



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2018

No. 22

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 5, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER W. MARSHALL 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 8, 2018, 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 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

REMEMBERING COLLIN KENNEDY

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, recently, my office faced a tragedy when we received word that my former field representative Collin Kennedy had passed away due to injuries he had suffered in an accident.

A Manassas, Virginia, native and a West Virginia University graduate, politics ran in Collin's blood. He had worked on numerous campaigns for the Republican National Committee and

interned on Capitol Hill before beginning work in my office in 2015, where he worked until last September. Collin, who was 27, served as my field representative in Victoria, Bastrop, Lavaca, Caldwell, and Gonzales Counties, where he was known for his boundless enthusiasm, positive outlook, and passion for life.

Since his death, dozens of people have left notes and messages about the strong relationship that they have shared with Collin and the lasting impact he left on our communities. They spoke of his kindness, his great attitude, and his constant willingness to lend a hand. They shared their fond memories of him attending ribbon cuttings, banquets, community meetings, and more.

One of my current staff wrote a touching tribute that described Collin as "the gold standard of what it means to be a friend and colleague," and I couldn't agree more. Collin's outsized personality and exuberance were well known, and his ability to reach people and connect with them was extraordinary.

I have to admit, I was a little worried hiring a West Virginian to work in Texas. He was going to be my eyes and ears. But Collin was amazing at how easily he made friends and fit in as a transplant Texan. I was blessed to have Collin as a staff member, and my family and I were blessed to have him as a friend.

Our prayers are with his parents, Jeffrey and Susan; his brother, Zachary; the rest of his family; and countless friends.

Collin, thank you for your years of great work. You will be missed.

REMEMBERING ROBERT "BOB" AGRIFOGLIO

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to remember Robert "Bob" Agrifoglio, who passed away recently at the age of 73.

Born in Chicago, Illinois, Bob enlisted in the U.S. Air Force on his 17th

birthday and headed to basic training in San Antonio, Texas. From there, he was deployed to Japan, Colorado Springs, and many other places. He went on to train as an aircraft loadmaster, where he flew Presidential support missions, performed airdrops, and flew missions all over the world, including South Africa, South America, and the Middle East.

Bob received orders to go to Vietnam, where he flew in numerous missions before his plane crashed, tragically, killing his fellow crew members. Despite an aggressive push to return to the skies, Bob's injuries from that crash permanently removed him from flight service.

After 17½ years on Active Duty, he went on to work at the Department of Defense safety offices for the next 17 years, before he finally retired in 1996.

Bob never stopped serving the community, helping with veterans events, volunteering to help veterans with their healthcare issues, and helping to run a weekly Tuesday veterans' coffee service with Dotson Lewis and many other veterans in the Corpus Christi area.

Thank you, Bob, for your years of service not only to our country, but to the Corpus Christi community and all of your friends and fellow veterans worldwide. You will be missed.

REMEMBERING DON KASPAR

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to remember the life of a great constituent, Mr. Don Kaspar, who passed away, recently, at 88.

Don was born on November 24, 1928, in Shiner, Texas, where he graduated from Shiner High School in 1945. He served as the president of his class at Texas A&M, where he graduated in 1949 with a degree in agricultural administration.

He worked part-time factory jobs throughout school and served as a junior executive at Kaspar Wire Works, a

□ 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.

H739

company founded in 1898 by his grandfather.

During the Korean war, Don served in the United States Army as a second lieutenant and then as a first lieutenant, receiving a Combat Infantry Badge and a Bronze Star.

He then returned to Kaspar Wire Works, now Kaspar Companies, where he became CEO, and it grew from a small company with 18 employees to a multinational enterprise with nearly 1,000 employees. I was fortunate enough to tour the company a couple of years ago with Don and learned about the success of his ventures.

Despite his busy job, Don always had time to give back to the community. He was president of the Shiner Rotary Club, director of the Shiner Hospital Foundation, the first chairman of Shiner Youth Baseball, chairman of the Shiner United Way Fund, a local scoutmaster, chairman of the board at his local church, and more.

A pillar of the Shiner community, Don was married to the late Jean Welhausen Kaspar for 52 years and leaves behind 4 sons, their wives, 10 grandchildren, and 6 great-grandchildren.

Don, we miss you.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

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

Guide our minds, thoughts, and desires this day. By Your spirit, breathe into us a new spirit. Shape this Congress and our world according to Your design that we may fulfill Your will.

Bless the Members of the people's House. Give them attentive hearts and open minds, that through the diversity of ideas they might sort out what is best for this Nation. May their speech be deliberately free of all prejudice, that others might listen wholeheartedly.

Grant that all dialogue be mutually respectful, surprising even the most jaded with the emergence of unity and justice.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done here be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE 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.

HIGHLIGHTING THE 2018 MATZAH MITZVAH

(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. Madam Speaker, I would like to highlight the 2018 Jewish Community Services of South Florida Matzah Mitzvah, which will take place on Sunday, March 25, at Temple Israel of Greater Miami.

Every year, Madam Speaker, this wonderful event brings together volunteers and staff from the Jewish Community Services to prepare and deliver Passover holiday baskets to homebound seniors and other members of the Jewish community in need.

Those who take part in the Matzah Mitzvah do far more than just deliver meals: they help foster a sense of community amongst Jewish residents of south Florida and help to ensure that everyone who observes the Passover holiday does so with a full heart.

Volunteers will start assembling the food at 9 a.m., and the delivery of the food baskets will follow at 10 a.m.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Jewish Community Services of South Florida for its dedication to creating a better and more inclusive community. I also encourage everyone in south

Florida to come out this March 25 to Temple Israel of Greater Miami at 9 a.m. and take part in the 2018 Matzah Mitzvah.

DEMOCRATS SHOULD NOT BE LOCKED OUT OF THE FUNDING NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, here we are again. On Thursday, the government runs out of funding because the majority has not yet been able to reach across the aisle and negotiate a long-term budget agreement that reflects the priorities of the American people.

One party controls the House, the Senate, and the White House, but there is not a functional majority in the hands of one or another party. The majority is comprised of thoughtful Members who, on both sides of the aisle, if we chose to, could sit around the negotiating table and work out the differences that we bring to this Congress in a way that moves the country forward and adopts a budget that is reflective of the priorities that we were sent here to address.

So long as one party takes the approach that all of the votes necessary to pass any measure must only come from one party, we are not going to be able to move forward as a country.

Being in the minority, I understand we don't get to set the agenda, but we ought not be locked out of the conversation, especially when it is by coming together that we can get a long-term budget and not continue to kick the can down the road.

REPORT DEVASTATING TO DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a House Intelligence Committee report has found shocking abuses of surveillance by the FBI. The implications of the report are devastating to a democracy.

The premier law enforcement agency of the Federal Government wrongly took sides in a Presidential campaign. The report confirms that FBI officials sought to influence the 2016 election. Unsubstantiated opposition research paid for by the Clinton campaign was wrongly used as a basis to wiretap a Trump campaign official.

Justice Department and FBI employees were trying to influence the outcome of the Presidential election. To borrow a phrase from Intelligence Committee Chairman NUNES, this "happens in banana republics," but it should never happen in a democracy.

It would be understandable if the President and Attorney General wanted to clean house and ask everyone to resign who used a political file compiled by the Clinton campaign as a

basis to spy on an innocent American citizen who was with the Trump campaign.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF DONNA MCCLOSKEY

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Donna McCloskey, a constituent of mine from Bristol Borough, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, after a 42-year career of community service as an employee of the Grundy Foundation. Starting in 1975, Donna worked at the Grundy Library, eventually assisting the Grundy Foundation's executive director until Donna was appointed the Grundy Museum administrator, a position which she held for the past 12 years.

As the museum administrator, Donna is credited with updating the museum's strategic plan, creating best practices for all of the museum's programs and services, and building up partnerships between the museum and the community. Under Donna's leadership, the number of visitors to the museum increased exponentially, and the 40th and 50th anniversary events were great successes.

I want to express my deep gratitude and the gratitude of our entire community for Donna's commitment to preserving the history of our community. While her retirement is well deserved, her exit is already felt.

Thank you, Donna.

NORTH CAROLINIANS ON THE WORLD STAGE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the 242 athletes who made the 2018 United States Winter Olympic team. This is the largest delegation of athletes from any nation attending the Winter Olympic Games in history.

While reviewing the roster, I was pleased to see that the world will get to know something I have known for a long time: North Carolinians are strong competitors, three of whom I would like to salute.

