baseline. The baseline is what we should be judged by. Every year, whether I am here or another Member is here, I am hoping someone will come up here and say: Okay, here is what we took in. Did we exceed what the baseline was? Did we get less?

Well, over the next couple years, we will probably get less than that June baseline. But what also happened to the projections, the curve, the size of the economy? Remember, at the beginning of this discussion, we talked about some really neat things happening in our society.

When we started to work on the actual drafting of the tax reform bill at the beginning of the year, we were living in a world that was only going to grow in the United States about 1.8 percent GDP growth, and today we are over 3. Now, some of that is anticipatory effects. Some of that is a little excitement. There is a lot of confluence. But understand what that means in revenues and opportunities and just good things for everyone in our society.

So we are going to go to the next board just because this one is really hard to read.

So here is what I am asking everyone to do. If you be on the left, if you be on the right, if you happen to be in the media, understand that the June number was that, over the 2017 baseline, for functionally the next 10 years, was $43 trillion of revenue. That is fair. Judge us on that.

So 10 years from now, maybe someone will remember this and look back and say: Did we take in more revenues or less revenues in that time? Because, if you consider what was said by the left, it was the end of the world.

So that is the baseline number. We have on the previous chart sort of what was projected each year for the next 10 years.

So, if I am blessed to be here a year from now, I will come back January 2019, stand behind this microphone, and we will look at the revenues that came in in the 2018 fiscal year compared to what we projected months before the tax reform became real. Judge us by that, but don't come behind these microphones and make up Armageddon and then make up stories about what has taken place in the past.

This is important, because if you care about people, if you care about opportunity, we have some real difficulties coming towards us.

In lots of the data and lots of the charts, in about a decade and a half, 18 years or so, we hit a debt crisis, and your options are really simple. You have to do substantial reductions to the dollars flowing out that are substantially in entitlements because, remember, three-quarters of this government's money rolls out in entitlements.

□ 2030

Only about 15 percent of our spending is actually defense, and another 13 or so is everything else you think of government. Three-quarters of it is Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—all the things that are just formula.

And where we are right now, the peak of the baby boom is 60 years old today. So economist after economist after economist, particularly those on the left, have told us you can't grow more than 1.8 percent GDP. You are heading towards a debt crisis. You are heading towards this Armageddon.

So why wouldn't you stand up here, work to reform regulatory codes, the Tax Code, the immigration codes, these things, and maximize the things that will create growth and opportunity? I think that is just what, at least on the Republican side, we have been doing.

So the reason I put up this chart is more to lay a marker. I used the term ''goal line'' before. Understand that is the number before the tax reform, and I believe a lot of it is anticipatory effects on the economy. Hold us by that.

Now, who knows who will still be around here 10 years from now, but will revenue exceed $43 trillion? That is the benchmark. You can't say: Well, the debt went to this, our spending went to this, because they operate outside the revenues. That is policy decisions made here on what to spend, our disasters—God forbid—military action.

But the revenue number is what we should be judged by. And when you see what is happening right now in our communities, in our society, the number of organizations that have started to pay their employees more, the number of organizations that are bringing back billions of dollars to invest here in our country, the research, the development, maybe a lot of the Malthusian economists out there—and for those of you who don't get that, go look it up—who basically said the next three decades of our life are basically constrained, dear God, I hope they are wrong.

We as a body need to continue this optimistic opportunity of coming and saying: Okay. How do we get more of our brothers and sisters to actually be in the labor force?

We know today we have about 6 million jobs that are going unfulfilled, lack of skills. We also know from recent publications, because of the tax reform, businesses are taking some of those resources and putting them into job training and taking populations that were often being left on the sidelines and they are being drawn in. This is wonderful.

How do you actually turn to others and say: Should turning 65 or 67 be hitting a wall? How do we actually provide you the opportunity, if you so wish and so desire, to actually stay in the labor force and continue to help to grow this country? Because work, we know, is often good for the soul and the individual, but it is also really good for our tax revenues and really good for the size of our economy.

