defense did not request an extension of the probationary period or even indicate a need for it. Second, now that the 2-year probationary period for civilian defense employees has been enacted, the Department isn't even making use of this new authority.

According to the former Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Peter Levine, who testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in March of this year on civilian personnel reform, "the Department has done little to take advantage of that legislation."

Mr. Levine also warned that changing the law to address a small number of problem employees could hurt recruitment and retention and worker productivity. He stated: "If legislation that is intended to address a problem with 1 percent of the workforce is perceived as threatening and hostile by the other 99 percent, it may undermine morale and reduce the Department's ability to attract and retain the capable employees that it needs. The civilian workforce will not become more productive if problems with a small number of poor performers is addressed with measures that are perceived as a declaration of war on all employees."

In closing, 2 weeks ago, Congress passed legislation that would pave the way toward evidence-based policymaking, and we all supported that. For the sake of consistency, if nothing else, ought we not see the evidence of whether lengthening the probationary period is materially different and what impacts, both positive and negative, it

would have for Federal agencies and employees?

Absent such evidence and careful study, I certainly am not willing to take the risk that this bill will not do more harm to both agencies' ability to recruit and retain qualified employees and that it would not be used to arbitrarily punish hardworking Federal employees.

However, if the GAO studies the impact of this policy at DOD and finds that this new policy has been wonderful for morale and has indeed improved employee performance and helps employee recruitment, then sign me up. But I do think we ought to rely on data and hearings before the requisite committee when making such a major change to how we manage our Federal workforce.

I plan on offering an amendment, Mr. Chairman, that would arm us with the information we need to make an evidence-based decision regarding an extension of the probationary period of the Federal workforce, which is what we ought to be doing before consideration of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD statements in opposition or expressing deep concern about this legislation from the American Federation of Government Employees; the International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers; the National Treasury Employees Union; and a group of organizations, including the Government Accountability Project, the Liberty Coalition, the Project on Government Oversight, Public Citizen, and Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, November 28, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE), which represents approximately 700,000 federal and District of Columbia employees, in more than 70 agencies across the nation, I strongly urge you to oppose H.R. 4182, the "Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017," introduced by Representative James Comer (R-KY) when it comes to the floor this week. If enacted, this legislation would arbitrarily extend the probation period for a minimum of two years for newly hired federal employees. AFGE opposes this legislation as it does not address any issues surrounding employee performance evaluation or management's ability to properly evaluate employees during the probation period. Instead, all it will do is penalize federal workers and weaken their due process rights.

The extension of probation periods for competitive service federal employees from one year to two years is unnecessary and damaging to due process and the merit system. Candidates for federal jobs are put through an extensive selection process prior to being hired and one year is sufficient time for a competent manager to determine if a new employee has the ability to accomplish the duties for which he or she was hired.

Specifically, H.R. 4182 would extend the probation period to a minimum of two years after completion of a "formal training" program or after the date on which a required license is granted. Such a change could leave employees in probation limbo for many years. For example, government agencies re-

quire initial training for prolonged periods of time that could result in employees serving three to five year probation periods, or longer. Employees should not be subject to an almost perpetual state of probation because of comprehensive agency training, certification or licensing programs.

Additionally, extending the probation period reduces the due process rights of employees. While on probation, employees have few civil service protections and almost no appeal rights in the event of an adverse action. Civil service protections and the merit system exist to protect the government from politicization. Without these rights, employees on probation will have little to no protection against discrimination and employer retaliation and more exposure to termination not based on cause, but rather arbitrary and unjust reasons.

Extending the probation period does not solve any problems regarding poor performance. Supervisors should be responsible and held accountable for identifying and addressing issues of poor performance of new employees quickly and efficiently. Supervisors need better training to manage new employees. Extending the probation period does nothing to better train supervisors nor does it provide any accountability for supervisors to effectively manage new employees.

Please Vote NO on H.R. 4182, "Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017."

Sincerely,

THOMAS S. KAHN,
Director, Legislative Affairs.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PRO-
FESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGI-
NEERS, AFL-CIO & CLC,

Washington, DC, November 27, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As behalf of the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), representing upwards of 90,000 workers, including tens of thousands of federal employees, I am writing regarding H.R. 4182, the so-called Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017. This bill has been scheduled for full house consideration this week and IFPTE urges you to oppose it.

H.R. 4182 aims to extend the probationary period for federal civilian workers from one year to a minimum of two years. Under this bill, the probation period would not necessarily begin at the time a federal worker arrives for their first day of work. Rather, the period would, "end on the date that is 2 years after the date on which such formal training is completed." This is also true for federal jobs that require a license, in which the probationary clock would not start ticking until the license is achieved. In other words, probation for many federal workers under this legislation will be longer than two years, and dramatically more than the current 1 year period.

IFPTE is opposed to this bill for several reasons. First, this legislation is punitive in nature and serves no logical policy objective. For example, it does nothing to address performance issues, as supporters of this bill will erroneously argue, and is silent on addressing the ongoing challenges that management faces in properly evaluating new employees, regardless of whether the probationary period is for one year, or two years. For example, this past March former Acting Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Peter Levine, testified in the Senate regarding the DOD's use of their new two-year probationary period for federal workers. Mr. Levine testified that even though managers at the DOD were granted two years to determine if a newly hired DOD civilian employee should stay or go, that authority is rarely, if ever used.

Unfortunately, this is yet another in a long list of bills from this Congress that attempts

to legislate good management, while creating more useless and unnecessary requirements that end up costing taxpayers more money. It is illogical to think that a manager who will not act on a problem employee within one year of being hired would act within two years. Mr. Levine's testimony confirms as much. Federal managers already have the authority to discipline and ultimately fire employees, BUT they actually need to use the many authorities they already have to do so.

IFPTE believes that one year is more than enough time for managers to determine whether a newly hired employee can perform their job. Instead of creating more bureaucracy, as this bill will do, Congress should simply require managers to use the flexibilities they currently have, including the one year probationary period, to retain or release federal workers who have yet to fulfill their probationary periods. Please vote against H.R. 4182.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

GREGORY J. JUNEMANN,
President.

THE NATIONAL TREASURY
EMPLOYEES UNION,

November 28, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As National President of the National Treasury Employees Union, representing over 150,000 federal employees in 31 different agencies, I am writing to express NTEU's opposition to H.R. 4182, the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017 or the EQUALS Act of 2017, which would drastically extend the probationary period for individuals hired into the competitive service from one year to two years, reflecting changes in policy based on a handful of individual instances of concern that would—and can be—much better handled by improved management than by changing the law. With respect to any position that requires formal training, the two-year time period would begin after the required formal training. Given how limited an employee's due process rights and a labor organization's representational abilities are during the probationary period, NTEU believes that the current one year is the proper time period for agency management to assess and determine whether the individual is suitable for the position and capable of performing its duties. It is also important to recognize that the end of a probationary period does not mean that an employee cannot be disciplined or removed. It merely allows the employee to challenge such actions that are done without merit. Well trained managers can and do impose disciplinary and adverse actions that stand up to such challenges. In fact, in 2015, the Government Accountability Office found that the probationary period of one year was not working, for the most part, because those in supervisory positions are only there for a higher grade, that no one had trained the supervisor in how to supervise people, or that agencies are not properly using the probationary periods for supervisors who are not up to the task. Therefore, we question why this bill is necessary when, instead, increased and improved supervisor training is what is needed. NTEU has long supported and advocated Congress enacting federal supervisor training.

NTEU strongly opposes subjecting front-line federal employees—who are not tasked with managing agencies and long-term strategic responsibilities—to longer durations of assessment that preclude due process and collective bargaining rights. By extending the probationary period, the federal workforce essentially becomes an at will workforce, with limited rights and protections. In fact, the lack of these due process rights has

a chilling effect on employee use of the few protections they do have, namely protection against discrimination, sexual harassment, and whistleblower retaliation. Congress has long recognized and valued the importance of these protections for federal employees, which would be undermined by this bill.

We also have significant outstanding questions about what constitutes "formal training" under the bill as training programs differ greatly by agency. NTEU represents a variety of employees who undergo long periods of significant training that occurs at multiple points in time (non-consecutive in nature) and where the employee is already executing the actual job in between training sessions.

We are greatly concerned that the language in this bill could translate into 3 or 4 year—or even indefinite—probationary periods for some of the employees we represent, even though that may not be the intent. At this time, it is unclear how agencies would categorize various types of training that some of our members undergo under this new definition. It is also important to note that for positions that require extensive training, these individuals are subject to ongoing evaluations by management during any period of training.

For all of these reasons, we strongly oppose H.R. 4182 and urge you to vote against it.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON,
National President.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker,
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: We are writing to express our concerns that H.R. 4182, the EQUALS Act of 2017, could undermine protection for government employees who blow the whistle. The legislation extends the probationary period for civil service employees from one to two years.

We recognize that the Whistleblower Protection Act (WPA) covers probationary employees, and that there are provisions in H.R. 4182 that directly address those rights. But probationary employees already are at a handicap, because an agency has almost unlimited discretion to defeat a retaliation lawsuit through independent justification reasons entirely within its discretion. Second, probationary employees only have rights against partisan discrimination and under §2302(b)(8). This means an extra year that they will not be protected under the recently-enacted Follow the Rules Act or under 5 USC 2302(b)(9)(D) when they refuse to violate the law. The taxpayers could suffer the consequences.

We request that the House of Representatives consider these concerns before there is action on this legislation. The bill states its goal is to strengthen government accountability. Reducing whistleblower protection will undermine it.

Respectfully submitted,

TOM DEVINE,
Government Accountability Project.

MICHAEL D. OSTROLENK,
Liberty Coalition.

ELIZABETH HEMPOWICZ,
Project on Government Oversight.

SHANNA DEVINE,
Public Citizen.

DAVID WILLIAMS,
Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the EQUALS Act.

As a former Federal employee, I served in many capacities, from a letter carrier to a manager, and I know the dedication of those who serve in our civil service jobs. This bill is an insult to Federal employees and is completely unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, I say this is a bill in search of a problem. What are we fixing?

This is not good-government legislation. It just makes it easier to fire Federal employees without due process. By arbitrarily extending probationary periods, this bill takes away civil servants' employment rights and due process protections for at least 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, do you realize that benefits that career employees are entitled to are held in abeyance while they are on probation? They are given a different classification as being probationary than they are as being a career employee.

What are we trying to achieve?

They also give up the right to receive 30 days' notice before they are fired or furloughed, and they do not receive their rights as whistleblowers as probationary employees. This bill simply takes away workers' rights.

How many Members of Congress' parents worked as Federal employees to put them through college and to make a difference in America?

Here we are assaulting the legacy of Federal employees who work every day to make this country an amazing place to live.

This is not the way to address performance issues in the Federal workplace. As a Federal employee who had the responsibility to perform probationary evaluations, you need to talk to the supervisor if they are not doing their job conducting the proper evaluations.

We must continue to support accountability measures and tools. In addition, we must keep the spotlight on gross mismanagement.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who is my dear friend.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Virginia. He is doing a public service with his response to the bill that is coming forward today.

Mr. Chairman, you can call this bill whatever you want, but it is not a reform bill. It creates a problem in order to get rid of it.

Mr. Chairman, 0.18 percent is all of the employees who get dismissed. The sponsor must want more. Instead of taking that as an indication of the competency and of the excellence of Federal employees—under 1 percent, only 0.18—there must be more to be

fired than that. The data shows the opposite.

The Federal workforce has consistently been understood to be the best qualified public employees in the country however you look at them, particularly with their education and with their efforts.

The first reason the sponsor gives for this bill is that managers “simply lose track of time and are unaware of the 1-year deadline approaching.”

Whose competency should we be checking? Not the employees, surely. Management should be doing its job. They are paid big Federal bucks precisely for that.

But they are paid to do something else. They are paid to observe. They are not observing if they are not even looking for the 1-year deadline wherein they could fire an employee.

They are supposed to assist employees during that first year. They are supposed to help correct employees during that first year.

What are they doing during that first year losing track of it? Who bears the burden is the employee who may be perfectly competent but wasn't receiving the assistance or the oversight to which she was entitled.