I offer my well wishes and congratulations to Heather Bergsma of High Point, North Carolina, who will compete in long track speed skating; Kimani Griffin from Winston-Salem, North Carolina, who will compete in long track speed skating; and Bobby Sanguinetti from Wilmington, North Carolina, who will compete in ice hockey.

The Olympic Games remain one of the only avenues in which the world's community may come together despite resounding differences. I wish these North Carolinians the very best as they

compete on the world stage, along with their fellow United States athletes, and will look forward to cheering all of them on.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

STRENGTHENING PROTECTIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES ACT OF 2018

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4547) to amend titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act to improve and strengthen the representative payment program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4547

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 "Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—STRENGTHENING OVERSIGHT AND BENEFICIARY PROTECTION

Sec. 101. Stronger monitoring of representative payees.

Sec. 102. Reducing the burden on families.

Sec. 103. Protecting beneficiaries through information sharing.

Sec. 104. Clarifying overpayment liability for child in child welfare system.

Sec. 105. Reports.

TITLE II—IMPROVING PAYEE SELECTION AND QUALITY

Sec. 201. Advance designation of representative payees.

Sec. 202. Prohibition on individuals convicted of certain crimes serving as representative payees.

Sec. 203. Prohibition on individuals with representative payees serving as representative payees.

Sec. 204. Reassessment of payee selection and replacement policies.

TITLE I—STRENGTHENING OVERSIGHT AND BENEFICIARY PROTECTION

SEC. 101. STRONGER MONITORING OF REPRESENTATIVE PAYEES.

(a) PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY FOR BENEFICIARIES WITH REPRESENTATIVE PAYEES.—Section 205(j)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(j)(6)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C)(i) The Commissioner of Social Security shall make annual grants directly to the protection and advocacy system serving each of the States and the American Indian consortium for the purpose of conducting reviews of representative payees in accordance with this subparagraph. The total amount used by the Commissioner for such grants each year—

“(I) shall be an amount sufficient, as determined by the Commissioner in consultation with each of the protection and advocacy systems, to carry out all of the activities described in clause (ii); and

“(II) shall not be less than \$25,000,000.

“(ii) A protection and advocacy system awarded a grant under this subparagraph shall use the grant funds to—

“(I) conduct all periodic onsite reviews pursuant to this paragraph and such other reviews of representative payees as the Commissioner may request, including reviews conducted in response to allegations or concerns about the performance or suitability of the payee;

“(II) conduct additional reviews that the protection and advocacy system has reason to believe are warranted;

“(III) develop corrective action plans to assist representative payees in conforming to requirements specified by the Commissioner;

“(IV) submit a report to the Commissioner on each completed review containing such information as the Commissioner shall require; and

“(V) conduct an initial onsite assessment of any organization that begins collecting a fee for its services as a representative payee to ensure that such organization is established as such a representative payee in accordance with requirements specified by the Commissioner.

A protection and advocacy system may refer beneficiaries to other programs or services as the protection and advocacy system considers appropriate.

“(iii) To be eligible to receive grants under this section, a protection and advocacy system shall submit an initial application to the Commissioner at such time, in such form and manner, and accompanied by such information and assurances as the Commissioner may require.

“(iv)(I) Subject to subclause (II), the Commissioner shall ensure that any funds used for grants under clause (i) shall be allocated to the protection and advocacy systems serving each of the States and the American Indian consortium in a manner such that the amount provided to each protection and advocacy system bears the same ratio to the total of such funds as the number of represented beneficiaries in the State or American Indian consortium in which such protection and advocacy system is located bears to the total number of represented beneficiaries.

“(II) The amount of an annual grant to a protection and advocacy system under clause (i) shall—

“(aa) in the case of a protection and advocacy system serving American Samoa, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, or

the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or the American Indian consortium, not be less than \$30,000; and

“(bb) in the case of a protection and advocacy system serving any other State, not be less than \$60,000.

“(III) Funds provided to a protection and advocacy system through a grant under clause (i) for a one-year period shall remain available through the end of the following one-year period.

“(IV) For purposes of this clause, the term ‘represented beneficiary’ means an individual—

“(aa) who is entitled to benefits under this title, title VIII, or title XVI; and

“(bb) whose benefits have been certified for payment to a representative payee.

“(v)(I) The Commissioner shall make annual grants, in an amount equal to 4 percent of the total amount of grants awarded each year under clause (i), to an eligible national association for the provision of training and technical assistance, administrative support, and data collection services to protection and advocacy systems in connection with grants awarded under clause (i).

“(II) In this clause, the term ‘eligible national association’ means a national disability association with extensive knowledge and demonstrated experience in providing training, technical assistance, and administrative oversight to protection and advocacy systems that monitor representative payees.

“(vi) In conducting reviews under this section, a protection and advocacy system shall have the same authorities, including access to records, facilities, and persons, as such system would have for purposes of providing services under subtitle C of title I of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15041 et seq.).

“(vii) Whenever benefit amounts under this title are increased by any percentage effective with any month after November 2018 as a result of a determination made under section 215(i), each of the dollar amounts specified in clauses (i)(II) and (iv)(II) shall be increased by the same percentage.

“(viii) No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this subparagraph. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

“(ix) In this subparagraph:

“(I) The term ‘American Indian consortium’ means a consortium established under subtitle C of title I of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15041 et seq.).

“(II) The term ‘protection and advocacy system’ means a protection and advocacy system established under subtitle C of title I of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15041 et seq.).

“(III) The term ‘State’ means the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.”.

(b) **EXPANSION OF PERIODIC ONSITE REVIEW REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 205(j)(6)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(j)(6)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking “or”;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(3) by adding after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv) the representative payee collects a fee for its services.”; and

(4) by adding after clause (iv) (as added by paragraph (3)) the following flush text:

“The Commissioner shall also conduct periodic onsite reviews of individual and organizational payees, including payees who are re-

lated to the beneficiary and primarily reside in the same household, selected on the basis of risk-factors for potential misuse or unsuitability associated with such payees or beneficiaries.”.

(c) **AVAILABILITY OF GRANT FUNDS.**—

(1) **PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SYSTEM GRANTS.**—Grants described under clause (i) of subparagraph (C) of section 205(j)(6) of the Social Security Act (as added by subsection (a)) shall be awarded on August 1, 2018, and annually thereafter, and funds provided by such grants to a protection and advocacy system may be used to reimburse the protection and advocacy system for amounts expended by the protection and advocacy system during the period beginning on May 1, 2018, and ending on such date for hiring and start-up costs in preparation to carry out reviews of representative payees in accordance with such subparagraph.

(2) **NATIONAL ASSOCIATION GRANTS.**—Grants described under clause (v) of such subparagraph shall be awarded on May 1, 2018, and annually thereafter.

SEC. 102. REDUCING THE BURDEN ON FAMILIES.

(a) **TITLE II.**—Section 205(j)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (E) through (H), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D)(i) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply in any case where the other person to whom such payment is made is—

“(I) a parent, or other individual who is a legal guardian of, a minor child entitled to such payment who primarily resides in the same household;

“(II) a parent of an individual entitled to such payment who is under a disability (as defined in section 223(d)) who primarily resides in the same household; or

“(III) the spouse of the individual entitled to such payment.

“(ii) The Commissioner of Social Security shall establish and implement procedures as necessary for the Commissioner to determine the eligibility of such parties for the exemption provided in clause (i). The Commissioner shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to determine eligibility for such exemption.”;

(3) in subparagraph (E) (as so redesignated), by striking “and (C)” and inserting “(C), and (D)”;

(4) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated), by striking “(D)” each place it appears and inserting “(E)”.

(b) **TITLE VIII.**—Section 807(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1007(h)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6), respectively; and

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

“(3)(A) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in any case where the other person to whom such payment is made is the spouse of the individual entitled to such payment.

“(B) The Commissioner of Social Security shall establish and implement procedures as necessary for the Commissioner to determine the eligibility of such parties for the exemption provided in subparagraph (A). The Commissioner shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to determine eligibility for such exemption.”.

(c) **TITLE XVI.**—Section 1631(a)(2)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(a)(2)(C)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (v) and (vi), respectively;

(2) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv)(I) Clause (i) shall not apply in any case where the representative payee is—

“(aa) a parent, or other individual who is a legal guardian of, a minor child entitled to such payment who primarily resides in the same household;

“(bb) a parent of an individual entitled to such payment who is under a disability who primarily resides in the same household; or

“(cc) the spouse of the individual entitled to such payment.