Remember, the bigger the economy gets, the less that cliff, that wall, that debt crisis that is about a decade and a half away, the more that gets pushed off into the future and the demographic curve that is those of us who are baby boomers, maybe that doesn't create a debt crisis. Maybe it actually turns into an opportunity for this economy, for this society to continue to grow and be happy and healthy and prosperous.

This is one of those times I get behind the microphone and I am actually excited from what I am seeing out there in the data. I ask this body, even with the partisan rancor, let's continue to adopt those policies that grow, that bring people, provide opportunities to be part of the labor force, to be part of the American Dream; and by doing that, the thing the left tells us they care about, income inequality, actually closes. The things so many of us care about of not hitting that debt crisis maybe get postponed, maybe never happen.

There is a path here, but it has to be everything. It has to be the tax reform. We just accomplished that. It has to be rationalizing our regulatory system. We are working on that. It has to be an immigration system that focuses on maximizing economic expansion. It has to be the adoption of technology. We are working on it. I think we can get there.

This is just fun having a chance to get behind this microphone and actually be positive and optimistic after the last few years of where things were quite dour.

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

MEDICAL MARIJUANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening with a heavy heart, deeply concerned about my fellow Floridians and my fellow Americans who have seen benefits as a consequence of medical marijuana.

Throughout this great country, there have been circumstances where States have chosen to experiment and afford their citizens the opportunity to receive medical marijuana treatments, and that opportunity flourished as a consequence of a series of actions, one of which was the Cole memo.

The Cole memo was direction from the Attorney General of the United States in the last administration not to prioritize the arrest and prosecution of people who were using medical marijuana legally under their State laws, not to punish the doctors or prescribers or dispensing organizations that were assisting in the logistics for that care but, instead, to focus our precious Federal resources where they could do the most good: to stop drug trafficking, human trafficking, illegal illicit activity that surrounds the drug trade, to

ensure that there wasn't access for minors or cartels or people who would drive a medical practice deeper into the black market.

It is deeply unfortunate that Attorney General Jeff Sessions has recently rescinded the Cole memo, placing into question the very channels of medicine that have helped so many of my constituents and so many fellow Americans.

This evening, I am going spend some time speaking about this issue, but I wanted to take the opportunity first and yield to my good friend, my colleague from the State of Florida, who has been a leader not only on this issue, but on so many of the critically important bipartisanship reforms that we should be working on here in the Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague Mr. GAETZ for this special hour to shine a light on this issue, on the Federal Government's overreach and unjust treatment of legally operating businesses all across our country.

Businesses that operate legally and in compliance with their State's laws and regulations deserve a Federal Government that respects the 10th Amendment of the Constitution.

Like my colleagues, I have been disappointed that, when it comes to the treatment of these legal marijuana businesses, the current administration, which supposedly respects the federalist model of our government, continues to take such drastic steps to ignore States' rights and the decisions of voters and State legislatures across the country.

In the 2016 elections, over 70 percent of Florida citizens voted to legalize the use of medical marijuana. The two counties that make up my own congressional district in south Florida, Monroe and Miami-Dade, voted in favor of the measure 80.3 percent and 68.3 percent, respectively. The voices and the votes of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, matter.

The 10th Amendment of the Constitution matters, and for those who like to call themselves constitutionalists, the entire Constitution has to matter, not just the parts that are convenient at a given time.

In addition to the witch hunt opened up by the Attorney General's actions last week, current Federal law also prohibits these businesses from deducting the common expenses associated with running a small business when they file their taxes, expenses necessary to running a business like rent, most utilities, and payroll. Simply put, this rule places legitimate enterprises which have been established under State law at a major competitive disadvantage where legal employers are paying exorbitantly higher effective tax rates.

That is why I introduced H.R. 1810, the Small Business Tax Equity Act, last year. This bipartisan bill amends the Tax Code to allow legally operating marijuana businesses to utilize common tax deductions and credits, thus providing them with tax parity.

The Federal Government should not be ignoring States' rights and the decisions of voters and State legislatures across the country. We must work to afford all businesses selling legal products the opportunity to make appropriate deductions and contribute to our economy and create jobs.