We are moving without information that would help us understand if there is a problem. What is the reason for not calling witnesses to find out if there is a problem? Because if there is, then we ought to do something about it.

We do know this: 36 percent of all the employees dismissed are dismissed in that first year. That would seem to indicate that maybe management is doing its job.

Today's young workforce is always looking for better opportunities. Pass this bill, and you chase away the best and the brightest from even applying to work for the American people.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), who is a perspicacious member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, someone who grasps these issues fundamentally, and is my good friend.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Virginia for those loquacious comments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4182, the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act.

H.R. 4182 unnecessarily doubles the probationary period for Federal employees from 1 to 2 years. During this period, employees have essentially no due process rights and can be removed for any reason or no reason at all with no right to appeal.

This is an arbitrary change to existing policy, and there is no evidence to suggest that extending the probationary period will address any issues surrounding employee performance or the department performance.

Not only are candidates for Federal jobs already put through extensive selection processes, but a year is sufficient for any competent manager to de-

termine the ability of any employee to accomplish the job that they have been hired to do.

This bill will not improve agency outcomes but would penalize Federal workers by weakening their due process rights. Without due process, Federal employees will have little protection against employer discrimination and termination without cause.

These due process rights are also critical to promoting equity, fairness, and ensuring that whistleblowers continue to speak up without fear of retaliation.

It is also a clear attempt to undermine Federal employees' right to unionize since they would not be eligible to participate until their probationary period is over.

We need evidence-based changes that value Federal employees, make their workplaces safe, protect them against sexual harassment and discrimination, and ensure that their voices are heard. I ask my colleagues to reject this shortsighted legislation.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire of the Chair the schedule on the amendments.

The CHAIR. After general debate is completed, the Committee will proceed to the amendments.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair for that clarification.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), who is a professor and a very able member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

□ 1545

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. CONNOLLY for his invitation, and I am delighted to be here to speak out against H.R. 4182, the so-called Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act.

The first complaint I have got to lodge about it is the process by which it is taking place. This is a radical change in the civil service hiring policy and in the workplace without a hearing. I know we have grown accustomed to that, but let's just focus on the fact that here we are in the Nation's Capital and we have got all of the employees, managers, and supervisors, and everybody here, and we didn't even have a hearing to discuss why this might be necessary.

Then it is passed on a completely party-line vote in the Oversight Committee, which leads to the suspicion that this has nothing to do with the integrity of the civil service or the excellence of the civil service, the things that we should be thinking about, but it has to do, in fact, with a partisan mission.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Did my colleague just say there was not a single hearing

on a bill that affects the entire Federal Government?

Mr. RASKIN. Reclaiming my time, I tremble to say here in front of the whole body, but I don't believe that it was. I stand to be corrected by my colleagues if there was a hearing.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Did we act on evidence-based policymaking? Were there studies and data that showed how successful extending the probationary would be for all of these Federal agencies?

Mr. RASKIN. Reclaiming my time, not to my knowledge. I am used to that coming out of the State legislature, where we have endless hearings that go on into 2 a.m. in the morning or they go on for several days. But there were no hearings, there was no evidence, there was no expert testimony.

I couldn't figure out what was behind it. Then I realized that there is this effort to demoralize the Federal workforce and there was this effort to create a kind of political control over what is going on in the Federal workplace.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, I am baffled and puzzled by the way in which this measure came about. And I am really scared about what it means for all of our constituents who make the sacrifice of going to work for the Federal Government to serve the American people, because they are going into the workplace and I think most people are used to a probationary period of 3 months or 6 months. We had a year. Now we are doubling it to 2 years, which means that people are living in fear at a time when there is an administration that is intimidating people for doing their jobs; for example, for doing research about climate change and trying to deal with environmental problems. They are facing reprisals in the workplace.

This is a bill that deserves to go down in defeat. Anybody who represents Federal workers, I think, should stand up strongly against it. It should be returned to sender and let's have some real hearings and some real analysis.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, I think it is important to define what the probationary period is and what it is not.

According to the MSPB, the probationary period is the final step in the employee screening process when an individual must demonstrate “why it is

in the public interest for the government to finalize an appointment to the civil service.”

This is not a punitive measure. It is an opportunity for a prospective employee to prove they are qualified to serve the American people through a position in the civil service. These are critically important jobs and we need the best and brightest to fill them. A longer probationary period gives all new hires time to complete their training, learn on the job, and demonstrate that they can perform the role they were hired to do. This is good for our government, good for Federal employees, and good for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4182, the EQUALS Act.

My Republican colleagues have offered a legislative solution to a problem that does not exist.

The Oversight Committee has not held a single hearing to examine the existing one-year probationary period.

Yet, this legislation would double the probationary period. In the process, it would degrade the due process rights of these employees.

These due process protections are critical to protecting whistleblowers who report waste, fraud, and abuse.

For example, the Oversight Committee has examined retaliation against whistleblowers at the Transportation Security Administration.

In one case, a career official and disabled veteran testified before the Oversight Committee that he was removed from consideration for a Senior Executive Service position during his probationary period because he reported misconduct by top leaders at TSA including sexual harassment.

During his interview with Committee staff, this senior career official explained that extending the probationary period would make it easier for agencies to retaliate against other whistleblowers in the future.

The House of Representatives should not approve legislation that would allow more retaliation against whistleblowers at federal agencies.

Apart from the negative effects, we have seen no reason to adopt this bill. We have seen no problem that needs to be addressed.

As I said, the Oversight Committee never held a hearing on this bill.

We have not determined whether doubling the probationary period would help agencies deal with poor performers or further their missions.

We have not seen any evidence that federal agencies need a blanket one-year extension of the probationary period for every single federal job.

Instead, a recent GAO report recommended that the Office of Personnel Management actually study whether expanding the probationary period makes sense. GAO found that OPM should, and I quote:

Determine whether there are occupations in which . . . the probationary period should extend beyond 1-year to provide supervisors with sufficient time to assess an individual's performance.

I agree with GAO that a study needs to be conducted first.

But our Republican colleagues want to skip this step. They want to skip any real examination of the issue and just add another year of probation during which employees have limited rights.

Some of my colleagues cite the fact that Congress passed a two-year probationary period for Department of Defense civilian employees in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2016.

However, I would like to note two important facts.

First, the Defense Department did not request this change in the probationary period or indicate any need for it.

Second, the Department is not even using this new authority.

The Acting Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Peter Levine, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in March. He stated, and I quote, “the Department has done little to take advantage of that legislation.”

Mr. Levin warned that changing the law to address a small number of problem employees could hurt recruitment and retention and worker productivity. He stated, and I quote:

“If legislation that is intended to address a problem with one percent of the workforce is perceived as threatening and hostile by the other 99 percent, it may undermine morale and reduce the Department's ability to attract and retain the capable employees that it needs.”

Before damaging protections for whistleblowers, we should first determine whether an extension of the probationary period is needed at all.

We should also determine whether it is appropriate for all federal service occupations or only certain occupations.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4182

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 “Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017” or the “EQUALS Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD FOR POSITIONS WITHIN THE COMPETITIVE SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3321 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “The President” and inserting “Subject to subsections (c) and (d), the President”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c)(1) The length of a probationary period established under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall—

“(A) with respect to any position that requires formal training, begin on the date of appointment to the position and end on the date that is 2 years after the date on which such formal training is completed;

“(B) with respect to any position that requires a license, begin on the date of appointment to the position and end on the date that is 2 years after the date on which such license is granted; and

“(C) with respect to any position not covered by subparagraph (A) or (B), be a period of 2 years beginning on the date of the appointment to the position.

“(2) In paragraph (1)—

“(A) the term ‘formal training’ means, with respect to any position, a training program required by law, rule, or regulation, or otherwise required by the employing agency, to be completed by the employee before the employee is able to successfully execute the duties of the applicable position; and

“(B) the term ‘license’ means a license, certification, or other grant of permission to engage in a particular activity.

“(d) The head of each agency shall, in the administration of this section, take appropriate measures to ensure that—

“(1) any announcement of a vacant position within the agency and any offer of appointment made to any individual with respect to any such position clearly states the terms and conditions of any applicable probationary period, including any formal training period and any license requirement;

“(2) any individual who is required to complete a probationary period under this section receives timely notice of any requirements, including performance requirements, that must be met in order to satisfactorily complete such period;

“(3) any supervisor or manager of an individual who is required to complete a probationary period under this section receives notification of the end date of such period not less than 30 days before such date; and

“(4) if the head decides to retain an individual after the completion of a probationary period under this section, the head submits a certification to that effect, supported by a brief statement of the basis for the certification, in such form and manner as the President may by regulation prescribe.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 3321(e) of title 5, United States Code (as so redesignated by subsection (a)(2)), is amended by striking “Subsections (a) and (b)” and inserting “Subsections (a) through (d)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section—

(1) shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall apply in the case of any appointment (as referred to in section 3321(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code) and any initial appointment (as referred to in section 3321(a)(2) of such title) taking effect on or after the date on which this section takes effect.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD FOR POSITIONS WITHIN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3393(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “1-year” and inserting “2-year”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3592(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking “1-year” and inserting “2-year”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section—

(1) shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall apply in the case of any individual initially appointed as a career appointee under section 3393 of title 5, United States Code, on or after the date on which this section takes effect.

SEC. 4. ADVERSE ACTIONS.

(a) SUBCHAPTER I OF CHAPTER 75 OF TITLE 5.—Section 7501(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “or, except” and inserting “and, except”; and

(2) by striking “1 year of current” and inserting “2 years of current”.

(b) SUBCHAPTER II OF CHAPTER 75 OF TITLE 5.—Section 7511(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i) by striking “; or” and inserting “; and”;

(2) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “1 year” the first place it appears and inserting “2 years”;

(3) in subparagraph (B) by striking “1 year” and inserting “2 years”; and

(4) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “; or” and inserting “; and”.

(c) ACTIONS BASED ON UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.—Section 4303(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking “1 year of current” and inserting “2 years of current”; and

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking “1 year” and inserting “2 years”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c)—

(1) shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall apply in the case of any individual whose period of continuous service (as referred to in the provision of law amended by paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b), as the case may be) commences on or after the date on which this section takes effect.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS REQUIRED.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-430. 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. HASTINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-430.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chair, 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 3, line 18, strike “The length” and insert “Except as provided for in paragraph (2), the length”.

Page 4, after line 8, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in the case of an individual who has successfully completed a term of service in a national service program under the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.) or the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4950 et seq.), or as a volunteer or a volunteer leader under the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), the length of a probationary period established under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall—

“(A) with respect to any position occupied by such an individual that requires formal training, begin on the date of appointment to the position and end on the date that is 1 year after the date on which such formal training is completed;

“(B) with respect to any position occupied by such an individual that requires a license, begin on the date of appointment to the position and end on the date that is 1 year after

the date on which such license is granted; and

“(C) with respect to any position occupied by such an individual that is not covered by subparagraph (A) or (B), be a period of 1 year beginning on the date of the appointment to the position.

Page 4, line 9, strike “paragraph (1)” and insert “this subsection”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 635, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, for far too long, the Republican majority in Congress has treated Federal workers as if they are the problem.

We have spent years beating up Federal employees, implementing pay freezes, implementing hiring freezes, and cutting benefits in order to drive employees away from government service. The legislation we are debating today continues this offensive unfair trend.

This bill doubles the probationary period for employees of the civil service, in an effort to make it easier to fire the employees without giving them any chance to challenge that decision. In doing so, my Republican friends are sending a clear message, and that message is that they see Federal employees as untrustworthy and unworthy of being secure in their employment.

The amendment I am offering would exempt those who have served this country through programs such as the Peace Corps and AmeriCorps from the 2-year probationary period under this legislation, instead keeping them at the 1-year level of probation already in effect.

Last night, I offered an amendment at the Rules Committee to extend this same exemption for veterans, but it was blocked from consideration.

Let me say that again because I want every one watching to hear me loudly and clearly. Last night, the Republican majority on the Rules Committee voted to block an amendment that would have protected veterans employed in the government from being fired without cause.