“(II) The Commissioner of Social Security shall establish and implement procedures as necessary for the Commissioner to determine the eligibility of such parties for the exemption provided in subclause (I). The Commissioner shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to determine eligibility for such exemption.”;

(3) in clause (v) (as so redesignated), by striking “and (iii)” and inserting “(iii), and (iv)”;

(4) in clause (vi) (as so redesignated), by striking “(iv)” each time it appears and inserting “(v)”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 103. PROTECTING BENEFICIARIES THROUGH INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) **INFORMATION SHARING TO DETERMINE STATE FOSTER CARE STATUS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 205(j) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1)(A) The Commissioner of Social Security shall—

“(i) enter into agreements with each State with a plan approved under part E of title IV for the purpose of sharing and matching data, on an automated monthly basis, in the system of records of the Social Security Administration with each Statewide and Tribal Automated Child Welfare Information System to identify represented minor beneficiaries who are in foster care under the responsibility of the State for such month; and

“(ii) in any case in which a represented minor beneficiary has entered or exited foster care or changed foster care placement in such month, redetermine the appropriate representative payee for such individual.

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘State’ has the meaning given such term for purposes of part E of title IV;

“(ii) the term ‘Statewide and Tribal Automated Child Welfare Information System’ means a statewide mechanized data collection and information retrieval system described in section 474(a)(3)(C); and

“(iii) the term ‘represented minor beneficiary’, with respect to an individual for a month, means a child (as defined for purposes of section 475(8)) entitled to benefits under this title for such month whose benefits are certified for payment to a representative payee.”.

(2) **CONFORMING CHANGE.**—Section 471(a)(8)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(8)(A)) is amended by inserting “the program established by title II,” after “XX.”.

(3) **GAO STUDY AND REPORT.**—

(A) **EVALUATION.**—As soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall evaluate—

(i) the number of represented minor beneficiaries in foster care under the responsibility of a State for each month during the previous year;

(ii) whether the representative payee for each represented minor beneficiary is—

(I) a governmental child welfare agency;

(II) an organizational payee that is not a governmental child welfare agency;

(III) a foster parent or child-care institution (within the meaning of part E of title IV); or

(IV) another individual; and

(iii) whether funds were conserved, used for direct expenses of the minor beneficiary, or used to reimburse the State for foster care maintenance costs.

(B) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 36 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation required under subparagraph (A).

(C) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this paragraph—

(i) the term “State” has the meaning given such term for purposes of part E of title IV of the Social Security Act; and

(ii) the term “represented minor beneficiary”, with respect to an individual for a month, means a child (as defined for purposes of section 475(8) of the Social Security Act) entitled to benefits under title II of such Act for such month whose benefits are certified for payment to a representative payee.

(4) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to months beginning on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) **EXCEPTION IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.**—In the case of a State plan under part E of title IV of the Social Security Act that the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirement imposed by the amendments made under this subsection, such plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such title solely on the basis of its failure to meet this additional requirement before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of such session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(b) **IMPROVING COORDINATION WITH ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commissioner of Social Security shall study and test the administrative feasibility of improving information sharing, in partnership with State agencies that provide adult protective services, with respect to—

(A) the assessment of an individual's need for a representative payee in connection with benefits to which the individual is entitled under title II or title XVI of the Social Security Act; and

(B) oversight of individuals and organizations serving as representative payees.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than June 30, 2022, the Commissioner of Social Security shall conclude the study described in paragraph (1) and submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the results of such study.

(c) **STUDY ON POTENTIAL TO COORDINATE WITH STATE COURTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commissioner of Social Security shall enter into an agreement with the Administrative Conference of the United States to conduct a study that includes—

(A) an overview of potential opportunities for information sharing between the Social Security Administration and State courts and relevant State agencies;

(B) a detailed analysis of the barriers to such information sharing, including any Federal or State statutory barriers;

(C) a description of how such information sharing would be implemented, including any additional infrastructure needed; and

(D) a description of any risks or other factors that the Social Security Administration and the Congress should consider before implementing such information sharing.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than June 30, 2020, the Commissioner of Social Security shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and make publicly available a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 104. CLARIFYING OVERPAYMENT LIABILITY FOR CHILD IN CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM.

(a) **AMENDMENT TO TITLE II.**—Section 204(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 404(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3)(A) When any payment of more than the correct amount is made on behalf of an individual who is a represented minor beneficiary for a month in which such individual is in foster care under the responsibility of a State and the State is the representative payee of such individual, the State shall be liable for the repayment of the overpayment, and there shall be no adjustment of payments to, or recovery by the United States from, such individual.

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘represented minor beneficiary’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (j)(11)(B)(iii).”.

(b) **AMENDMENT TO TITLE XVI.**—Section 1631(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1683(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (7) as paragraphs (4) through (8), respectively; and

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

“(3)(A) When any payment of more than the correct amount is made on behalf of an individual who is a represented minor beneficiary for a month in which such individual is in foster care under the responsibility of a State and the State is the representative payee of such individual, the State shall be liable for the repayment of the overpayment, and there shall be no adjustment of payments to, or recovery by the United States from, such individual.

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘represented minor beneficiary’, with respect to an individual for a month, means a child (as defined for purposes of section 475(8)) entitled to benefits under this title for such month whose benefits are certified for payment to a representative payee.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to overpayment determinations made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and to any other overpaid amounts that have not been recovered as of such date.

SEC. 105. REPORTS.

(a) **REPORT ON BENEFITS MISUSED.**—Section 205(j) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(j)), as amended by section 103(a), is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking “(A) In addition to” and inserting “In addition to”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(12)(A) Not later than January 31 of each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the total number of individuals entitled to benefits under titles II, VIII, and XVI, respectively, (and the number of individuals con-

currently entitled to benefits under more than one such title) who have a representative payee, the total number of such representative payees, and the results of all reviews of representative payees conducted during the previous fiscal year in connection with benefits under this title, title VIII, or title XVI. Such report shall summarize problems identified in such reviews and corrective actions taken or planned to be taken to correct such problems, and shall include—

“(i) the number of such reviews;

“(ii) the results of such reviews;

“(iii) the number of cases in which the representative payee was changed and why;

“(iv) the number of reviews conducted in response to allegations or concerns about the performance or suitability of the payee;

“(v) the number of cases discovered in which there was a misuse of funds, and the total dollar amount of benefits determined by the Commissioner during such fiscal year to have been misused by a representative payee (regardless of the fiscal year in which such misuse occurred);

“(vi) the number of cases discovered in which such misuse of funds resulted from the negligent failure of the Commissioner to investigate or monitor a representative payee;

“(vii) the final disposition of such cases of misuse of funds, including—

“(I) any criminal, civil, and administrative penalties imposed;

“(II) the total dollar amount of misused benefits repaid to beneficiaries and alternative representative payees under each of—

“(aa) paragraph (5) (on the basis of a negligent failure of the Commissioner described in such paragraph);

“(bb) paragraph (5) (on any other basis); and

“(cc) paragraph (7);

“(III) the total dollar amount of misused benefits recovered under each of—

“(aa) paragraph (5); and

“(bb) paragraph (7);

“(viii) any updates to prior year reports necessary to reflect subsequent recoveries and repayments pertaining to misuse determinations made in prior years; and

“(ix) such other information as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

“(B) Each report required under this paragraph for a fiscal year shall include the information described in clauses (i) through (ix) of subparagraph (A) with respect to—

“(i) all representative payees reviewed during such fiscal year;

“(ii) all such representative payees that are organizations, separated by whether such organization collects a fee for its services as a representative payee;

“(iii) all such representative payees that are individuals serving 15 or more individuals; and

“(iv) all such representative payees that are individuals serving less than 15 individuals, separated by whether such representative payee is a family member.”.