Another important point, Mr. Speaker—and again I thank my colleague for taking this time and bringing us together to talk about this issue in a bipartisan manner—the best ally of those who are operating illegally, the drug cartels, the drug traffickers who do not pay any taxes, who target children, the best ally they have are the policies that the Attorney General has embraced. Because what happens, Mr. Speaker, is that these legally operating businesses can no longer compete and people turn to the black market.

So, hopefully inadvertently—I hope inadvertently—the Attorney General has actually done a great favor to those who operate outside the law and is punishing those who are actually trying to control this substance, to keep it away from young people, to make sure that only those who have permission from their States, prescriptions from their doctors, can access this substance.

I am, again, so grateful to join my colleagues tonight to call on the Attorney General, on this administration, on this President, who, when he campaigned said, ''I will defer to the States; I will respect the States,'' and, in this case, a State like Florida, which voted for the President, also voted 71 percent to allow medical marijuana in our State, all the way from Key West to the panhandle.

The residents of Florida deserve to be respected. I will continue working with my colleagues on this side of the aisle, across the aisle, to make sure that our government respects States' rights, to make sure that our government is on the side of those who want to operate within the law, those who want to pay taxes, those who want to be compliant, not the gangs and the illegal drug traffickers who are celebrating today as a result of this dangerous policy change.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) for joining me this evening. Each and every point that Mr. CURBELO made wasn't partisan. It didn't lend itself to a conservative or a liberal ideology. It just made sense: just adhere to our constitutional principles in a way that we can help people without getting the government in the way.

I am particularly grateful that the movement criticizing Attorney General Sessions for this very poor judgment exercised is not a Republican movement or a Democratic movement. It is bipartisan.

In that bipartisan spirit, I yield to my friend Mr. CORREA from California. I want to thank the many Californians who have been a part of this effort going forward, and I yield to him.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I also am honored to join my colleagues from across the aisle tonight to talk about Attorney General Sessions' decision to rescind the Cole memo, which has guided the State of California as well as other States in pursuing reasonable cannabis regulation.

As a California State senator, we relied on the Cole memo to help craft California's cannabis industry regulatory framework.

□ 2045

I personally introduced legislation to regulate medical cannabis that was sponsored by the public safety community of the State of California. We all relied on the Cole memo. We all relied on regulating medical marijuana to make sure that it was chemical free, that it was tested, labeled, and that cannabis was kept away from our children, our neighborhoods, and our schools.

I remember working on this legislation, and one day I got a phone call from a Republican doctor who wanted to lecture me about my bill. I assumed he was opposed to the legislation, but, you know what, I wanted to hear him out. So I had him drive out to my district office. And during the meeting, he told me about his daughter, a young Miss Moynihan, who from birth to the age of 10—she was 10 years old—had had seizures. And every year, those seizures had gotten worse and worse. And the medication he had to use to keep the seizures under control had gotten stronger and stronger with terrible side effects on his beloved daughter.

Finally, Dr. Moynihan fell across medical cannabis. He used it. It was like a miracle. His daughter was getting better with no negative side effects. But then he said, ''Lou, I want to make sure that my daughter's seizures stop, but I want to make sure she doesn't get high,'' meaning what he wanted me to do in my legislation was to make sure that my legislation carried language to make sure that medical cannabis was tested and properly labeled.

All this doctor wanted was medical cannabis for his beloved daughter. And there are many patients like young Miss Moynihan that rely on medical cannabis, but she also relies on the proper regulation, and labeling, and manufacturing of medical cannabis.

Attorney General Sessions' doing away with the Cole memo effectively says to the State of California: You can no longer regulate medical cannabis. This will not be available for the young Moynihans of the State of California. I ask Attorney General Sessions to reinstitute the Cole memo. Let States do what States do best. Let's respect the sovereignty of our States, and let's move forward, not backward.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for joining

us this evening. His words are a clarion call to sympathize with, empathize with, and support parents who have children with refractory epilepsy and other diseases that lead to chronic and, at times, unstoppable seizures.

There is a desperation in the voice of parents who have children who have these seizures. That moves me. A child's eyes can roll in the back of their head. They can turn blue, gasping for air. The gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) referenced circumstances where a parent would reach out and ask for help.