I was told by my colleague who introduced this measure that being able to fire veterans within a 2-year probationary period—footnote right there: veterans would have already served 2 or more years before becoming civil servants at that level—but I was told that, without giving them any legal protections, recourse, or even an ability to improve “helps the veterans, just like it helps everyone.”

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am here to tell you that is hogwash. Veterans should not need to prove themselves worthy of a government job for a full 2 years before they are afforded the rights that should be inherent their position.

We ought to be spending time working to strengthen our Federal workforce through better training and more plentiful diversity programs. Instead,

this bill needlessly undermines our civil service and the fine people who work within it, while simultaneously making it a less attractive place of employment for our best and brightest at a time when we are in desperate need of such people.

This amendment would protect those who have already served our country in the national service from this bill's intentions. In my opinion, we should be expanding protections for everyone—for veterans, women, minorities, LGBTQ Americans, and especially for disabled Americans.

Let me say one more thing that I said last night, and this is with due respect to my colleague, Mr. CONNOLLY, who is managing for the minority in this case, and the extraordinary number of constituents that he and the Members, both Republican and Democrat, in the near curtilage of this area here in metropolitan Washington, they do an incredible job. Their constituents virtually all are saying to them that this is an unnecessary measure.

I am sure that Mr. CONNOLLY has made that very clear. I heard him introduce measures that I introduced in the Rules Committee last night from a variety of organizations. I will not burden you more but to say that we should be about the business of trying to build a Federal workforce and not put obstacles in their way.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not create an exception for alumni of the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps, and other national service programs. It puts them at a disadvantage.

They would have less time than other new hires to prove themselves before managers make a decision whether to keep them or let them go. This could mean fewer Peace Corps, AmeriCorps, and other national service alumni are retained at the end of the probationary period.

Under the current 1-year system, supervisors often do not have enough time to determine whether a potential employee is a good fit for the job. Managers tend to err on the side of releasing an employee who is on the fence at the end of a probationary period.

New hires to the Federal Government deserve ample time to demonstrate they are able to perform all critical aspects of the job. H.R. 4182 gives them more time.

This amendment would actually put certain groups at a disadvantage in comparison to the rest of the Federal workforce. Alumni of the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps, and other programs would have 1 year to demonstrate the skills and core competencies required for the

Federal job they are seeking. Their colleagues would have 2 years.

The spirit of this amendment is admirable, but the unintended consequence of adopting it will be that the very people the amendment is meant to benefit would be at a disadvantage.

The probationary period is not a punishment. It is an extension of the hiring process and a tool to help ensure a qualified civil service. This amendment would create additional classes of Federal employees and unnecessarily add complexity to an already complex system.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COMER. 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.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 2 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY GIANFORTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-430.

Mr. GIANFORTE. 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 4, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

“(3) any supervisor or manager of an individual who is required to complete a probationary period under this section receives periodic notifications of the end date of such period not later than 1 year, 6 months, 3 months, and 30 days before such end date; and

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 635, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GIANFORTE

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, strike lines 8 through 12 and insert the following:

“(3) any supervisor or manager of an individual who is required to complete a probationary period under this section receives periodic notifications of the end date of such period not later than 1 year, 6 months, 3 months, and 30 days before such end date; and

Mr. GIANFORTE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

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

A longer probationary period for new Federal hires is important to give supervisors the time they need to evaluate whether a new hire should gain career employee status. But a longer probationary period will not accomplish anything if supervisors don't use the extended time properly.

Managers often don't know the end dates for probationary employees under their supervision. Because probationary periods end automatically, without action by a supervisor, an employee can be hired without a complete assessment of whether the employee is qualified for full Federal service.

A 2015 Government Accountability Office report recommended automated systems to notify supervisors when the end of an individual's probationary period is imminent.

□ 1600

Agencies have these systems. They just need to use them. My amendment requires supervisors to be notified at a series of regular intervals in advance of the expiration of a probationary period. The notifications occur at 1 year, 6 months, 3 months, and 30 days before the scheduled completion of a probationary period.

This notification will remind supervisors of their responsibilities to observe employees and provide feedback throughout the probationary period. It will also remind supervisors to decide whether the employee is fit for Federal service.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, as indicated, I appreciate the intent of my friend from Montana, but this is a bad bill. We ought to be studying the effect of the existing pilot program at the Department of Defense to see how it works, and we ought to be adopting the GAO recommendation of better training for supervisors whom the GAO found, frankly, were ill-equipped to evaluate employees during a 1- or 2-year probationary period.

We ought to have a hearing, and my friend from Montana might even agree with this, since he is the newest Member, one of the newest Members of our committee. Our committee is the locus for government-wide initiatives such as this.

We have not had a single hearing on this bill, or, frankly, on this subject,

and I think that is a huge mistake. We are putting the cart before the horse; so I think we ought to return to a more empirical-based policymaking, especially when it is a policy that will affect every future Federal employee, and those numbers are huge, given the baby boom bulge ready to retire. That is 40 percent of the workforce, and it has to be replaced.

So while I very much appreciate the intent of my friend from Montana, it is in that context I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Virginia. I urge adoption of this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-430.

Mr. CONNOLLY. 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:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. STUDY ON LENGTH OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on Federal agencies that have lengthened the employee probationary period from 1 to 2 years and other potential extensions of probationary periods for certain occupations in the Federal Government.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall analyze—

(1) any impact of an existing 2-year probationary period (compared to a 1-year probationary period) on the employing agency's ability to deal with underperforming employees, improve productivity, improve recruitment and retention, and accomplish the mission of the agency and shall include the Department of Defense as a case study; and

(2) whether certain occupations in the Federal Government should have probationary periods in excess of 1 year because of the complexity, sensitivity, or unique occupational challenges of such occupations, including—

(A) whether such a probationary period extension would provide supervisors sufficient time to adequately assess employee performance and whether the extension would lead to measureable improvements in the performance of employees in those occupations; and

(B) an identification of the occupations, and the characteristics of those occupations, that would benefit from longer probationary periods, including requirements to exercise supervisory authority and possess professional licenses and training.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report containing the study required under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 635, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, under H.R. 4182, the probationary period for all Federal employees is extended for an additional year, regardless of the job they are hired to do. All new employees are punished equally, and supervisors are given no new tools to improve their use of the existing probationary period.

In February 2016, as I have mentioned before, the GAO reports studying the rules and trends relating to review and dismissal of employees for poor performance, suggests that the Office of Personnel Management look into whether there are certain occupations, due to the nature or complexity of the position, in which the probationary period should be extended beyond 1 year or not.

We heard testimony before the Rules Committee from a number of colleagues who represent areas with big Federal concentration, Federal employee concentrations with specialized agencies, such as the weather service in Oklahoma and CDC in Atlanta where a 2-year probationary period may very well impede the ability to hire the skilled workers we need.

The report goes on to say that it is something that should be looked into. It does not call for a government-wide extension of the probationary period. That is why I filed this amendment to require the GAO to conduct a study on the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies that have used this tool, a 2-year probationary period.

A 2-year probationary period for civilian employees at DOD was enacted in 2016, and as the largest Federal agency, this extension would provide a good case study on the potential impacts: good, bad, and indifferent on the legislation before us. It is a study we ought to do before we adopt a bill.

Some of my colleagues believe that since extending the probationary period has been working out so well, it ought to be extended across the entire Federal Government. There are a few things I need to point out for us. This policy only affected those who were hired after November 25, 2015, the day the law went into effect.

Secondly, the former Under Secretary of Defense, as I mentioned in earlier statements, Peter Levine, testified before the Armed Services Committee that the Department has done little to take advantage of that legislation. That is his testimony. Therefore, there are only a small number of employees who have completed the 2-year probationary period, and it is too soon to declare it a success or failure.

That is why my amendment would have the GAO give us guidance. How

has it worked? Has it helped? Has it hurt? Are there some things we haven't anticipated that we need to address?

The study would also look into whether extending the probationary period has any effect on the ability of an agency to recruit and retain. And, again, I pointed out 40 percent of the existing workforce is eligible for retirement now or in the next few years. That is a huge number of people. And we have got to worry about recruitment.

Gathering the data is a necessary first step, not a last step or an afterthought, before deciding to change a law with such profound impact on Federal agencies. This bill, as I said to my friend from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), may yet prove to be a good idea, but we don't know. There remain a lot of questions about the efficacy of this proposal. It is risky, and it can have terrible negative consequences that we haven't even foreseen and some of which we can predict today.

Two weeks ago, this body adopted a policy of evidence-based policymaking, so let's put it into implementation with this bill. Let's look for some evidence, empirical evidence, systematically done to justify the adoption of such a sweeping bill.

Mr. Chairman, I call for the adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, extending the probationary period is not a new idea. Federal manager groups have advocated for an extended probationary period for more than a decade.

The Government Accountability Office completed a study on the probationary period in February of 2015. In that study, chief human capital officers told GAO a longer probationary period could help supervisors make a performance assessment for those occupations that are particularly complex or difficult to assess. GAO also recommended considering, "extending the supervisory probationary period beyond 1 year to include at least 1 full employee appraisal cycle."

As far back as 2005, the Merit Systems Protection Board completed a study and recommended longer probationary periods when an agency deems it necessary to fully evaluate a probationer. It is not necessary to wait for more studies on this issue.

This amendment strikes the entire bill, meaning the current probationary period would remain the same and the problems that GAO and others have identified would persist. This amendment undermines the entire purpose of the bill, which is to allow managers' employees more time to conduct a fair and complete assessment of probationary Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. CONNOLLY, and I want to salute him as a really ardent champion for those of your constituents who work in the Federal Government. In Maryland, as in Virginia, we have lots of them, but it is not just there.

Eighty-five percent of the Federal workforce lives outside of the Washington/Maryland/Virginia area: Kentucky and California and South Carolina and Texas. This would apply to all new employees. Millions of new people coming into the workforce would be added, doubling the probationary period. Imagine if you were trying to hire for your small business and you had to tell people that they were going to be on probation for 2 years basically, with none of the rights that you would have vested as if you had really gotten hired and been part of the workforce.

I want to say, they are willing, apparently, in this bill, to give people a whole extra year on probation. They are not wanting to wait even 1 year or a half a year, maybe, for the GAO to do a proper study so we can use evidence-based policymaking, as the gentleman says. That is the very least that we can do.