(b) **REPORT ON ELIMINATION OF THE ACCOUNTING FORM.**—The Commissioner shall—

(1) conduct a study on the changes made by the amendments made by section 102 of the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018, which shall include the impact of such changes on families, beneficiaries, and the operations of the Social Security Administration; and

(2) not later than January 1, 2021, submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(c) **REPORT ON THE ADVANCED DESIGNATION POLICY.**—The Commissioner shall—

(1) conduct a study on the changes made by the amendments made by section 201 of the

Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018, which shall include the impact of such changes on beneficiaries and the operations of the Social Security Administration; and

(2) not later than January 1, 2025, submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

TITLE II—IMPROVING PAYEE SELECTION AND QUALITY

SEC. 201. ADVANCE DESIGNATION OF REPRESENTATIVE PAYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 205(j)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(j)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C)(i) An individual who is entitled to or is an applicant for a benefit under this title, title VIII, or title XVI, who has attained 18 years of age or is an emancipated minor, may, at any time, designate 1 or more other individuals to serve as a representative payee for such individual in the event that the Commissioner of Social Security determines under subparagraph (A) that the interest of such individual would be served by certification for payment of such benefits to which the individual is entitled to a representative payee. If the Commissioner of Social Security makes such a determination with respect to such individual at any time after such designation has been made, the Commissioner shall—

“(I) certify payment of such benefits to the designated individual, subject to the requirements of paragraph (2); or

“(II) if the Commissioner determines that certification for payment of such benefits to the designated individual would not satisfy the requirements of paragraph (2), that the designated individual is unwilling or unable to serve as representative payee, or that other good cause exists, certify payment of such benefits to another individual or organization, in accordance with paragraph (1).

“(ii) An organization may not be designated to serve as a representative payee under this subparagraph.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this section.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Commissioner of Social Security shall promulgate regulations specifying the information an individual is required to provide to the Commissioner in order to designate another individual to serve as the individual's representative payee under section 205(j)(1)(C) of the Social Security Act (as added by subsection (a)).

(d) NOTIFICATION TO BENEFICIARIES.—Not later than January 1, 2020, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner of Social Security shall notify each individual entitled to a benefit under title II, VIII, or XVI of the Social Security Act of the name of any individual designated to serve as the individual's representative payee under section 205(j)(1)(C) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)).

SEC. 202. PROHIBITION ON INDIVIDUALS CONVICTED OF CERTAIN CRIMES SERVING AS REPRESENTATIVE PAYEES.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II.—Section 205(j)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(j)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) in subclause (V), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subclause (VI), by striking the period and inserting “, and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(VII) determine whether such person has been convicted (and not subsequently exonerated), under Federal or State law, of a felony provided under clause (iv), or of an attempt or a conspiracy to commit such a felony.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) The felony crimes provided under this clause, whether an offense under State or Federal law, are the following:

“(I) Human trafficking, including as prohibited under sections 1590 and 1591 of title 18, United States Code.

“(II) False imprisonment, including as prohibited under section 1201 of title 18, United States Code.

“(III) Kidnapping, including as prohibited under section 1201 of title 18, United States Code.

“(IV) Rape and sexual assault, including as prohibited under sections 2241, 2242, 2243, and 2244 of title 18, United States Code.

“(V) First-degree homicide, including as prohibited under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code.

“(VI) Robbery, including as prohibited under section 2111 of title 18, United States Code.

“(VII) Fraud to obtain access to government assistance, including as prohibited under sections 287, 1001, and 1343 of title 18, United States Code.

“(VIII) Fraud by scheme, including as prohibited under section 1343 of title 18, United States Code.

“(IX) Theft of government funds or property, including as prohibited under section 641 of title 18, United States Code.

“(X) Abuse or neglect, including as prohibited under sections 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, or 117 of title 18, United States Code.

“(XI) Forgery, including as prohibited under section 642 and chapter 25 (except section 512) of title 18, United States Code.

“(XII) Identity theft or identity fraud, including as prohibited under sections 1028 and 1028A of title 18, United States Code.

The Commissioner of Social Security may promulgate regulations to provide for additional felony crimes under this clause.

“(v)(I) For the purpose of carrying out the activities required under subparagraph (B)(i) as part of the investigation under subparagraph (A)(i), the Commissioner may conduct a background check of any individual seeking to serve as a representative payee under this subsection and may disqualify from service as a representative payee any such individual who fails to grant permission for the Commissioner to conduct such a background check.

“(II) The Commissioner may revoke certification of payment of benefits under this subsection to any individual serving as a representative payee on or after January 1, 2019 who fails to grant permission for the Commissioner to conduct such a background check.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) in subclause (IV), by striking “or” at the end;

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

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(VI) except as provided in clause (vi), such person has previously been convicted (and not subsequently exonerated) as described in subparagraph (B)(i)(VII).”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi)(I) With respect to any person described in subclause (II)—

“(aa) subparagraph (B)(i)(VII) shall not apply; and

“(bb) the Commissioner may grant an exemption from the provisions of clause (i)(VI) if the Commissioner determines that such exemption is in the best interest of the individual entitled to benefits.

“(II) A person is described in this subclause if the person—

“(aa) is the custodial parent of a minor child for whom the person applies to serve,

“(bb) is the custodial spouse of the beneficiary for whom the person applies to serve,

“(cc) is the custodial parent of a beneficiary who is under a disability (as defined in section 223(d)) which began before the beneficiary attained the age of 22, for whom the person applies to serve,

“(dd) is the custodial court appointed guardian of the beneficiary for whom the person applies to serve,

“(ee) is the custodial grandparent of a minor grandchild for whom the person applies to serve,

“(ff) is the parent who was previously representative payee for his or her minor child who has since turned 18 and continues to be eligible for such benefit, or

“(gg) received a presidential or gubernatorial pardon for the relevant conviction.”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VIII.—Section 807 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1007) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting “, and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) determine whether such person has been convicted (and not subsequently exonerated), under Federal or State law, of a felony provided under paragraph (4), or of an attempt or a conspiracy to commit such a felony.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) The felony crimes provided under this paragraph, whether an offense under State or Federal law, are the following:

“(A) Human trafficking, including as prohibited under sections 1590 and 1591 of title 18, United States Code.

“(B) False imprisonment, including as prohibited under section 1201 of title 18, United States Code.

“(C) Kidnapping, including as prohibited under section 1201 of title 18, United States Code.

“(D) Rape and sexual assault, including as prohibited under sections 2241, 2242, 2243, and 2244 of title 18, United States Code.

“(E) First-degree homicide, including as prohibited under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code.

“(F) Robbery, including as prohibited under section 2111 of title 18, United States Code.

“(G) Fraud to obtain access to government assistance, including as prohibited under sections 287, 1001, and 1343 of title 18, United States Code.

“(H) Fraud by scheme, including as prohibited under section 1343 of title 18, United States Code.

“(I) Theft of government funds or property, including as prohibited under section 641 of title 18, United States Code.

“(J) Abuse or neglect, including as prohibited under sections 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, or 117 of title 18, United States Code.

“(K) Forgery, including as prohibited under section 642 and chapter 25 (except section 512) of title 18, United States Code.

“(L) Identity theft or identity fraud, including as prohibited under sections 1028 and 1028A of title 18, United States Code.

The Commissioner of Social Security may promulgate regulations to provide for additional felony crimes under this clause.

“(5)(A) For the purpose of carrying out the activities required under paragraph (2) as part of the investigation under paragraph (1)(A), the Commissioner may conduct a background check of any individual seeking to serve as a representative payee under this

subsection and may disqualify from service as a representative payee any such individual who fails to grant permission for the Commissioner to conduct such a background check.

“(B) The Commissioner may revoke certification of payment of benefits under this subsection to any individual serving as a representative payee on or after January 1, 2019 who fails to grant permission for the Commissioner to conduct such a background check.”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) except as provided in paragraph (2)(D), such person has previously been convicted (and not subsequently exonerated) as described in subsection (b)(2)(G).”; and

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

“(D)(i) With respect to any person described in clause (II)—

“(I) subsection (b)(2)(G) shall not apply; and

“(II) the Commissioner may grant an exemption from the provisions of paragraph (1)(F) if the Commissioner determines that such exemption is in the best interest of the individual entitled to benefits.

“(ii) A person is described in this clause if the person—

“(I) is the custodial spouse of the beneficiary for whom the person applies to serve,

“(II) is the custodial court appointed guardian of the beneficiary for whom the person applies to serve; or

“(III) received a presidential or gubernatorial pardon for the relevant conviction.”.

(C) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XVI.—Section 1631(a)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(a)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (V), by striking “and” at the end;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(VII) determine whether such person has been convicted (and not subsequently exonerated), under Federal or State law, of a felony provided under clause (xv), or of an attempt or a conspiracy to commit such a felony.”;

(2) in clause (iii)—

(A) in subclause (IV), by striking “or” at the end;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(VI) except as provided in clause (xvii), such person has previously been convicted (and not subsequently exonerated) as described in clause (ii)(VII).”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(xv) The felony crimes provided under this clause, whether an offense under State or Federal law, are the following:

“(I) Human trafficking, including as prohibited under sections 1590 and 1591 of title 18, United States Code.

“(II) False imprisonment, including as prohibited under section 1201 of title 18, United States Code.