I yield to the gentleman to maybe further explain how it makes you feel as a policymaker when you have got someone who wants to cut through the normal discord and disruption in the policymaking process, and they just want their child to be able to breathe in the absence of these debilitating symptoms. If the gentleman wouldn't mind, I yield to him for that explanation.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I just want to add, think about all of the progress that we made as a country, as a nation in regulating cannabis, medical cannabis, how so many States have relied on that Cole memo to be lawfully abiding citizens, lawful citizens, lawful businessmen, and States have also relied on that memo to make sure that their regulatory framework fits within Federal guidelines.

Much time, energy, effort, and resources have been invested by these States to make sure that we are following Federal law. And overnight, the Cole memo is gone. All of that work these States have put together is out the door. How do we tell all of these citizens that want to follow the law, want to pay their taxes, want to do what is right under the law that they are now criminals? This is not right. It is inconsistent with our due process. And at the end of the day, again, these are States' rights.

We have given effectively these powers, these abilities to the States to regulate medical cannabis. We cannot just turn our back and say: We didn't mean it. Sorry. Let's move forward.

I don't believe we can return to those days when we would lock up individuals for minor sources of cannabis. We can't go around the streets and arrest people for cannabis anymore, and, of course, Dr. Moynihan has to have the ability to continue to medicate his daughter.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish his constituents the best of luck in these trying times. One may reasonably wonder: What does the repeal of the Cole memo really mean for a patient, or a doctor, or a dispensing organization? It presents a series of logistical challenges that could be crippling not only to this industry, but to the very vulnerable Americans who rely upon it for medicine.

Today, all across America, banks do not know whether or not their receipt of deposits from cannabis organizations operating legally under the color of State law would subject that bank to some broader consequence, to the oppressive hand of the Federal Government coming in and creating all kinds of other bad consequences for the people who bank with that institution.

And so the result is that dispensing organizations that want to grow, that want to make investments, that want to do research, that want to be able to deliver to fragile and vulnerable patients, won't be able to meet payroll, won't be able to fund the infrastructure of their companies, and won't be able to do the research so that we find out what strains of cannabis can be uniquely helpful to specific ailments.

So this repeal of the Cole memo isn't merely a circumstance where you are okay, so long as you are not being arrested or prosecuted in that very moment. It literally erodes the framework that has allowed people to be able to bring medicine to the doorstep of some of our most vulnerable Americans.

That is the true danger here: confusing policy and lack of clarity regarding the rules. In an area where innovation could do so much good for people, why would we not want the clearest, most predictable rules possible? Why wouldn't we want the highest standards for testing, labeling, and research? Why wouldn't we want to introduce cannabis, not in a context that could lead to abuse, or money laundering, or other illicit activity? Why would we not want it introduced in the most clinical setting possible, approved by researchers, prescribed by doctors, and then used by patients that oftentimes have seen every other reasonable medical remedy fail.

I am a limited government guy. I just don't understand why any administration, Republican or Democrat, would want to place the government between vulnerable people and something that could potentially help them. Again, recognizing the bipartisan flavor of this evening, I wanted to take just a moment to recognize one of my conservative friends, someone who has led in this institution on conservative causes during his tenure here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wanted to join him just for a few moments to simply applaud the way in which he is raising this issue tonight.

I think it is incredibly important because it was Jefferson who actually said ''that the normal course of things was for government to gain ground and for liberty to yield.'' And you think about the significance of the 10th Amendment and what it says. Its words are real simple: ''Those powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

This is a gut-check moment on the degree to which we really believe in the 10th Amendment, and we really believe in a limited Federal Government. So I would make very quickly three points: one, what you are talking about tonight is ultimately about this larger question of whether States are simply proxies, if you will, worker bees, if you will, for the Federal Government and nothing more than that.

Are all decisions to be made in simply Washington, D.C., or can they actually be made at the local level? This issue that you are raising is ultimately not about marijuana, but it is about local voice and local control.

For instance, we have an oil drilling issue off the coast of South Carolina, and a number of us have raised it, not because it was our idea, but because every single municipality along the coast of South Carolina came out in unison with different resolutions, different proclamations that said: We don't want offshore, not so much for offshore, but for its impacts in the way that we develop as a coastline. And so this is ultimately about simply this larger question of: Does Washington make all of the calls, or is there a State government, a local government, and an individual involvement that actually are involved in the way that decisions get made?