The good gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) said that there was a study done 10 years ago.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-430 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is a request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) 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 Acting CHAIR. This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 221, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 646]

AYES—195

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

NOES—221

Abraham	Bergman	Brat
Aderholt	Biggs	Brooks (AL)
Allen	Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Buchanan
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Buck
Arrington	Black	Bucshon
Babin	Blackburn	Budd
Banks (IN)	Blum	Burgess
Barr	Bost	Byrne
Barton	Brady (TX)	Calvert

Carter (GA)	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Carter (TX)	Hunter	Reed
Chabot	Hurd	Reichert
Cheney	Issa	Rice (SC)
Coffman	Jenkins (KS)	Roby
Collins (NY)	Jenkins (WV)	Roe (TN)
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Comstock	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Cook	Jordan	Rokita
Costello (PA)	Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Cramer	Katko	Rooney, Thomas
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	J.
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Ross
Curtis	King (NY)	Rothfus
Davidson	Kinzinger	Rouzer
Davis, Rodney	Knight	Royce (CA)
Denham	Kustoff (TN)	Russell
DeSantis	Labrador	Rutherford
DesJarlais	LaHood	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Donovan	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Duffy	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Sessions
Duncan (TN)	Lewis (MN)	Shimkus
Dunn	LoBiondo	Shuster
Emmer	Long	Simpson
Estes (KS)	Loudermillk	Smith (MO)
Farenthold	Love	Smith (NE)
Faso	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Fleischmann	MacArthur	
Flores	Marchant	
Fortenberry	Marino	
Fox	Marshall	
Franks (AZ)	Massie	
Frelinghuysen	Mast	
Gaetz	McCarthy	
Gallagher	McCaul	
Garrett	McClintock	
Gianforte	McHenry	
Gibbs	McKinley	
Goodlatte	McMorris	
Gosar	Rodgers	
Govdy	McSally	
Granger	Meadows	
Graves (GA)	Meehan	
Graves (LA)	Messer	
Graves (MO)	Mitchell	
Griffith	Mooleenaar	
Grothman	Mooney (WV)	
Guthrie	Mullin	
Handel	Newhouse	
Harris	Noem	
Hartzler	Nunes	
Hensarling	Olson	
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	
Hice, Jody B.	Palmer	
Higgins (LA)	Paulsen	
Hill	Pearce	
Holding	Perry	
Hollingsworth	Pittenger	
Hudson	Poe (TX)	
Huizenga	Poliquin	

NOT VOTING—17

Barletta	Harper	Renacci
Bridenstine	Jayapal	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Kennedy	Stivers
Conyers	Norman	Taylor
Delaney	Pocan	Webster (FL)
Gohmert	Posey	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1637

Ms. STEFANK, Messrs. OLSON, BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. GRANGER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. TORRES and Mr. DOGGETT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 223, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 647]

AYES—193

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

NOES—223

Abraham	Barton	Brat
Aderholt	Bergman	Brooks (AL)
Allen	Biggs	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Buck
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Babin	Black	Budd
Bacon	Blackburn	Burgess
Banks (IN)	Blum	Byrne
Barletta	Bost	Calvert
Barr	Brady (TX)	Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)	Hudson	Poe (TX)
Chabot	Huizenga	Poliquin
Cheney	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Coffman	Hunter	Reed
Collins (NY)	Hurd	Reichert
Comer	Issa	Rice (SC)
Conaway	Jenkins (KS)	Roby
Cook	Jenkins (WV)	Roe (TN)
Costello (PA)	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Cramer	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Jordan	Rokita
Curbelo (FL)	Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Curtis	Katko	Rooney, Thomas J.
Davidson	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Denham	King (IA)	Rothfus
Dent	King (NY)	Rouzer
DeSantis	Kinzinger	Royce (CA)
DesJarlais	Knight	Russell
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Sanford
Donovan	Labrador	Schweikert
Duffy	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Sessions
Dunn	Lance	Shimkus
Emmer	Latta	Shuster
Estes (KS)	Lewis (MN)	Simpson
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Faso	Long	Smith (NE)
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	Love	Smith (TX)
Fleischmann	Lucas	Smucker
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Fortenberry	MacArthur	Stewart
Fox	Marchant	Tenney
Franks (AZ)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Frelinghuysen	Marshall	Thornberry
Gaetz	Massie	Tiberi
Gallagher	Mast	Tipton
Garrett	McCarthy	Trott
Gianforte	McCaul	Turner
Gibbs	McClintock	Upton
Gohmert	McHenry	Valadao
Goodlatte	McMorris	Wagner
Gosar	Rodgers	Walberg
Gowdy	McSally	Walden
Granger	Meadows	Walker
Graves (GA)	Meehan	Walorski
Graves (LA)	Messer	Walters, Mimi
Graves (MO)	Mitchell	Weber (TX)
Griffith	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Guthrie	Mullin	Williams
Handel	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Harris	Noem	Wittman
Hartzler	Nunes	Womack
Hensarling	Olson	Woodall
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Yoder
Hice, Jody B.	Palmer	Yoho
Higgins (LA)	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Hill	Pearce	Young (IA)
Holding	Perry	Zeldin
Hollingsworth	Pittenger	

NOT VOTING—17

Bridenstine	Kennedy	Rutherford
Collins (GA)	Norman	Scalise
Conyers	Pocan	Stivers
Delaney	Posey	Taylor
Harper	Renacci	Webster (FL)
Jayapal	Ruppersberger	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1644

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FERGUSON). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. FERGUSON, 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. 4182) to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify probationary periods with respect to positions within the competitive service

and the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 635, 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.

The question is on the amendment.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of H.R. 4182 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of H.R. 3017.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 204, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 648]

AYES—213

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

Ratcliffe	Sanford	Wagner
Reed	Schweikert	Walberg
Reichert	Scott, Austin	Walden
Rice (SC)	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Roby	Sessions	Walorski
Roe (TN)	Shimkus	Walters, Mimi
Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Weber (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (MO)	Wenstrup
Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Westerman
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Williams
Rooney, Francis	Smucker	Wilson (SC)
Rooney, Thomas J.	Stefanik	Wittman
Roskam	Stewart	Womack
Ross	Tenney	Woodall
Rothfus	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Rouzer	Thornberry	Yoho
Royce (CA)	Tipton	Young (AK)
Russell	Trott	Young (IA)
Rutherford	Turner	Zeldin
	Valadao	

NOES—204

Adams	Gabbard	Norcross
Aguilar	Gallego	O'Halleran
Barragán	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Bass	Gomez	Pallone
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	Panetta
Bera	Gottheimer	Pascarell
Beyer	Green, Al	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Blunt Rochester	Hanabusa	Peters
Bonamici	Hastings	Peterson
Bost	Heck	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins (NY)	Polis
Brady (PA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Raskin
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jeffries	Richmond
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Cárdenas	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cartwright	Katko	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Keating	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Sánchez
Ciulline	Kihuen	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schneider
Cleaver	King (NY)	Schrader
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Cole	Langevin	Serrano
Comstock	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Cook	Lawrence	Sherman
Correa	Lawson (FL)	Simpson
Costa	Lee	Sinema
Costello (PA)	Levin	Sires
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Crist	Lieu, Ted	Smith (NJ)
Crowley	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cummings	LoBiondo	Soto
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Suozzi
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lowe	Takano
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham, M.	Thompson (CA)
DeBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Demings	Lynch	Tiberi
Denham	Maloney,	Titus
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Torres
Dingell	Matsui	Tsongas
Doggett	McCollum	Upton
Donovan	McEachin	Vargas
Doyle, Michael F.	McGovern	Veasey
Ellison	McKinley	Vela
Engel	McNerney	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meeks	Visclosky
Espallat	Meng	Walz
Esty (CT)	Moore	Wasserman
Evans	Moulton	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Welch
Fudge	Neal	Wilson (FL)
	Nolan	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Bridenstine	Grijalva	Norman
Collins (GA)	Harper	Pocan
Conyers	Jayapal	
Delaney	Kennedy	

Posey Scalise Taylor
Renacci Stivers Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1651

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BROWNFIELDS ENHANCEMENT, ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT, AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the passage of the bill (H.R. 3017) to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to reauthorize and improve the brownfields program, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 8, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 649]

YEAS—409

Abraham	Carter (GA)	Deutch
Adams	Carter (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Aderholt	Cartwright	Dingell
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Allen	Castro (TX)	Donovan
Amodei	Chabot	Doyle, Michael
Arrington	Cheney	F.
Babin	Chu, Judy	Duffy
Bacon	Cicilline	Duncan (SC)
Banks (IN)	Clark (MA)	Duncan (TN)
Barletta	Clarke (NY)	Dunn
Barr	Clay	Ellison
Barragán	Cleaver	Emmer
Barton	Clyburn	Engel
Bass	Coffman	Eshoo
Beatty	Cohen	Espallat
Bera	Cole	Estes (KS)
Bergman	Collins (NY)	Esty (CT)
Beyer	Comer	Evans
Bilirakis	Comstock	Farenthold
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Faso
Bishop (MI)	Connolly	Ferguson
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Fitzpatrick
Black	Cooper	Fleischmann
Blackburn	Correa	Flores
Blum	Costa	Fortenberry
Blumenauer	Costello (PA)	Foster
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Fox
Bonamici	Cramer	Frankel (FL)
Bost	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Boyle, Brendan	Crist	Frelinghuysen
F.	Crowley	Fudge
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Gabbard
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gallagher
Brat	Cummings	Gallego
Brooks (AL)	Curbelo (FL)	Garamendi
Brooks (IN)	Curtis	Gianforte
Brown (MD)	Davidson	Gibbs
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Gohmert
Buchanan	Davis, Danny	Gomez
Buck	Davis, Rodney	Gonzalez (TX)
Bucshon	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Burgess	DeGette	Gosar
Bustos	DeLauro	Gottheimer
Butterfield	DelBene	Gowdy
Byrne	Demings	Granger
Calvert	Denham	Graves (GA)
Capuano	Dent	Graves (LA)
Carbajal	DeSantis	Graves (MO)
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Green, Al
Carson (IN)	DesJarlais	Green, Gene

Griffith	MacArthur	Ruppersberger
Grijalva	Maloney,	Rush
Grothman	Carolyn B.	Russell
Guthrie	Maloney, Sean	Rutherford
Gutiérrez	Marchant	Ryan (OH)
Hanabusa	Marino	Sánchez
Handel	Marshall	Sarbanes
Harris	Mast	Schakowsky
Hartzler	Matsui	Schiff
Hastings	McCarthy	Schneider
Heck	McCaul	Schrader
Hensarling	McClintock	Schweikert
Herrera Beutler	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Hice, Jody B.	McEachin	Scott, Austin
Higgins (LA)	McGovern	Scott, David
Higgins (NY)	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Hill	McKinley	Serrano
Himes	McMorris	Sessions
Holding	Rodgers	Sewell (AL)
Hollingsworth	McNerney	Shea-Porter
Hoyer	McSally	Sherman
Hudson	Meadows	Shimkus
Huffman	Meehan	Shuster
Huizenga	Meeks	Simpson
Hultgren	Meng	Sinema
Hunter	Messer	Sires
Hurd	Mitchell	Slaughter
Issa	Moolenaar	Smith (MO)
Jackson Lee	Mooney (WV)	Smith (NE)
Jeffries	Moore	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins (KS)	Moulton	Smith (TX)
Jenkins (WV)	Mullin	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Murphy (FL)	Smucker
Johnson (LA)	Nadler	Soto
Johnson (OH)	Napolitano	Speier
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Stefanik
Johnson, Sam	Newhouse	Stewart
Jones	Noem	Suozi
Jordan	Nolan	Swalwell (CA)
Joyce (OH)	Norcross	Takano
Kaptur	Nunes	Tenney
Katko	O'Halleran	Thompson (CA)
Keating	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)
Kelly (IL)	Olson	Thompson (PA)
Kelly (MS)	Palazzo	Thornberry
Kelly (PA)	Pallone	Tiberi
Khanna	Palmer	Tipton
Kihuen	Panetta	Titus
Kildee	Pascrell	Tonko
Kilmer	Paulsen	Torres
Kind	Payne	Trott
King (IA)	Pelosi	Tsongas
King (NY)	Perlmutter	Turner
Kinzinger	Perry	Upton
Knight	Peters	Valadao
Krishnamoorthi	Peterson	Vargas
Kuster (NH)	Pingree	Veasey
Kustoff (TN)	Pittenger	Veazy
LaHood	Poe (TX)	Vela
LaMalfa	Poliquin	Velázquez
Lamborn	Polis	Visclosky
Lance	Price (NC)	Wagner
Langevin	Quigley	Walberg
Larsen (WA)	Raskin	Walden
Larson (CT)	Ratcliffe	Walker
Latta	Reed	Walorski
Lawrence	Reichert	Walters, Mimi
Lawson (FL)	Rice (NY)	Walz
Lee	Rice (SC)	Wasserman
Levin	Richmond	Schultz
Lewis (GA)	Roby	Waters, Maxine
Lewis (MN)	Roe (TN)	Watson Coleman
Lieu, Ted	Rogers (AL)	Weber (TX)
Lipinski	Rogers (KY)	Welch
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Wenstrup
Loeb sack	Rokita	Westerman
Lofgren	Rooney, Francis	Williams
Long	Rooney, Thomas	Wilson (FL)
Loudermilk	J.	Wilson (SC)
Love	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Lowenthal	Rosen	Womack
Lowey	Roskam	Woodall
Lucas	Ross	Yarmuth
Luetkemeyer	Rothfus	Yoder
Lujan Grisham,	Rouzer	Yoho
M.	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)
Luján, Ben Ray	Royce (CA)	Young (IA)
Lynch	Ruiz	Zeldin

NAYS—8

NOT VOTING—16

Amash	Gaetz	Massie
Biggs	Garrett	Sanford
Budd	Labrador	
Bridenstine	Harper	Pearce
Collins (GA)	Jayapal	Pocan
Conyers	Kennedy	
Delaney	Norman	

Posey Scalise Taylor
Renacci Stivers Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1700

Mr. BROWN of Maryland changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent in the House Chamber for rollcall votes 642 through 649 on Thursday, November 30, 2017, as a result of the flu. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall vote 642, “nay” on rollcall vote 643, “nay” on rollcall vote 644, “nay” on rollcall vote 645, “aye” on rollcall vote 646, “aye” on rollcall vote 647, “nay” on rollcall vote 648, and “aye” on rollcall vote 649.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance of a close friend's funeral I missed the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: “nay” on rollcall No. 646, “nay” on rollcall No. 647, “yea” on rollcall No. 648, and “yea” on rollcall No. 649.