“(III) Kidnapping, including as prohibited under section 1201 of title 18, United States Code.

“(IV) Rape and sexual assault, including as prohibited under sections 2241, 2242, 2243, and 2244 of title 18, United States Code.

“(V) First-degree homicide, including as prohibited under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code.

“(VI) Robbery, including as prohibited under section 2111 of title 18, United States Code.

“(VII) Fraud to obtain access to government assistance, including as prohibited under sections 287, 1001, and 1343 of title 18, United States Code.

“(VIII) Fraud by scheme, including as prohibited under section 1343 of title 18, United States Code.

“(IX) Theft of government funds or property, including as prohibited under section 641 of title 18, United States Code.

“(X) Abuse or neglect, including as prohibited under sections 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, or 117 of title 18, United States Code.

“(XI) Forgery, including as prohibited under section 642 and chapter 25 (except section 512) of title 18, United States Code.

“(XII) Identity theft or identity fraud, including as prohibited under sections 1028 and 1028A of title 18, United States Code.

The Commissioner of Social Security may promulgate regulations to provide for additional felony crimes under this clause.

“(xvi)(I) For the purpose of carrying out the activities required under clause (ii) as part of the investigation under clause (i)(I), the Commissioner may conduct a background check of any individual seeking to serve as a representative payee under this subsection and may disqualify from service as a representative payee any such individual who fails to grant permission for the Commissioner to conduct such a background check.

“(II) The Commissioner may revoke certification of payment of benefits under this subsection to any individual serving as a representative payee on or after January 1, 2019 who fails to grant permission for the Commissioner to conduct such a background check.

“(xvii)(I) With respect to any person described in subclause (II)—

“(aa) clause (ii)(VII) shall not apply; and

“(bb) the Commissioner may grant an exemption from the provisions of clause (iii)(VI) if the Commissioner determines that such exemption is in the best interest of the individual entitled to benefits.

“(II) A person is described in this subclause if the person—

“(aa) is the custodial parent of a minor child for whom the person applies to serve,

“(bb) is the custodial spouse of the beneficiary for whom the person applies to serve,

“(cc) is the custodial parent of a beneficiary who is under a disability which began before the beneficiary attained the age of 22, for whom the person applies to serve,

“(dd) is the custodial court appointed guardian of the beneficiary for whom the person applies to serve,

“(ee) is the custodial grandparent of a minor grandchild for whom the person applies to serve,

“(ff) is the parent who was previously representative payee for his or her minor child who has since turned 18 and continues to be eligible for such benefit, or

“(gg) received a presidential or gubernatorial pardon for the relevant conviction.”.

(d) APPLICATION TO NEW APPOINTMENTS.—Subject to subsection (e), the amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply with respect to any individual appointed to serve as a representative payee pursuant to section 205(j), 807, or 1631(a)(2) of the Social Security Act on or after January 1, 2019.

(e) APPLICATION TO PRIOR APPOINTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 2024, the Commissioner of Social Security shall conduct a review of each individual serving as a representative payee pursuant to 205(j), 807, or 1631(a)(2) of the Social Security Act, to determine whether such individual has been convicted of a felony as described in section 205(j)(2)(B)(i)(VII), 807(b)(2)(G), or 1631(a)(2)(B)(ii)(VII), respectively (as such provisions are added by this section). Except as provided in section 205(j)(2)(C)(vi), 807(d)(2)(D), or 1631(a)(2)(B)(xvii) (as so added), any individual determined by the Commissioner to have been so convicted may not serve as a representative payee on or after the date of such determination.

(2) PRIORITY.—In conducting reviews under paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall prioritize reviews of the following categories of individuals, in the following order:

(A) An individual serving as representative payee for 15 or more individuals.

(B) An individual serving as representative payee for an individual who is not related to the representative payee.

(C) An individual serving as representative payee for an individual who has attained the age of 18 and is not the spouse of the representative payee.

(f) PERIODIC REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Commissioner of Social Security shall issue regulations to establish a process for reviewing each individual serving as a representative payee pursuant to section 205(j), 807, or 1631(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (other than individuals with respect to whom an exemption has been granted under section 205(j)(2)(C)(vi), 807(d)(2)(D), or 1631(a)(2)(B)(xvii)) not less than once every 5 years to determine whether any such individual has been convicted of a felony as described in subsection (e)(1) of this section.

SECTION 203. PROHIBITION ON INDIVIDUALS WITH REPRESENTATIVE PAYEES SERVING AS REPRESENTATIVE PAYEES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO TITLE II.—Section 205(j)(2)(C)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(j)(2)(C)(i)), as amended by section 202(a)(2), is further amended—

(1) in subclause (V), by striking “or” at the end;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(VII) such person’s benefits under this title, title VIII, or title XVI are certified for payment to a representative payee during the period for which the individual’s benefits would be certified for payment to another person.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO TITLE VIII.—Section 807(d)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1007(d)(1)), as amended by section 202(b)(2), is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) such person’s benefits under this title, title II, or title XVI are certified for payment to a representative payee during the period for which the individual’s benefits would be certified for payment to another person.”.

(c) AMENDMENT TO TITLE XVI.—Section 1631(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(a)(2)(B)(iii)), as amended by section 202(c)(2), is further amended—

(1) in subclause (V), by striking “or” at the end;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) such person’s benefits under this title, title II, or title XVI are certified for payment to a representative payee during the period for which the individual’s benefits would be certified for payment to another person.”.

(d) AMENDMENT TO TITLE XVI.—Section 1631(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(a)(2)(B)(iii)), as amended by section 202(c)(2), is further amended—

(1) in subclause (V), by striking “or” at the end;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) such person’s benefits under this title, title II, or title XVI are certified for payment to a representative payee during the period for which the individual’s benefits would be certified for payment to another person.”.

(e) AMENDMENT TO TITLE XVI.—Section 1631(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(a)(2)(B)(iii)), as amended by section 202(c)(2), is further amended—

(1) in subclause (V), by striking “or” at the end;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) such person’s benefits under this title, title II, or title XVI are certified for payment to a representative payee during the period for which the individual’s benefits would be certified for payment to another person.”.

(f) AMENDMENT TO TITLE XVI.—Section 1631(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(a)(2)(B)(iii)), as amended by section 202(c)(2), is further amended—

(1) in subclause (V), by striking “or” at the end;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) such person’s benefits under this title, title II, or title XVI are certified for payment to a representative payee during the period for which the individual’s benefits would be certified for payment to another person.”.

(g) AMENDMENT TO TITLE XVI.—Section 1631(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(a)(2)(B)(iii)), as amended by section 202(c)(2), is further amended—

(1) in subclause (V), by striking “or” at the end;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) such person’s benefits under this title, title II, or title XVI are certified for payment to a representative payee during the period for which the individual’s benefits would be certified for payment to another person.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) NEW APPOINTMENTS.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any individual appointed to serve as a representative payee under title II, title VIII, or title XVI of the Social Security Act on or after January 1, 2019.

(2) PRIOR APPOINTMENTS.—With respect to individuals serving as a representative payee whose benefits under this title, title VIII, or title XVI are certified for payment to another representative payee as of January 1, 2019, the Commissioner shall take any steps necessary to terminate such individual's service as a representative payee as soon as possible, but no later than January 1, 2024.

SEC. 204. REASSESSMENT OF PAYEE SELECTION AND REPLACEMENT POLICIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of Social Security shall conduct, with opportunity for public comment, a review and reassessment of—

(1) the appropriateness of its order of preference for selecting representative payees, including payees who may be creditors of the beneficiary or who are private, for-profit institutions; and

(2) the effectiveness of its policy and operational procedures in properly determining when to change a representative payee, including—

(A) from a payee that has a higher order of preference (such as a family member) to a payee that has a lower order of preference (such as a creditor); or

(B) when a request to change payees arises from someone other than the beneficiary.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Social Security shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and make publicly available a report on the results of the review and reassessment under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. 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. 4547, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to take action on bipartisan legislation to help those receiving Social Security. This bill, led by Congressmen SAM JOHNSON of Texas and JOHN LARSON of Connecticut, the chairman and ranking member of the Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee, takes actions to improve the representative payee program.

Today, when someone on Social Security is not able to manage their own benefits, the Social Security Administration will assign them what is called

a representative payee. These are individuals or organizations that have a vital responsibility to be helping some of our most vulnerable people on Social Security: children, seniors, and folks with disabilities. The payee receives benefits on behalf of these Americans, and they are required to use the money to fulfill those needs.