I would, furthermore, say that this is a gut-check vote on the notion of federalism. Federalism is hard. The reason our Founding Fathers didn't want a king or a queen but wanted this massive process called a Republican and a Democratic voice that went with it was because, though it is a lot harder, it is a lot fairer—one man, one voice; not all voices in Washington.

So what I think is interesting, back when I was in a different role at the State level, I remember different bills coming across my desk from different counties, for instance, for proposed tax increases. And staff would say: You have got to veto that. And I would say: No, the counties are free to make stupid decisions. I don't agree with it. I think it is a mistake, but counties ought to be able to have the voice to decide what they want to do.

This is that exact same principle at play at the Federal level. And by having this quiltwork of different experiments in different States, and then being able to determine what works and what doesn't work, we are able to formulate national policy, not from on high, top down, but from the bottom up.

Finally, I make this simple point: this is about saying the Federal Government does not decide the complexion of a local business. I think that what was significant about one of your earlier speakers, CARLOS CURBELO, H.R. 1810—I am a cosponsor of his bill—it simply says, you have got to treat a local business as a local business. If it is legal locally, then you have got to treat it as such. And you can't come in and preempt from a Federal level and decide how local business is going to operate.

So for a lot of different reasons, I simply applaud what you have raised tonight. And I thank the gentleman for his voice and his very strong stand for liberty and conservative principles in doing so.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. It is worth noting that so many of the experiences that make up the people who serve in this body come from local government, or State legislatures, or governorships. I am very proud to have served in the Florida Legislature. I know my colleague, Mr. SANFORD, served as the Governor of the State of South Carolina. And we have seen how States can function as the laboratories of democracy. And from time to time, a State may look at another and say there is a circumstance where they have done something right, or they have done something that we wouldn't necessarily agree with. And then we can tailor proposals that have withstood scrutiny and review experiences in other States and try to improve upon them.

That is the great federalist system that our Founders promised us that remains guaranteed in our Constitution today. Federalism is not some quaint, little notion of how government should run. It is the enduring promise that we have a right to live under today. And so I thank my colleague for reminding the Congress that it is the States that are the necessary constituents of the Federal Government, not the other way around.

It highlights why the decision of the Attorney General to rescind the Cole memo was so deeply flawed because it highlights the arrogance of a Federal Government that believes that its policies should always stand in primacy to innovation at the State level.

Here, that innovation is helping people, and that is the point that I would really like to stress. I have met with hundreds of families in the State of Florida and throughout the country who have seen benefits from medical marijuana. This isn't a medical theory. It is not something that people are merely hopeful for. It has actually created a more meaningful quality of life in American families.

Why wouldn't we be for that? Why don't we want to champion the opportunity for a parent to be able to hear their child speak for the first time?

Why wouldn't we want to give a grandparent some respite who might be caring for a child that has compulsory and reflexive seizures?

Why wouldn't we want to help a caretaker who might be caring for a parent of their own suffering from Alzheimer's, or Parkinson's, or dementia where we have seen improved research and growing opportunity for progress?

□ 2100

The Attorney General's decision is a step backward, but it doesn't have to be, because the Trump administration can step forward and fulfill the promise that President Trump made on the campaign trail to respect the rights of States and to have a noninterference policy with medical marijuana.

I have called on Treasury Secretary Mnuchin to issue guidance and instruction to financial institutions that they will not be prosecuted or harmed or they will not face some adverse regulatory action if they continue to accept the deposits of medical marijuana companies. I am hopeful that Secretary Mnuchin has more foresight than we have seen from the Attorney General's Office and that he will provide this guidance.

Mr. Speaker, I would also ask that the President personally engage. I know the President. I know him to be a man with a huge heart who cares about people. Throughout the Trump family, there is a particular focus on caring for the vulnerable and children who have to deal with complex medical issues.

I would hope that the President and that the members of the administration would find it within their hearts to take action on this important priority. Let us not allow Attorney General Jeff Sessions to limit progress on American families and on an industry that is growing and creating jobs and developing key innovations that can help people.