RELATING TO THE EXERCISE OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE RANKING MINORITY MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 636

Resolved, That until otherwise provided by the House, the authority of the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary shall be exercised by the minority member of the Committee who, prior to the adoption of this resolution, ranked immediately below the ranking minority member.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAURICE HINCHEY

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

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and sorrow that I rise today to announce the passing of our former colleague, Congressman Maurice Hinchey.

Mr. Hinchey passed away on November 22, just before Thanksgiving, at the age of 79 in Saugerties, New York, leaving behind an extraordinary legacy that was marked by fervent patriotism, political courage, and forward-thinking leadership.

During his 20 years of service in the House of Representatives, Maurice Hinchey represented a broad swath of New

York State, from the Hudson Valley and the Catskill Mountains, over in the Southern Tier as well. Many of those areas make up what is today's 19th Congressional District, which I currently represent.

I also had the honor of working alongside Mr. Hinchey for 6 years in the New York State Assembly. There, he developed and honed his legislative skills as chairman of the assembly's Environmental Conservation Committee.

We proudly note the service of Maurice Hinchey to the Nation, and I am glad to be joined here by colleagues from the New York delegation and the dean of the delegation, Ms. SLAUGHTER, to extend our heartfelt condolences to Maurice Hinchey's widow, and to the entire Hinchey family.

HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAURICE HINCHEY

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Maurice Hinchey. He was an extraordinary friend who had the courage to take on all of the tough issues.

We served 4 years together in the New York State Assembly and 20 years together in Congress. I watched him do what he did best: defend the constituents and the land that he represented.

He is remembered as an environmental hero for his promotion of renewable energy and for sounding the alarm on the risks of hydraulic fracturing. Maurice did more to support the natural resources of the Catskill Mountains and Hudson Valley than anyone else.

From his efforts to clean up the Hudson River to the establishment of the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area, his legacy will endure.

To the millions of visitors who enjoy the Catskill Mountains or explore the Hudson Valley, you have a champion to thank. His name was Maurice Hinchey.

THE GRAND CANYON FFA TEAMS RECEIVES A GOLD MEDAL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Grand Canyon FFA for bringing home the gold at a recent national competition.

The Wellsboro High School team of 10th graders recently traveled to the National FFA Convention in Indianapolis. The team competed in the Conduct of Meeting event that is focused on parliamentary procedure.

As part of the competition, the team performs a meeting demonstration that includes an opening ceremony and a surprise issue to debate. They make

motions and resolve the issue within 13 minutes. Each team member has to answer oral questions and take a knowledge exam.

Mr. Speaker, I am incredibly proud of the Grand Canyon FFA team for advancing to the Gold Level Round and placing sixth overall in the Nation.

It is clear that the FFA is making a positive difference in the lives of students by developing their leadership skills, personal growth, and career success through agricultural education.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the members of the Grand Canyon FFA team on a job well done: Kylie Butler, Nina Coolidge, Rayann Pierce, Austin Richards, McKenzie Sweigart, Katarina Swendrowski, and Taylor Wetherbee.

WE NEED TAX REFORM

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about tax reform. Tax reform should be all about helping those who are in need: Working families, veterans, seniors, small-business owners, just to name a few.

Unfortunately, the plan that the congressional Republicans are currently ramming through the Senate with the vote that could happen just in a few short hours does exactly the opposite.

Their plan would overwhelmingly benefit the superrich and the well-connected at the expense of the middle class, small businesses, not to mention veterans and seniors struggling to make ends meet.

The middle class and small businesses, we can do better by them. Instead of giving us a budget-busting half-trillion-dollar tax cut to the wealthiest Americans, let's provide greater tax relief to working families. Let's keep our promise to the veterans. Let's strengthen Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid. Let's help the aspiring entrepreneurs pursue their passion. Let's ensure better wages, better jobs, better opportunities, and a better future for all Americans.

HONORING OFFICER JAIMIE COX

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

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Officer Jaimie Cox, a fallen hero from my district who was killed in the line of duty during a traffic stop on November 5, 2017.

Jaimie Cox, a Rockford native, served our community and our country proudly. After graduating high school, he served in the United States Army National Guard. He was deployed to Afghanistan in 2008 and was honorably discharged in 2010. He went on to attend Northern Illinois University and graduated in 2014.

For his military service, Cox received the Combat Infantryman Badge, Army

Achievement Medal, and the Army Commendation Medal. He also won the Illinois National Guard Abraham Lincoln Medal of Freedom Ribbon.

Following college, Cox joined the law enforcement division at the Illinois Department of Natural Resources before coming home to serve as an officer in the Rockford Police Department.

Mr. Speaker, Jaimie Cox spent his life dedicated to serving and protecting others. On a daily basis, he risked his life to help others and he gave the ultimate sacrifice protecting our community.

On behalf of the 16th Congressional District of Illinois, we honor his service, mourn his sacrifice, and pay tribute to our fallen hero, Jaimie Cox.

THE IMPORTANCE OF NET NEUTRALITY

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the importance of preserving net neutrality.

As many of my colleagues are aware, cybersecurity is a top priority of mine, as I believe it is the national and economy security challenge of the 21st century.

As co-chair of the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus, I have fought for years to help reduce security risks while preserving the amazing benefits of an open interoperable internet.

But the internet was not designed with security in mind, so I haven't been surprised by the work needed to better protect our networks and data.

But the internet was designed to be free and open. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have been stunned by the Federal Communication Commission's recent proposal to end net neutrality and allow a small group of large companies to control what we see online. This is absolutely outrageous.

I have heard from countless constituents back home in Rhode Island about this misguided effort, and I join them in calling for the FCC to reject it.

Mr. Speaker, we do need to better protect ourselves on the internet, but we better make sure there is still a free and open internet to protect.

LAW ENFORCEMENT MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLNESS

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, every day, our law enforcement officers and first responders place their lives at risk to protect our neighborhoods and our families. They deserve our respect, our admiration, and support.

That support can come in many different forms, but an important component to supporting our law enforcement officers is to provide them the resources they need for mental wellness.

Law enforcement officers have stressful jobs. They are exposed to higher levels of violence and death than the average American.

One in five officers has PTSD. One in four officers have thought about suicide at one point during their career, and the suicide rate for police officers is four times higher than the rate for firefighters.

We can do more, Mr. Speaker. That is why I am glad the House passed the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act earlier this week.

This legislation will provide law enforcement's agencies with the resources they need to address mental health issues faced by officers. It will make grants available to departments across the country and it will study the effectiveness of regular mental health checks and crisis hotlines.

I have had numerous conversations with law enforcement leaders and police officers in my district, and this is a priority for them. It is supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Law Enforcement Officers Association, and the National Association of Police Officers.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the House is working to improve the mental health of those who are charged with protecting us. I thank the men and women who put on the blue uniform each day to keep us safe.

RECOGNIZING PREMATURITY AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Prematurity Awareness Month.

Today, we think of infant mortality as a problem of the past, but according to the World Health Organization, complications of pre-term birth now outrank all other causes as the world's number one killer of children under the age of 5.

Prematurity is a serious global problem affecting families from every nation and every facet of society, even here in the most developed nation in the world.

In the 2017 March of Dimes' Premature Birth Report Card, the United States was awarded a C grade due to the persistence of high pre-term birth rates.

However, up to 75 percent of all deaths due to pre-term birth can be prevented through relatively low-cost interventions. We have the resources to address this problem, but we must also have the will.

Let's recognize November as Prematurity Awareness Month by supporting efforts at home and abroad to reduce the impact of pre-term births, honor those working on this issue around the globe, and promote policies that will prevent pre-term births and improve outcomes for affected infants.

My resolution, H.R. 625, I believe, would do just that.

□ 1715

REMEMBERING GARY LEWIS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. Gary Lewis who passed away on November 20 at 65 years of age.

Mr. Lewis was well known in Jesup, Georgia, for serving his community with his dentistry practice. For years in Jesup, he served all corners of his town with quality dental care, and, after his retirement, Dr. Hugh Armstrong continued his legacy of dentistry.

Mr. Lewis' dedication to his community is exemplified by his work with Help a Child Smile Mobile Dental Program. In this program, Mr. Lewis would go into schools and use his expertise as a dentist, free of charge, to serve students whose parents may not have the funds, the time, or the ability to regularly take their child to a dentist.

Outside of dentistry, Mr. Lewis enjoyed hunting and fishing and was an active member of the Jesup Primitive Baptist Church.

I know the entire Jesup community will miss Mr. Lewis' bright spirit and helping hand.

REMEMBERING FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAURICE HINCHEY

(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, I rise today to remember a great champion of the people who passed away last week at the age of 79. Maurice Hinchey was, indeed, a great champion of the people, a great patriot, and a great leader.

I served with him in the State Assembly in New York for 16 years and here in the Congress for 20 years. He was perhaps one of the foremost environmentalists of his generation. He led the successful fight to get General Electric to clean up the PCBs in the Hudson River, to clean up that river and make it not quite drinkable yet, but make it environmentally safe.

He led every environmental battle. He is one of those people who made it easier to serve in Congress because you could always check and say, "Did I do the right thing on an environmental vote," by looking to see how Maurice voted.

Maurice was a liberal in a conservative area, and everyone loved him because they knew what a wonderful man he was, and they knew how much he cared about his constituents and about the country. It didn't matter whether he was liberal or conservative. Every-

body loved him. We all did, we all do, we regret his passing, and may he rest in peace.

NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, November is National Adoption Month, which is an opportunity to remember the more than 400,000 children across the country who are waiting for a family to provide them with a loving home, one they can call their own. The backbone of American society is the family unit. The children in foster care systems around the country deserve to know the love and warmth of a supportive family, and more and more across the country are promoting awareness of adoption and the children waiting to be shown support by adoptive families.

The best way to help children grow up to be good citizens, hold jobs, invent new technologies, discover cures for diseases, and become role models for other children is to provide them leadership, love, and support as they grow up.

Mr. Speaker, adoption brings so much joy to so many children as well as their new families. During National Adoption Month, let's continue to devote resources to ensure we can continue spreading this joy.

REMEMBERING FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAURICE HINCHEY

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a giant of the Hudson Valley, former Congressman Maurice Hinchey.

Mr. Hinchey passed away last week, but 21 years ago, I had the opportunity to be a young volunteer on his campaign for Congress. A few days ago, I attended his wake with hundreds of my neighbors in the Hudson Valley.

When you met Maurice Hinchey, you met, first and foremost, a real, live, flesh-and-blood human being who was strong, principled, and passionate. That person became a real hero to many of us in the Hudson Valley.

We celebrate his life of service in the Navy, in the New York Assembly, and, of course, here in the Congress.

I am blessed to represent a district that includes many of the same communities that Maurice Hinchey represented. When I took office, I heard the same thing again and again: if you want to succeed, just do what Maurice Hinchey did. That advice is easier said than done, but I have tried.

He was one of a kind: a leader, a fighter, a gentleman, and a statesman. He was a tireless advocate for the Hudson River and for the larger environment.

We are all blessed to have been served by him, and he will be sorely missed.