Here is the problem: The Representative Payee Program just isn't working the way it should. As the Committee on Ways and Means has learned from the work of our Social Security Subcommittee, the Social Security Administration has serious challenges knowing when someone needs help managing their benefits and also in making sure that those who provide that help are doing a good job.

This puts some of our most vulnerable receivers of Social Security at risk, and that is completely unacceptable. We have a responsibility to fix it. That is why this legislation is so important.

With this bipartisan bill, we can make the representative payee program more effective and more accountable for the Americans who depend upon it. This bill strengthens oversight; it increases protections for those on Social Security; it reduces burdens on families; and it puts greater focus on the needs of Social Security families, giving Americans more of a say in selecting the payee of their choice and, more importantly, ensuring they have a payee they can trust.

Although our committee did not mark up this bill, we have held multiple subcommittee hearings on the issue and meetings among Members from both sides of the aisle. We have heard from stakeholders about the challenges they face. This bill is a long time coming and is going to make important, much-needed changes to the representative payee program.

To further solidify the committee's understanding and our legislative intent, I am sending the Acting Commissioner of Social Security a letter signed by myself and Congressmen RICHARD NEAL, SAM JOHNSON, and JOHN LARSON.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter which transmits a technical explanation of the bill. We have asked the Acting Commissioner to make that letter and technical explanation available on the agency's website.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, February 5, 2018.

NANCY BERRYHILL,
Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration
Baltimore, MD.

DEAR ACTING COMMISSIONER BERRYHILL: The attached document outlines the Committee's understanding and legislative intent of H.R. 4547, the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018, in lieu of a Committee Report from the Committee on Ways and Means. We ask that you make this letter and attached document publicly available on the agency's website.

In 1939, Congress first authorized the Social Security Administration (SSA) to make benefit payments to another person or orga-

nization—called a representative payee—in cases where a beneficiary is not capable of managing their own benefits. Reports from government watchdogs and stakeholders have raised repeated concerns about how the SSA administers the representative payee program. H.R. 4547 takes important steps to address these concerns.

Over time, the SSA's payee monitoring program has strengthened, adding both statutory and discretionary on-site reviews to oversee payee performance, and leveraging predictive models to focus additional reviews on the highest-risk payees. Most payees also file an annual report of how the benefits were used, but it has become clear that the accounting form is not an effective protection, with little misuse identified from the submissions. H.R. 4547 builds on the current framework by requiring additional on-site reviews and improving the effectiveness of reviews by requiring state Protection and Advocacy systems to conduct the reviews on behalf of the SSA. We expect this legislation will allow the SSA to greatly expand reviews of payees and better focus oversight on the highest-risk payees, while eliminating the burden of the accounting form for certain family members, who will remain subject to review under the predictive models.

In addition to strengthening oversight, H.R. 4547 takes important steps to address the serious shortcomings with payee selection. This bill makes sure that individuals with significant felony convictions and those who have a payee themselves cannot serve as payees. The bill also allows beneficiaries to designate their preferred payee in advance and requires the SSA to assess the appropriateness of the order-of-preference list it uses to select payees, particularly in cases where there is a change in payee.

By strengthening oversight of payees as well as the safeguards around who may serve as a payee, these commonsense provisions in H.R. 4547 make much-needed improvements to the representative payee program to protect vulnerable beneficiaries.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.
RICHARD E. NEAL,
Ranking Member.
SAM JOHNSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Social Security.
JOHN B. LARSON,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Social Security.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the Members for their hard work and leadership on this important issue. Particularly, I want to express my gratitude to Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member LARSON for their dedication to improving the representative payee program. This is a very important bill that has strong bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4547, the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018, which the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and I have introduced and on which the committee has held several hearings.

Before I begin, I would like to acknowledge our distinguished chairman. We on the Committee on Ways and Means are fortunate that we, in our midst, get to work daily with two iconic American heroes: JOHN LEWIS of Georgia and SAM JOHNSON of Texas. It has been my high honor to serve as the ranking member with this great American hero and dedicated public servant.

We all know that Mr. JOHNSON is indicating that he will not be seeking reelection again. That is a great loss to the Congress and a great homecoming for people in Plano, Texas, and his family, who richly deserve this great American hero. He demonstrates that heroism daily in the committee by his compassion and concern for his fellow Americans. Much as he defended them in his service to the military, he defends them daily here in the United States Congress.

As Chairman BRADY pointed out, there is a great need within the payee system to address a number of the concerns, as the hearings which Mr. JOHNSON conducted revealed many of the inadequacies that existed. There are currently 8 million Social Security beneficiaries who have a representative payee to help manage their benefits, nearly half of whom are children. In many cases, we are talking about the most vulnerable of our citizens, many of whom cannot advocate for themselves.

That is why our bill strengthens the number of quality-of-performance reviews by entrusting them to protection and advocacy organizations in each State. These organizations are embedded in the communities they serve and will be best equipped to flag and investigate instances where payees may be abusing their beneficiaries.

Many of the State organizations have written letters of support for H.R. 4547, including Disability Rights Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I include that letter in the RECORD.

DISABILITY RIGHTS CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, CT, December 13, 2017.

Representative SAM JOHNSON,
Chairman, Social Security Subcommittee, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

Representative JOHN B. LARSON,
Ranking Member, Social Security Subcommittee, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JOHNSON AND RANKING MEMBER LARSON: Thank you for introducing the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2017 (H.R. 4547), bipartisan legislation to improve and strengthen the Social Security Administration's (SSA) representative payee program. This legislation is necessary to create a permanent, independent system of oversight to protect Social Security beneficiaries from fraud and exploitation. It also addresses issues of choice by beneficiaries and decreases reporting burdens on families.

As an employee of the Connecticut protection and advocacy system during the previous iteration of Representative Payee reviews, I experienced how important it was to conduct on site reviews of financial accounts but even more invaluable to meet Social Security recipients, interview them and see

where they live. The reviews also informed other areas of advocacy conducted by the agency and would be an asset to Disability Rights Connecticut, the new protection and advocacy system for Connecticut.

Disability Rights Connecticut's mission is to advocate, educate, investigate and litigate to advance and protect the civil rights of people with disabilities to participate, equally and fully in the social and economic life of Connecticut. As a protection and advocacy system we do this through information and referral, technical assistance, investigation, monitoring and advocacy. We also provide training, education and outreach to empower individuals to advocate for themselves and others.

Again, thank you for your sponsorship of H.R. 4547. Please do not hesitate to contact me or refer your Connecticut inquiries to Disability Rights Connecticut.

Sincerely,

GRETCHEN KNAUFF,
Executive Director.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, aside from that and because of Mr. JOHNSON's leadership, the bill before us today has the support of many advocacy groups, including the AARP, the National Committee to Preserve Social Security & Medicare, the National Disability Rights Network, the Association of Mature American Citizens, and the National Alliance on Mental Illness. I therefore urge my colleagues on both sides, as Chairman BRADY has indicated, to join us in voting "yes" on this very important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise as chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security in support of the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018.

My good friend from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) and I introduced this legislation to make much-needed reforms to the Social Security representative payee programs. Congress first authorized Social Security to designate representative payees all the way back in 1939. The program was last updated in 2004.

For those unfamiliar, the Social Security representative payee program designates a payee to help manage the benefits of those who need assistance managing their benefits. We are talking about quite a few. In fact, you may be surprised to learn that there are about 8 million beneficiaries with payees. In my home State of Texas, we are talking about more than 625,000 people with payees. To put a face on this program, we are talking about folks like

the aging relative or the elderly neighbor next door, people you may know but didn't realize had a representative payee.

With 10,000 Americans retiring every day, this vitally important program is only going to grow in demand. But here is the problem: multiple reports have raised serious concerns about how Social Security administers this program.

In light of these reports, we held two hearings on the representative payee program last year. The first hearing looked at how Social Security decides who needs a payee. The second hearing looked at how Social Security selects and oversees payees.

During the hearing, Social Security told us the greatest challenge that they face is monitoring representative payee behavior. We also learned from Social Security's inspector general that Social Security needs to do a better job of screening payees so that only qualified people are serving as payees. And we heard from State courts that they are concerned about the lack of information sharing between Social Security and States.

We can and must do better for the millions of folks who need some help managing their Social Security benefits. This is why I have been working with Ranking Member LARSON on the bill and we are voting on it today.

This bipartisan bill does the following: it strengthens monitoring of payees; it reduces the burden of unnecessary forms for families; it increases beneficiary protections; and it improves payee selection and quality.