Beyond dealing with this inartful rescinding of the Cole memo, there is broader medical marijuana reform that needs to happen. There is no excuse to maintain marijuana on the list of Schedule I drugs.

Schedule I is reserved for those drugs that have no medical value, that can't help anyone, and that should be subjected to the strictest scrutiny. Not even cocaine is a Schedule I drug. I don't even think that some of the drugs that are doing the most harm and causing the most deaths throughout the panoply of this opioid crisis are all Schedule I drugs. But marijuana is? It is indefensible, and it is indicative of a dogma of a lie that the Federal Government has told to the American people for a generation.

Think of the opportunity if we could come together and make some progress on this issue. Throughout the 115th Congress, we have had robust opportunities to debate about our discord and disagreement and to discuss issues where perhaps we won't be able to come together as Republicans and Democrats, but this should not be one of those issues. This isn't partisan. It is not even conservative or liberal. You just have to believe that the role of government isn't to hurt people who are trying to get better or hurt people who are trying to help others who are trying to get better.

We spend way too much time arresting people for marijuana in the first place. In the year 2015, 643,000 people were arrested for marijuana. That is one person every 49 seconds for a year. 574,000 of these arrests were for possession, not distribution or sale.

Forty percent of all drug-related arrests are for marijuana possession. This is particularly discriminatory. African Americans are more than 2½ times more likely to be arrested for possession than Whites.

Marijuana is a $20 billion industry in this country. If we allow Attorney General Sessions to have his way, we will drive that $20 billion into the black markets, into the hands of the money launderers and the cartels, and the consequence will be fewer solutions for patients.

Marijuana has shown tremendous promise in the treatment of Alzheimer's to slow the protein deposits on the brain. For patients with AIDS and HIV, medical marijuana can stimulate appetite and slow muscle wasting syndrome. It can function as an antinausea medicine, as an analgesic, and it can reduce peripheral neuropathy. For arthritis patients, there can be a reduction in certain types of symptoms that could clear people's airways suffering from debilitating arthritis.

We have also seen very favorable results for the many millions of Americans dealing with chronic pain who right now are getting prescriptions for opioids. So many of the prescriptions written for opioids today in America causing deaths, taking away our children, our aunts and uncles and our parents, could be avoided if we weren't prescribing opioids in the first place and if we had a lower impact alternative like medical cannabis.

People with cancer have been given new hope not only that these symptoms can be relieved through medical cannabis, but that the actual growth of tumors can be slowed. There is really great research that has been published by the British Journal of Pharmacology regarding the antitumor properties that medical cannabis can have. But, unfortunately, that research has to be done in Israel, in Europe, and in other places in the world because in this country we continue to maintain the indefensible policy that no research can reasonably occur on medical cannabis.

As a matter of fact, this very Attorney General and this very Department of Justice have frustrated reasonable efforts to make more medical cannabis available for research, to unlock cures for the American people and to help American families.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with this.

I wasn't always a believer in medical cannabis, but I met a girl in my district who was being told by her doctor that she was going to have to saw her brain in half to stop the seizures from firing across. Today, that little girl is a medical cannabis patient. She has traded surgeries for softball games; she

has traded doctors for dancing lessons; and she brings hugs, hope, and joy to our entire community. It is for her—it is for the millions of Americans benefiting from medical cannabis—that I call upon this administration to stop the Attorney General from harming Americans through his repeal of the Cole memo.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my bipartisan group of colleagues who joined with me this evening.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2157

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 195, FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–520) on the resolution (H. Res. 696) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 195) to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for January 16 and today on account of travel delays due to inclement weather.

Mr. VELA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of weather in district.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

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

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JENNIFER A. HEMINGWAY, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 27 AND OCT. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Jennifer A. Hemingway	10/27	10/28	Estonia		252.46			(3)			
	10/28	10/31	Czech Republic		1,242.15			(3)			
Committee total					1,494.61						1,494.61

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JENNIFER A. HEMINGWAY, Jan. 2, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX, Chairman, Jan. 5, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ROB BISHOP, Chairman, Jan. 8, 2018.