MOVE THE U.S. EMBASSY TO JERUSALEM

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, the Jerusalem Embassy Act, signed by President Clinton, requires the American Embassy in Israel to be moved to Jerusalem. But this law also allows the President to waive the act every 90 days, which has happened ever since.

This Friday, President Trump must decide to sign another waiver or to honor our friend and ally, Israel. I rise to call on President Trump to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem.

Jerusalem is the eternal, undivided capital of Israel, yet our Embassy is in Tel Aviv. This is disrespectful, dismissive, and wrong. It sends the message that Israel cannot designate its own capital city.

Some claim that moving the Embassy threatens peace between Israel and Palestinians. But the Palestinian Authority does far more to jeopardize peace than the location of our Embassy. They name schools after terrorists and Nazis, teach children that the murder of Jews is noble, and they pay the salaries of terrorists.

Moving our Embassy will tell the Palestinian Authority that their days of denying Israel's existence are over, and that they must become a partner in peace.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now. It is time to honor our promise to Israel and to move the American Embassy to Jerusalem.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSMAN MAURICE HINCHEY

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my longtime friend and colleague, Maurice Hinchey, who passed away this month at the age of 79.

A lifelong public servant, Congressman Hinchey was a steadfast champion for New York's Hudson Valley and never wavered in his commitment to the people he served, the communities he represented, and the causes in which he believed.

Over his 20 years in the Congress, Congressman Hinchey helped shape the course of his environmental movement and record, and as a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee, he always put the Hudson Valley and New York State first, ensuring that our priorities were reflected in the Nation's spending policies and securing New Yorkers' fair share of Federal resources.

Congressman Hinchey inspired and influenced not only a generation of public servants and community leaders, but also those of us who had the good fortune to serve alongside him in this body. We will miss him deeply.

My thoughts are with Congressman Hinchey's wife, Ilene; his children, Michelle, Reese, and Josef; and the countless people in the Hudson Valley and beyond whose lives he enriched.

CATASTROPHIC FLOODING AID

(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, certainly my deepest thoughts as well to the Hinchey family.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I come from an area that saw the greatest catastrophic flooding in the history of the continental United States. Someone asked me: I haven't heard anything from your State.

I said to them: We are still hurting.

We do have 120,000 to 130,000 homes still under water. People are living in shells.

I am not selfish. I know what is going on in Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Florida. We begged the administration to give us the amount of money in their request for what was needed, and we got \$44 billion for every victim from the U.S. Virgin Islands to Puerto Rico to Florida to Texas. I can't stand for that, for the desperate people who are in need.

I ask the President to reevaluate his submission and to submit to us a reasoned response to the devastation of this State and the other States. I ask the appropriators, who I know are very concerned, to come together to give us the emergency supplemental so that homes can be rebuilt, that homes can be bought out, and that, in fact, the infrastructure that is crumbling and caused the major flooding, that reservoir pools that flooded whole complete developments, can be fixed, that we can do infrastructure and save lives.

The people of the floods beg of you, and we will be in the fight.

THE TAX BILL

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill that this Chamber voted on 2 weeks ago was bad enough, added \$1.5 trillion to the debt, 36 million middle class households will see their taxes go up, and 50 percent of those tax cuts would go to the wealthiest 1 percent in this country.

But the Senate bill that is being debated on the other side of this Capitol right now is even worse. In addition to what I just described, we will see 13 million Americans lose their ability to see a doctor, to stay healthy, to take care of themselves, and even to live their lives.

For those lucky enough to have healthcare, their premiums in Texas, for example, will go up, on average, \$1,700 a year. We will see 1 million of our fellow Texans lose their health insurance if this bill passes.

Now, many people have called my office to ask what they can do to help. The number for the Capitol switchboard is 202-224-3121. It will be the public pressure that will help to form the political will for our colleagues in the Senate to do the right thing and to vote "no" on this tax bill.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAURICE HINCHEY

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life of Maurice Hinchey, a beloved friend and an awesome colleague.

I entered into the New York State Assembly when he was the environmental conservation chair for the New York State Assembly. I witnessed his fight to expose toxic contamination of Love Canal where he worked against illegal waste dumping by organized crime. I watched as he worked so hard to protect the Catskills and the Adirondacks from acid rain. It was there that I witnessed his integrity, his intellect, his compassion, and his passion to make a difference.

Then he came to Washington to serve this Nation. He worked hard to establish the Hudson River Valley Greenway. He worked hard to fight against PCB contamination of the Hudson River. He made certain that hydrofracking would not destroy our environment. He made certain that he spoke out against the Iraq war and spoke out against NAFTA and the damage it could do to American jobs.

This was a person who was principled. He acted with those principles with every fiber of his being. Today I want to recognize that person, our voice for the environment, a principled individual that the late Governor Mario Cuomo called the environmental conscience of New York State.

I extend my deepest condolences to his wife, Ilene Marder Hinchey; and his children, Reese, Josef, and Michelle.

I know that, in the last year of his life, Maurice and his family worked to raise awareness for frontotemporal degeneration. I am hoping that their fight will continue so that others impacted by this disease will be able to conquer that situation.

Maurice, rest in peace. You are a champion.

We don't live in a perfect world, perhaps we never will. But those who are disadvantaged and those who are in need will need a champion. That champion was Maurice Hinchey, and he will continue to inspire.

□ 1730

REMEMBERING FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAURICE HINCHEY

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to mourn the loss of our great colleague, Maurice Hinchey.

I knew Maurice for more than 30 years. We served together for many years in the New York State Assembly, and then he came to Congress.

In the assembly in Albany and all of New York State, he was known as one of the champions of the environment. He chaired that committee in Albany. When he came to Washington, he also, as my colleagues have said, championed green things and making sure the environment was safe for all of us for generations to come.

The thing that I really remember about Maurice Hinchey is what a nice person he was. He was soft-spoken but sharp, intelligent, and honest. He was the kind of person who was in public service for all the right reasons and really was a model Member of Congress for so many of us. Whether you agreed with him or disagreed with him, he listened to you. He was a tenacious fighter and a really smart individual who really, really knew his subject.

The thing I remember about Maurice is what a nice guy he was, how soft-spoken he was, and how caring he was. He didn't enter public life to get the accolades. He entered it because he really believed government should make a difference and could make a difference.

Let me say, Maurice, you did make a difference: You made a difference to many in America; you made a difference to those of us in New York State; you made a difference to your friends who served in the New York State Assembly in Albany; and you made a difference in the United States Congress here in Washington.

Rest in peace, Maurice. We will miss you, but we will never forget you.

REMEMBERING FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAURICE HINCHEY

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring the memory, legacy, and public office of Maurice Hinchey.

Mo and I were elected in the same election in 1974 and met during freshman orientation that December on a cold Albany day. From then on, we were friends.

I came from the South Bronx, so I knew about the issues of the environment, but I didn't know the intricacies of how they should be approached legislatively. He taught me all about it, as he did our whole freshman class. From

day one, he was that person who spoke about saving this Earth, saving this country, and saving this land that has been loaned to us.

In addition, Maurice was, as has been said here, one of the nicest guys you could ever imagine. He was a unique elected official. He was a liberal in a conservative district who was loved by his constituents.

Early in my assembly career, the first year, I visited his district and saw how he cared for the people and how they cared for him. He took me all around. It was wonderful how he loved his community.

He taught us that there were places outside of New York. I will always remember Maurice used to say to me: I have got to go to New York City once a month.

I said: Why?

He said: Just to charge my batteries, get the big city lights, and then I come back.

He was a special human being. He could play softball and swing a bat like no one else.

I will miss you, my brother. I will miss you. You are special. The people will miss you forever.

IN MEMORY OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAURICE HINCHEY

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week we lost one of the finest people ever to serve the people of New York State and the country when Congressman Maurice Hinchey passed away.

I would like to express my deepest condolences to his wife, Ilene; his sons, Reese and Josef; his daughter, Michelle; and the entire Hinchey family.

Maurice leaves behind a legacy of service that is second to none. During his 18 years in the New York State Assembly, he became what former Governor Mario Cuomo called "the environmental conscience of New York State" for his groundbreaking investigations into polluters and landmark environmental laws.

When he came to Congress in 1993, he continued that work, creating the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area, preserving wild public lands, and doing everything possible to clean and protect his beloved Hudson River.

Maurice and I came to Congress in the same class and we became fast friends. I already miss him dearly, but I know that his work and his legacy will be remembered for generations to come. To know him was to love him.

Rest in peace, my dear friend.

GOP TAX SCAM

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans will lie awake in

bed this evening worried about their ability to take care of their families because they simply don't make enough money and are struggling with the daily needs of life.

What is the Republican Party working to do to make it even worse?

Passing a tax cut for the richest people in this country, the most powerful corporations, that will result in raising taxes on 82 million families, providing \$1.5 trillion debt for the next generation, making deep cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, Pell grants, and infrastructure—all things that are necessary to grow and strengthen the middle class of this country—which will be a huge boon to the richest people in America.

The Senate version will also remove 13 million people from having access to affordable healthcare. The Republicans in the Senate are doing this right now.

The American people need to be certain that their voices are being heard to stop this proposal. It is a scam that will impose tremendous costs on working people in this country. It will provide tremendous benefits to the very powerful and very wealthy. It incentivizes American companies to ship American jobs overseas by making those incentives more generous.

The American people deserve a better deal. They deserve better wages, better jobs, and a better future. They deserve a much better deal than this raw deal these Republicans are giving in this tax scam.

GOP TAX SCAM

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to provide every American with a plot summary of the GOP tax scam.

Step one: cut taxes for powerful billionaires and millionaires.

Step two: grow a giant, \$2.5 trillion debt.

Part of that is to also grow the deficit so we can get to step three: use that to justify cuts to Medicare and Social Security for our seniors.

Our ability to protect our environment for the future, education, infrastructure, research and development, homeland security, and our military all will see cuts if this goes through.

If you are worried about income inequality, this puts that disparity on steroids by charging the credit card and getting rid of popular deductions to boot, and it will ship jobs overseas by lowering the abroad tax rate.

But don't take my word for it. While Main Street continues to suffer, Wall Street is throwing a party with record stock increases today.

It is time to take a stand against the GOP tax scam.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: GOP TAX SCAM

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

gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here this evening on behalf of the Progressive Caucus in Congress, which is in very strong opposition to both the House and Senate versions of the tax scam that is speeding through the United States Congress this week. We have several members who would like to participate in this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE). He is a passionate representative of the people of Rhode Island and a real champion of the American middle class.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, for yielding.

I want to quote Congressman RASKIN, who has said before, and I think it actually accurately captures what is happening: The Republicans are moving at the speed of light in the dark of night to jam through this proposal which will visit so much harm upon our economy and upon the American people, and particularly onto working families.

I think it is important to say, at the outset, that the process that has produced this piece of legislation that is now under consideration in the Senate—their own version of the same proposal—is an important thing to understand.

The last time that we did comprehensive tax reform—it was before I arrived in Congress—there were hundreds of people who testified. There were hearings to really understand the implications of these proposals.

Our economy is complicated. Tax policy is complicated. You want to be sure that you are making the right decisions based on good information, good evidence, and the guidance of experts.

This proposal in the House and, similarly, in the Senate happened with no hearings. Not a single witness testified. In fact, it was drafted even without the participation of some of the Republican Members of Congress. It was presented as a finished product and then brought to the floor for a vote.

One of the reasons I would say, Mr. Speaker, that my Republican colleagues are trying to get this done so quickly is because the more the American people learn about this proposal, the more they realize that it is not something they support, and it undermines the long-term health and prosperity of our country.

What does it do?

It provides a huge, gigantic tax cut for the people at the very top. About 50 percent of the proposal goes to the top 1 percent.

It creates greater economic incentives to ship American jobs overseas. Think about that. It creates better incentives to send good jobs overseas.

It raises taxes on 82 million middle class families.

It imposes \$1.5 trillion additional debt on the next generation.

To pay for all of this, it imposes deep cuts on things that are so important to the economy and important to working families: Medicare, Medicaid. We will see more cuts in infrastructure, education, and all the things that are necessary to build and strengthen our economy.