This commonsense legislation is supported by over 45 organizations, including AARP, the National Council of Social Security Management Associations, the National Disability Rights Network, the National Committee to Preserve Social Security & Medicare, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I include the National Council of Social Security Management Associations and the National Disability Rights Network letters in the RECORD.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SOCIAL SECURITY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATIONS,
INC.,

Arlington, VA, December 6, 2017.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON, Chairman,
Hon. JOHN B. LARSON, Ranking Member,
House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JOHNSON AND RANKING MEMBER LARSON: On behalf of the National Council of Social Security Management Associations (NCSSMA) and our members throughout the nation, I would like to thank you for your introduction of H.R. 4547, the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2017. We very much appreciate your leadership on this important legislation and the hard work and dedication of the Subcommittee staff in engaging NCSSMA and other stakeholders to ensure such a commonsense measure that will not only benefit and protect the American public, but also ease the administrative burden on the hardworking employees of the Social Security Administration (SSA).

We firmly believe this legislation will better protect those individuals who most need

our assistance while relieving the administrative burden both for families and SSA, ensuring that resources are focused on programs, policies and workloads that make sense.

We sincerely appreciate the ongoing discussions we have had with the Subcommittee regarding the Representative Payee program and are encouraged that H.R. 4547 addresses so many of the issues and concerns we have raised. We enthusiastically support this legislation and look forward to working with you to advance it through the legislative process.

Thank you for your willingness to work with NCSSMA and the opportunity for our organization to provide feedback not only related to the Representative Payee program, but also on so many other important issues related to SSA and the programs we administer.

Thank you again for your leadership. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or if we can provide additional assistance.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER DETZLER,
NCSSMA President.

NATIONAL DISABILITY RIGHTS NETWORK,
Washington, DC, December 6, 2017.

Representative SAM JOHNSON,
Chairman, Social Security Subcommittee, House
Ways and Means Committee, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: On behalf of the National Disability Rights Network (NDRN) and the nationwide network of fifty-seven Protection and Advocacy systems we represent, I write in strong support of H.R. 4547, the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2017. Enactment of this legislation will provide critical protections for Social Security beneficiaries as well as needed reforms to the crucial representative payee program.

NDRN is the non-profit membership organization for the federally mandated Protection and Advocacy (P&A) and Client Assistance Program (CAP) systems for individuals with disabilities. The P&A and CAP systems were established by the United States Congress to protect the rights of people with disabilities and their families through legal support, advocacy, referral, and education. P&As and CAPs are in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Territories (American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and the US Virgin Islands), and there is a P&A and CAP affiliated with the Native American Consortium which includes the Hopi, Navajo and San Juan Southern Paiute Nations in the Four Corners region of the Southwest. Collectively, the P&A and CAP Network is the largest provider of legally based advocacy services to people with disabilities in the United States.

News stories, Office of Inspector General and Government Accountability Office reports, and hearings held by the House Ways and Means Committee have demonstrated the need for changes in the representative payee program. Your legislation proposes many important and needed changes that will streamline the program as well as take important steps to increase oversight of the representative payee program by funding the nationwide network of P&A systems to monitor how representative payees are administering the Social Security funds received by beneficiaries.

This legislation recognizes the important oversight work that the nationwide network of P&A systems performed for the Social Security Administration (SSA) starting in 2009 after it was revealed dozens of men with developmental disabilities were abused and financially exploited at a turkey processing

plant known as Henry's Turkey Service. The company acted as the workers' representative payee which gave them access to the men's social security disability benefits. It was found that in addition to physically and verbally assaulting the men, Henry's was fraudulently using funds from the men's social security payments.

To the Social Security Administration's (SSA) credit, following the discovery of this theft, SSA increased monitoring beyond reviews that they are statutorily required to perform and began investigating whether other organizational representative payees were exploiting the beneficiaries they were appointed to serve. As part of this effort, SSA turned to the federally mandated P&A system to conduct monitoring on representative payees. The collaboration between SSA and the P&A systems allowed SSA to meet its goal of ensuring that payees meet the fiduciary responsibilities they accepted when they applied to act as a payee. The partnership not only allowed SSA to meet their responsibilities, but also allowed the P&A systems to address health and safety issues and other issues important to the beneficiary but that fall outside of SSA's purview (for more information and statistics on this program, see this report: http://www.ndrn.org/images/Documents/Resources/NDRN_Rep_Payee_Overview_-_July_2016.pdf). H.R. 4547 recognizes the benefits provided by the nationwide network of P&A systems to monitor representative payees and how they are administering the social security benefits received by beneficiaries.

Again, we greatly appreciate your work on this important issue culminating in the introduction of this critical legislation. We stand ready to work with you to quickly get this important legislation enacted into law. Should you have any questions or need more information, please be in touch with Eric Buehlmann, Deputy Executive Director for Public Policy.

Sincerely,

CURT DECKER,
Executive Director.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to vote "yes" on this and pass the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018 today. As I have said before, this is too important not to get right.

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

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4547, the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018. This bill is important to two program areas under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, which I chair: Supplemental Security Income and child welfare.

Thank you to Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member LARSON for their work on this bill and for including Supplemental Security Income recipients.

All individuals receiving benefits through the Social Security Administration deserve to be protected, especially those who need the assistance of a representative payee to manage their finances.

□ 1615

I would specifically like to highlight the important changes this bill would make for children involved with the foster care system, another vulnerable population in need of protection.

H.R. 4547 requires the Social Security Administration, or SSA, to enter into monthly data exchanges with State foster care programs to identify when a child receiving Social Security benefits has entered or exited foster care or changed foster care placement.

When a change occurs, SSA will now be required to redetermine the appropriate representative payee to ensure Social Security benefits follow the child. Additionally, the Government Accountability Office will be required to produce a report on minor beneficiaries in foster care and the representative payees to identify whether additional changes are needed.

H.R. 4547 also clarifies liability for overpayments when a child is in foster care. In cases where a Social Security beneficiary or Supplemental Security Income recipient is overpaid while in foster care and the State foster care agency is the payee, the beneficiary or recipient would not be liable for the overpayment. Instead, the State foster care agency would be required to repay SSA for the overpayment it received.

Foster youth exiting the system have enough challenges, and paying back an overpayment they never received should not have to be one of them.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Subcommittee Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member LARSON for their hard work on this legislation. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 4547, the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I had the opportunity to engage in this issue during hearings the committee held last year. I recognize the need for reform of the representative payee program in order to improve its integrity and ensure that beneficiaries are getting the assistance they need.

The representative payee program helps around 8 million Social Security beneficiaries manage their benefits. H.R. 4547 offers several reforms that will improve the program. These include provisions that will help better protect vulnerable beneficiaries, particularly those who are in foster care, by allowing for enhanced information sharing with State foster care programs. This will ensure that children in foster care have the appropriate representative payee if there is a change in placement. The bill also improves

oversight of representative payees by requiring State protection and advocacy programs to conduct reviews of payee performance.

Mr. Speaker, many Social Security beneficiaries require assistance in managing their benefits. I appreciate the work that the Ways and Means' Subcommittee on Social Security has done to improve the Social Security representative payee program, and I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4547.

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, many Americans who are charged with managing Social Security benefits for their elderly parents or for their children struggle to make the system work. I have heard stories from my communities in Kansas of the burdensome process that can be involved with the representative payee program.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4547, the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018. This important bipartisan piece of legislation reduces the burdens on families by eliminating the requirement to file an annual payee accounting form for spouses and for parents who live with their children.

In addition, the bill protects the most vulnerable beneficiaries through improved information sharing between the Social Security Administration and their respective States' adult protective services, such as KDADS in Kansas.

This will help identify whether a beneficiary is in foster care, reassess whether the payee is appropriate, and ensure the beneficiaries are provided for. The Social Security Administration has a great responsibility to ensure that Americans who need help managing their Social Security benefits get that help.

I would like to thank Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member LARSON for putting this bill together that will strengthen the representative payee program so that it better protects beneficiaries and reduces burdensome government paperwork that rarely provides any real value to families. Too many Americans are counting on the Social Security Administration to get this right.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the distinguished chairman from Texas for the very bipartisan nature of which this bill has come together, and that doesn't happen by accident. It happens because of the hard bipartisan work across the aisle of the staffs whom we work so closely with.

It also means that we want to recognize Amy Shuart, Lara Rosner, Matt Russell, Anne DeCesaro; and from my staff, Kathryn Olson, Jason Kanter, Morna Miller; and Jill Hunter-Williams, who is with Danny Davis' staff; and the irreplaceable Sylvia Lee from my office as well.