This is a gigantic giveaway to the biggest corporations and the wealthiest people of this country, and it is paid for by the middle class. It is paid for by hardworking Americans.

There are, as I said just a moment ago, millions of people who lie awake at night worrying about whether or not they can make ends meet, take care of their families, and pay their bills because they are just not making enough money.

But instead of addressing that with a real tax reform proposal that provides real tax relief to middle class families and incentivizes the creation of good-paying jobs, this does just the opposite. It makes the situation worse. In fact, what the bill does, although its name is something about job creation, it does just the opposite because it is premised on this economic theory called trickle-down economics: if you let people at the very top hold on to more of their money, keep more of what they make, it will somehow just trickle down to the rest of us.

We know that is an economic theory that doesn't work. It doesn't work because what you really need to create jobs and to grow the economy is for people of the middle class to have a good-paying job and have money in their pockets so they can buy the goods and services businesses produce. That is how you grow the economy.

If you go to any small business in my State and ask, "What do you need to create another job to add to your number of employees?" they will tell you, "I need customers. I need people to buy the things I make and sell."

That is why having a tax policy that invests in rebuilding the middle class and provides tax relief to middle class families and doesn't rely on this trickle-down economics is the way that you grow the economy. This does just the opposite.

In addition to that proposal on the Senate side, they have inserted another proposal that will strip away healthcare from 13 million Americans.

Think about this: Just when you thought this bill or this approach couldn't get any worse, the Senate Republicans have done that.

We had a rally today with folks from all across this country who are standing up to say: This is not fair. This makes our Tax Code worse. This provides no relief for the people who need it. It doesn't help small businesses. Instead, it is a reflection of what a swamp Washington is.

All those folks who have a lot of political power, who spend a lot of money on elections, have allowed or have demanded that a tax bill go forward that benefits them.

Shame on my colleagues. This is a disgrace. What this is going to do to our economy and to working families is something that everyone who votes for this will be responsible for.

We are still hoping that we can defeat this proposal in the Senate and move forward in a bipartisan way for serious tax reform that will grow the economy, that will provide relief to middle class families, that will help raise people's wages and not be a huge giveaway for the richest people in the country, the most powerful corporations, incentivizing shipping American jobs overseas and then giving the bill to the next generation and to working families in this country.

This is dead wrong. We have to defeat it.

I thank my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, for organizing this Special Order hour so we can continue to bring attention to this horrible piece of legislation, which, by the way—I will end with this—is not tax reform. This is a scam being visited upon the American people. We need to do everything we can to stop it.

□ 1745

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CICILLINE for his strong leadership for the people of Rhode Island and his dedication to the middle class of America, which is besieged and under attack today in Washington, D.C. You know, the former Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Rubin, came and said that this is the worst piece of tax legislation he had seen ever in the history of the United States of America.

Now, the good news is that the American people have taken a look, and they don't like it. By more than 2-1, the American people in public opinion polls are rejecting this plan. The Quinnipiac poll found that American voters are rejecting the plan by more than 2-1, with 52 percent disapproving and only 25 percent approving. Every day, the more people find out about it, the more that they hate the guts of this bill and what is inside of the tax plan.

We are in a situation of "beat the clock" now. Can we get the information out to the people, Mr. Speaker, about what is in this bill before it is rammed through the United States Congress?

So let's start with this: 82 million middle class households are going to see their taxes go up over the next decade. They are going to completely obliterate the State and local tax deduction, which States like mine, Maryland, New Jersey, Connecticut, California, Illinois, are going to be killed by, because if you make investments in your educational infrastructure, if you make investments in the transportation infrastructure, now they want to abolish the State and local tax deduction and make you pay twice for the same money that you have earned, while driving pressure down on the States to eliminate investment in the people who live in the States.

Well, so they are going to raise taxes on millions of middle class families. Why? So they can slash taxes for the wealthiest corporations and the wealthiest people in the country. They want to slash the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 20 percent at a time of record corporate profits in America.

They say that everybody is going to get wage increases by that. But we have already got record corporate profits, and we have seen wage growth be stagnant under the policies that are being propounded by the GOP in Congress.

If you want to increase people's wages, increase the minimum wage. Have some courage. Have some honesty. Let's increase the minimum wage. Let's give America a raise. That will work, not just showering billions of dollars more on the richest people in the country.

By the way, it is not just the richest people in the country. One-third of corporate ownership in America goes to foreign investors. That is right. So if we decide to give \$1½ trillion to investors in America with a corporate tax break, one-third of that money is going to leave America immediately and go to China or Saudi Arabia or wherever the rich corporate investors are.

The purpose of this bill isn't even just to enrich the wealthiest people in America. It is to enrich the wealthiest people on Earth because the money is going to be flying overseas as soon as we institute this corporate tax cut.

Then they build up record deficits: \$1.5 trillion to \$2 trillion in deficits on the House and Senate plans—which are twiddle dumb and twiddle dumber—\$1.5 trillion to \$2 trillion that the children, the grandchildren, and the great-grandchildren of the middle class are going to be paying back for decades so there can be a party on Wall Street; so there can be a party among the 1 percent; so Donald Trump's family, according to *The New York Times*, can collect up to \$1 billion in tax relief.

How are they doing it?

Well, for example, they want to abolish the estate tax, which right now applies only to two of the richest 1,000 families in America. You take 1,000 families, only two of them are even paying the estate tax because it applies only to the wealthiest people in the country. They want to abolish that; totally in contradiction to the design of the Founders of America who did not want to see the transmission of millions, much less hundreds of millions, much less billions of dollars from one generation to the next because they understood that the intergenerational transmission of that kind of wealth is a threat to democracy.

At a certain point, people have enough houses, they have enough yachts, they have enough helicopters.

And now what do they want to buy? They want to buy a governorship. They want to buy a Senate seat. They want to buy a whole institution like the House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate.

That is not democracy, and the Founders knew it. That is plutocracy.

So the radical economic inequality, which they want to cement into place with this tax bill, is a direct threat to the Democratic values of country, the Democratic values of the Founders of America.

They want to eliminate the student loan interest deduction and lifetime learning credits, a direct assault on middle class upward mobility. They want to make it much more expensive for young people to go to college and then to pay their loans back.

They want to eliminate the medical expense deduction, which millions of families have used in order to take care of a loved one who has a serious long-term illness or is in long-term care. They just want to get rid of the medical expense deduction. You should read the letters and the emails that I am getting from families that are saying: "This will bankrupt us."

Right now, under the medical expense deduction, if you are spending more than 10 percent of your income on medical expenses, you can start to deduct it. They want to get rid of that.

Oh, guess who else that hits as collateral damage in the war against the middle class.

Families with children with special needs. Right now, families with children with special needs can go to a private school and they can deduct the tuition and expenses of that education as part of the medical expense deduction.

Well, the GOP wants to get rid of that, too, because I suppose life is just not hard enough on families in America who have kids with autism or kids with muscular dystrophy or kids who face any other manner of physical or neurological or mental or emotional problems.

We should be on the side of the families who are struggling with special needs children. We should be on their side. We should be on the side of the State and local governments that are trying heroically to address it. Instead, this legislation will pull the rug out from beneath families with special needs.

They want to impose dramatic new limits on the mortgage interest deduction, which, again, has been essential for the middle class to be able to partake of homeownership, which has been so much a part of building the middle class in our country.

Now, because the public is rebelling against this terrible tax plan the way the public rebelled against their terrible ACA repeal plan, which would have stripped 30 million Americans of their healthcare—by the way, the Senate plan now has smuggled into it a provision which would go back to the discredited ACA repeal plan by trying to throw millions of people off of their healthcare by overturning the individual mandate.

Well, the public has figured this out, and, here, in Washington, it is a race against the clock.

Will the tidal wave of public opinion reach Washington in time to stop them from passing a special interest tax scam, which appeals only to the top 1 percent of the country? Or will they be able to get it through in time?

But I appeal to my colleagues across the aisle, I beseech them, and I beg them to revisit the whole thing. This is not how we accomplish successful tax policy in the United States of America.

We did it in 1986. The Democrats and Republicans came together to do it.

You know how we did it?

With more than 2½ years of hearings, discussions, policy debates, town hall meetings all over America. We invited the best ideas to come from all sides, and it passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives. It passed overwhelmingly in the U.S. Senate. The tax reform proposal, at the end, had been vetted and debated so much, everybody had contributed to it, it was so uncontroversial that it passed the House on a voice vote overwhelmingly, maybe unanimously. Nobody even asked for a rollcall vote. The Senate passed its version by a near unanimous vote of 97–3.

You see, that is how you do real tax reform. You bring the parties together to do it. There were more than 250 witnesses who appeared in the House Ways and Means Committee, who appeared before the Senate Finance Committee. Sure, there were some knockdown, drag-out fights; sure, the Democrats and Republicans were fighting like cats and dogs, but we were committed to coming up with a consensus product that would work for America, and we did it.

What we are seeing in Washington today is the exact opposite. The determination is to pass a completely partisan piece of legislation at all costs, with a very narrow majority running over the minority completely, and it is not going to work because America is a democracy. Taxation is the way that we support our government; the projects that we develop together. In taxation of all fields, we need to make sure that we are getting the best ideas from all sides. You can't ram it through and you can't crush the opposition.

What we are going to end up with—if they do manage to power this through with every manner of a backroom deal and a sweetheart contract and special interest strings attached, if they do manage to get it through, what you are going to have is a plan that is going to bankrupt the middle class the way that Donald Trump bankrupted four or five businesses.

The difference is that if you bankrupt a hotel, if you bankrupt a casino, if you bankrupt a corporation, well, there were laws that allow you to get back on your feet, and Donald Trump used them handsomely. He got back on his feet through the bankruptcy laws.

But what happens if you bankrupt the middle class of America? What happens if you bankrupt the government of the United States?

This is irresponsible. This is not responsible governance that is taking place, to be advancing a plan that a recent Secretary of the Treasury has called the worst tax plan ever ventured forth in the history of the United States of America.

We asked the majority in the House and the Senate to pull the plug on this terrible assault on the middle class, pull the plug on the tax scam, and let's go back to the hearing rooms and let's have some real hearings, let's have experts come in and let's look at how to relieve the tax burden on hardworking middle class taxpayers, relieve the tax burden on families that have special needs children, relieve the tax burden on people struggling to go to college and graduate school.

Why don't we try to bolster and strengthen the charitable sector and colleges and universities and schools across the land instead of trying to undermine them in order to occasion a dramatic shift of income in wealth up the ladder in the country?

Let's get back to work together, because if you are able to muscle this plan through the House and the Senate using every trick in the book except for negotiation and compromise and cooperation, it will be a disaster for the American people.

It will come back not only to haunt the political careers of people who assented to it and participated in it, but it will come back to haunt the entire country because the deficits and the debt will be out of control. We know that from every nonpartisan budget estimate and economist that has looked at it, every single one across the spectrum. Even the ones who are using the GOP's preferred method of dynamic scoring are saying it is going to be hell in terms of deficits and in terms of the debt.

So we are going to end up having to cut Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. That is what they are going to target next.

Whatever happened to the budget hawks? Are they an extinct species now? They are certainly an endangered species. Or have they just become budget ostriches?

□ 1800

They are hiding their heads in the sand while this highway robbery takes place in the Halls of Congress. Then they will come back next year, and they will say: Oh, look at these terrible deficits; we have got to cut Social Security; we have got to cut Medicare; we have got to cut Medicaid.

Now, suddenly, we are reborn as budget hawks again. We are born-again budget hawks. We can expect that to happen.

In the meantime, economic inequality in the country will continue to deepen and spread, and economic desperation will spread. We don't need to do this, Mr. Speaker, we do not need to do this. We are at a time of record corporate profits; record corporate pros-

perity. Wall Street has never been riding higher than it is now.

Why do we need to cut corporate taxes from 35 to 20 percent? Why do we need to start exporting more jobs abroad by instituting this new territoriality principle for taxes? A very fancy name that they assigned to it, do you know what it means? It means that if a business person is going to set up a factory on Main Street America with 1,000 jobs, they are going to pay full taxes on their business; but if they set it up in Hong Kong, or Singapore, or Mexico, or Switzerland, or the Cayman Islands, they are going to pay zero on it because it is not made in the United States. That is in this bill.

Now, they say they are going to recapture some of the money if it gets really obscene, but why should we have that principle at all now? In fact, the law today is compromised enough. It says that if they relocate their businesses abroad, they don't pay taxes until the profits are repatriated—until the profits come back. Now, all of it is on paper. The companies haven't really moved anywhere. That is dubious enough as it is.

They want to make the current system worse. They want to say that if you set up your business abroad, if you ship it overseas, either really or on paper—like to the Cayman Islands, or something like that—you escape taxation completely. Maybe we will be able to recapture a little bit of it later through some accounting tricks, but basically this is a massive invitation to corporate America to outsource jobs overseas—to ship our jobs overseas.

Now, I know the President of the United States is not much of a policy wonk. I am not sure if they have apprised him of this provision yet.

Mr. Speaker, I hope someone who is in touch with the President of the United States gets in touch with him and tells him that his campaign promise to put America first—promise to put American jobs first—and the tax plan that he is about to append his name to, if this actually happens, will be responsible for outsourcing and offshoring millions of American jobs, and profits, and taxes. That is built into this legislation, with a lot of other nasty surprises that surface every single day, as we try to figure out what is happening on this speeding train of the tax plan.

This process has nothing to do with representative democracy; it has nothing to do with integrity in the work of the people's representatives.

So, we ask our colleagues: Let's take a breather. The American people don't like what they see. They are rejecting it by more than 2 to 1 in all of the polls.

I have spoken to my colleagues across the aisle, who are getting very nervous about their emails, and their letters, and their calls right now, just like they got very nervous about the ACA repeal—which seemed like a great

idea, until they had a majority in Congress—and then they realized that they were going to throw millions of people to the streets.

Now it is a question of whether or not you want to outsource and offshore millions of jobs, whether you want to drive a \$1.5 trillion or \$2 trillion hole in the American deficit and in our economy, and whether you want to, basically, loot the middle class for the purposes of a big payday on Wall Street, and among foreign investors from Hong Kong to Saudi Arabia?

Well, that is the question. That is the choice that faces America this week, Mr. Speaker. That is what we are looking at. And who are we as a people? And do we have some sense—some semblance even—of community such that the GOP would want to try to get even 10 votes or 15 votes from the Democrats? No. All of the Democrats are opposing it.

Fortunately, 13 Republicans have crossed the aisle to say that they cannot stomach what they are seeing in this bill. We understand that there may be more coming this week, who are saying that they simply cannot tolerate what is taking place with this legislation.

But, as always, Mr. Speaker, this is a democracy that we are aspiring to be, not a plutocracy, not a theocracy, not a family government, not a royal government, but a democracy, which means that we place all of our faith and hope in the people to speak up, to talk to their representatives, to get in touch with them, and to ask them to read the fine print, so that we are not voting for a tax scam, instead of a tax bill.

All of the American people have a responsibility to get in touch with their legislators, Mr. Speaker, to ask: What is in the bill, and how is it going to affect us and the more than 80 million middle class families, who are going to end up seeing a tax hike over the next decade? And how is it going to affect people who take the State and local tax deduction and people who use the medical expense deduction for their families? And how is it going to affect people who have graduated from college and now are struggling to buy a house, or to get an apartment, or to move out of their parents' basement? And how is it going to affect them when the deduction for college student loan interest is abolished?

We need to slow down. We need to examine the priorities and the values that are built into this bill and see whether they actually square with the values, the beliefs, the priorities of the American people, and the needs of the American people.

We think this legislation is way off, Mr. Speaker. We ask the GOP majority to consider the unanimous opposition of the democratic block in Congress; we ask them to consider the public opinion polls, which show the American people rejecting the details of this bill by more than 2 to 1; and we ask

them to start over. Let's do it the way Congress did it back in 1986, when Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan got together, and the Democrats and Republicans talked about it, fought about it, and debated it. But they came up with a plan that, in the end, the vast majority of Congress and the vast majority of the people could support.

Let's not walk the plank for the 1 percent here. We know that there are some tiny interests in America that want to see this pass. Let's not walk the plank in Congress for a bill that reflects the interests of only the tiniest group of people. Let's do the job imagined by that great Republican President, who served in this body, proudly, from Illinois, in the House of Representatives: Abraham Lincoln, who spoke of "government of the people, by the people, for the people." That is the part of that great triad that we will be betraying if we pass this bill, because it is not for the people, it is for the 1 percent.

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

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 245. An act to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources; in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 254. An act to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

S. 343. An act to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to Indians; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 669. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 772. An act to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 825. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources; in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 1285. An act to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon,

the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, the Klamath Tribes, and the Burns Paiute Tribes to lease or transfer certain funds; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2810. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 1, 2017, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3242. A letter from the Honors Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rules — Truth in Lending (Regulation Z) [Docket No.: CFPB-2017-0027] received November 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3243. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Chester County, PA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2017-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8497] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3244. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Carroll County, IA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2017-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8495] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3245. A letter from the Program Specialist, LRAD, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rules — Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Exemption Threshold [Docket No.: OCC-2017-0016] (RIN: 1557-AE25) received November 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3246. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Health Education Assistance Loan (HEAL) Program [Docket ID: ED-2017-OPE-0031] (RIN: 1840-AD21) received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3247. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 08-17, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3248. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-58, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3249. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective October 15, 2017, that Danger Pay was authorized for Drug Enforcement Agency employees at the following overseas locations: Guayaquil and Quito, Ecuador and Asuncion, Paraguay; and Danger Pay was authorized for Federal Bureau of Investigation employees at the following overseas locations: N'djamena, Chad and Abuja, Nigeria, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; Public Law 98-164, Sec. 131; and Public Law 101-246, Sec. 151, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3250. A letter from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the Commission's Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress, for the period April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3251. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's Agency Financial Report of Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3252. A letter from the Director, White House Liaison, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3253. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3254. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's Fiscal Year 2017 Performance and Accountability Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3255. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Inspector General's semiannual report for April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3256. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Office of the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting a notification of a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3257. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Office of the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3258. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Groundfish Fishery; Fishing Year 2017; Recreational Management Measures [Docket No.: 161220999-7682-02] (RIN: 0648-BG52) received November 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3259. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2017-2018 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Amendment 27 [Docket No.: 160808696-7010-02] (RIN: 0648-BG17) received November 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3260. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2016 annual report to Congress describing the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section, within the Department's Criminal Division, and the report on the nationwide federal law enforcement effort against public corruption, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529(a); Public Law 95-521, Sec. 603(a); (92 Stat. 187); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3261. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (OOREG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — VA Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Nomenclature Change for Position Title — Revision (RIN: 2900-AQ11) received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 477. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies (Rept. 115-341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3971. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify the requirements for community financial institutions with respect to certain rules relating to mortgage loans, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4488. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide conditional protected status for certain individuals who came to the United States as children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4489. A bill to provide for the preservation of America's outdoor heritage and enhance recreation opportunities on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, the Judiciary, Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Ms. LEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 4490. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and Tribal Governments and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 4491. A bill to reauthorize title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GIBBS, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 4492. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 4493. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require the impaneling of a new jury if a jury fails to recommend by unanimous vote a sentence for conviction of a crime punishable by death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BRAT, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GALLEGO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BACON, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PALMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. PITTEGER, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN,

Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MARINO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BLUM, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 4494. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to prohibit the use of public funds to pay awards and settlements in connection with claims under such Act which arise from sexual harassment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. BRAT, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 4495. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny as a trade or business expense deduction amounts paid or incurred in connection with the settlement of a sexual harassment or sexual assault claim; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 4496. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to nonattainment plan provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 4497. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to prohibit the use of public funds to pay settlements and awards for workplace harassment and discrimination claims under the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 which arise from acts committed personally by Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 4498. A bill to prohibit military assistance to countries that engage in arms transfers and activities with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4499. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to set the rate of pay for employees of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection in accordance with the General Schedule; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4500. A bill to restore protections for Social Security, Railroad retirement, and Black Lung benefits from administrative offset; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 4501. A bill to increase funding for the State response to the opioid misuse crisis and to provide funding for research on addiction and pain related to the substance misuse crisis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. SIRE, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 4502. A bill to establish a review of United States multilateral aid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 4503. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to prohibit the imposition of nondisclosure agreements as a condition of the payment of an award or settlement in connection with a violation of such Act, to require Members of Congress to reimburse the Treasury for amounts paid as awards and settlements under such Act in cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 4504. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, the Financial Stability Act of 2010, and the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to improve access to information in the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, House Administration, the Judiciary, Ethics, Ways and Means, 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 Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SABLÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 4505. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a minimum salary threshold for bona fide executive, administrative, and professional employees exempt from Federal overtime compensation requirements, and automatically update such threshold every 3 years; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mrs. RADEVAGEN, Mr. KIND, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4506. A bill to provide incentives to encourage tribal job creation and economic activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, 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. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 4507. A bill to require assurances that certain family planning service projects and programs will provide pamphlets containing the contact information of adoption centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 636. A resolution relating to the exercise of the authority of the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. COLE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BOST, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARR, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WALKER, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H. Res. 637. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the symbols and traditions of Christmas should be protected for use by those who celebrate Christmas; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H. Res. 638. A resolution recognizing the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, as the national aviation cadet museum of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. PEARCE:

H.R. 4488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes)

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H. R. 4491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1, "all legislative powers herein granted shall be

vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare" of Americans.

In the Department of Education Organization Act (P.L. 96-88), Congress declared that "the establishment of a Department of Education is in the public interest, will promote the general welfare of the United States, will help ensure that education issues receive proper treatment at the Federal level, and will enable the Federal Government to coordinate its education activities more effectively." The Department of Education's mission is to "promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access."

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 4492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 4493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause "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 Office thereof."

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 4494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2 ("Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.").

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 4495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 4496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 4497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 4498.

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. DUFFY:

H.R. 4499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States);

and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 4500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 4501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 4502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 4503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 4504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 4505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 4506.

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. WITTMAN:

H.R. 4507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 35: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 140: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 173: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 176: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 233: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 303: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 368: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 394: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 502: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 535: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 564: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 611: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 632: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 754: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 807: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 881: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 912: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 913: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 930: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KIHUEN, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 936: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1078: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1114: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1164: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1167: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 1205: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1247: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1291: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1299: Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 1322: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1374: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1457: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1486: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1569: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1639: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1734: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 1739: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1847: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1953: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1987: Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1989: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2035: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2077: Mr. CULBERSON and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2219: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2234: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2340: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2404: Ms. HANABUSA and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2472: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2491: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2514: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 2591: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2598: Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2616: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2646: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2670: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2687: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2740: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2747: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 2862: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 2899: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2906: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2926: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 3030: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 3127: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 3255: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3350: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 3397: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 3495: Ms. NORTON, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3530: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3595: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3596: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 3602: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3632: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3635: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 3637: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 3671: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 3687: Ms. MENG and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3730: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3734: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3746: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3762: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 3787: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 3817: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3845: Ms. MOORE and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 3861: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 3871: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3919: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 3958: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 3971: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3994: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 4030: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4044: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 4052: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4114: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 4149: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 4206: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 4222: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4234: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 4240: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 4253: Mr. PANETTA and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4254: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 4265: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 4300: Mr. KEATING, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4314: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 4318: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 4333: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4345: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4391: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 4396: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PRICE of Washington, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HECK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TITUS, Ms. LEE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BERA, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KIND, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4398: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 4413: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 4426: Mr. KHANNA and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4427: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 4444: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOYER, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4446: Mr. SABLON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4465: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 4474: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H. Con. Res. 52: Ms. HANABUSA.

H. Con. Res. 90: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Res. 15: Mr. NEAL, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mrs. HANDEL.

H. Res. 466: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Ms. GRANGER.

H. Res. 495: Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. HANDEL, and Mr. ALLEN.

H. Res. 602: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HECK, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. PALMER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Res. 625: Mr. EVANS.