It is always an honor and pleasure to work with Mr. JOHNSON. He is, first and foremost, a gentleman. I look forward, later in this year, to traveling to Plano, Texas, where I hope we can have a hearing on Social Security in general.

Mr. JOHNSON has a bill and I have a bill that both have the same goals in mind, and while there may be different approaches, I know that his great bipartisan spirit and his gentleman nature will provide the kind of debate and dialogue that is necessary around an issue so vitally important to all Americans as Social Security.

This is America's greatest program and one that has never missed a payment and is often confused as being an entitlement when, in fact, it is the insurance that people have paid for and richly deserve. It hasn't been changed or modified significantly since Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill sat down and did that back in the early 1980s.

It is long overdue, and what better person who epitomizes the values and virtues of Ronald Reagan and who comes from Texas and who also has a heart as big as that great State, and I know that we will be able to come to a resolution about this very important issue that we face.

Mr. Speaker, I close by saying that it is not often, or perhaps more often than people would surmise, that we see this bipartisan cooperation. But it was Hubert Humphrey who said:

The ultimate moral test of any government is the way it treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

What Mr. JOHNSON has done today is to epitomize those very comments of then-Vice President Humphrey, and the Congress is responding. I encourage everyone to vote "yes" on H.R. 4547, the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act.

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, without agreement from both sides, you can't get anything done; and without Mr. LARSON, I think we would have been in deep, serious trouble in Social Security, but he and I think alike. We are for the people, and everything we do is trying to improve the system over what it is today, and I thank him for his help.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge all Members of the House to vote "yes" and pass the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act today so that the Senate can take ac-

tion soon and that the President can sign it into law without delay.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4547, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. 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 motion will be postponed.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2371) to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2371

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 "Western Area Power Administration Transparency Act".

SEC. 2. WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION PILOT PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration (referred to in this section as the "Administrator") shall establish a pilot project, as part of the continuous process improvement program and to provide increased transparency for customers, to publish on a publicly available website of the Western Area Power Administration, a database of the following information, beginning with fiscal year 2008, relating to the Western Area Power Administration:

(1) By power system and in a consistent format, rates charged to customers for power and transmission service.

(2) By power system, the amount of capacity or energy sold.

(3) By region, a detailed accounting, at the functional level and the budget activity level, of all expenditures, capital costs, and staffing costs, including—

(A) indirect costs, including overhead costs;

(B) direct charges and direct allocations;

(C) the number of contract staff;

(D) costs related to independent consultants;

(E) the number of full-time equivalents; and

(F) charges to the region from the headquarters office of the Western Area Power Administration for all annual and capital costs.

(4) For the headquarters office of the Western Area Power Administration, a detailed

accounting at the functional level and the budget activity level, of all expenditures and capital costs, including—

- (A) indirect costs, including overhead costs;
- (B) direct charges and direct allocations;
- (C) the number of contract staff;
- (D) costs related to independent consultants;
- (E) the number of full-time equivalents;

(F) a summary of any expenditures described in this paragraph, with the total amount paid by each region and power system; and

(G) expenses incurred on behalf of other Federal agencies or programs or third parties for the administration of programs not related to the marketing, transmission, or wheeling of Federal hydropower resources, including—

- (i) indirect costs, including overhead costs;
- (ii) direct charges and allocations;
- (iii) the number of contract staff; and
- (iv) the number of full-time equivalents.

(5) Capital expenditures, including—

(A) capital investments delineated by the year in which each investment is placed into service; and

(B) the sources of capital for each investment.

(b) ANNUAL SUMMARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year in which the pilot project is being carried out under this section, the Administrator shall make available on a publicly available website—

(A) updates to documents made available on the date of the initial publication of the information on the website under subsection (a);

(B) an identification of the magnitude of annual changes in the information published on the website under subsection (a);

(C) a description of the reasons for the changes identified under subparagraph (B);

(D) subject to paragraph (2), the total amount of the unobligated balances retained by the Western Area Power Administration at the end of the prior fiscal year within each marketing area and headquarters by—

- (i) purpose or function;
- (ii) source of funding;
- (iii) anticipated program allotment; and
- (iv) underlying authority for each source of funding; and

(E) the anticipated level of unobligated balances that the Western Area Power Administration expects to retain at the end of the fiscal year in which the annual summary is published, as delineated by each of the categories described in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (D).

(2) LIMITATION.—Amounts in the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund established by section 5(a) of the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (43 U.S.C. 620d(a)), shall not be considered to be an unobligated balance retained by the Western Area Power Administration for purposes of paragraph (1)(D).

(c) TERMINATION.—The pilot project under this section shall terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSAR. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their re-

marks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, we are considering my bill, H.R. 2371, the Western Area Power Administration Transparency Act. This bipartisan bill simply requires the Western Area Power Administration, known as WAPA, to establish a pilot project to allow for a more detailed understanding of how it uses both taxpayer and ratepayer dollars.

This bill is the result of calls from some of WAPA’s customers given rate increase trends and other financial discrepancies. H.R. 2371 requires WAPA to develop a publicly available website that contains a detailed accounting of its rates, expenditures, staffing, and other operational and financial dealings. Since cost increases are ultimately borne by its customers, WAPA needs to be more transparent about its business practices. That is exactly what this bill seeks to achieve. H.R. 2371 will increase transparency and afford ratepayers with the necessary information to positively engage with WAPA about its operation and spending decisions. I urge adoption of the measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2371, the Western Area Power Administration Transparency Act will help foster greater transparency and promote public confidence in the Western Area Power Administration, also called WAPA. WAPA is a critically important Federal agency that helps deliver power to nearly 40 million Americans across 15 States. This bill would establish a 7-year pilot project requiring WAPA to publish information online detailing the rates charged to customers for power and transmission service.

The legislation would also require WAPA to publish a detailed accounting of all expenditures, capital costs, and staffing costs by region and at WAPA’s headquarter office.

Finally, the legislation directs WAPA to publish information on the amount of unobligated balances the agency retains each year.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

□ 1630

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2371 will increase transparency and afford ratepayers with the necessary information to positively engage WAPA about its operations and spending decisions. Imagine that: getting back to what customers want.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2371.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

STE. GENEVIEVE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ESTABLISHMENT ACT

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2888) to establish the Ste. Genevieve National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2888

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 “Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park Establishment Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) HISTORIC DISTRICT.—The term “Historic District” means the Ste. Genevieve Historic District National Historic Landmark, as generally depicted on the Map.

(2) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term “Historical Park” means the Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park established by section 3(a).

(3) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park Proposed Boundary”, numbered 571/132,626, and dated May 2016.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.—The term “special resource study” means the study entitled “Ste. Genevieve Final Special Resources Study and Environmental Assessment, Missouri” and dated May 2016.

(6) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Missouri.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STE. GENEVIEVE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), there is established the Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park in the State as a unit of the National Park System to preserve, protect, and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the themes of French settlement, vernacular architecture, and community form and farming on the frontier associated with Ste. Genevieve.

(2) CONDITIONS FOR ESTABLISHMENT.—The Historical Park shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that—

(A) sufficient land has been acquired for the Historical Park to constitute a manageable unit; and

(B) the Secretary has entered into a written agreement providing that land owned by the State, the City of Ste. Genevieve, or other entity within the Historic District shall be managed consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The boundaries of the Historical Park shall be the boundaries generally depicted on the Map.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(d) ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land located within the boundary of the Historical Park or any nationally significant property identified in the special resource study within the Historic District by—

(A) donation;

(B) purchase with donated or appropriated funds; or

(C) exchange.

(2) BOUNDARY REVISION.—On the acquisition of any property within the Historic District under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall revise the boundary of the Historical Park to include the property.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the Historical Park in accordance with—

(A) this Act; and

(B) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(i) section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code; and

(ii) chapter 3201 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to prepare a general management plan for the Historical Park, the Secretary shall prepare the general management plan in accordance with section 100502 of title 54, United States Code.

(B) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—On completion of the general management plan under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate the general management plan.

(3) RELATED SITES.—The Secretary may provide interpretative tours and educational programs at related historic and cultural sites within the Historic District associated with the purposes for which the Historical Park is established.

(f) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance and enter into cooperative agreements with the owner of a nationally significant property within the Historical Park or the Historic District, to identify, mark, interpret, improve, and restore the property.

(2) RIGHT OF ACCESS.—A cooperative agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall provide that the Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall have the right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the property covered by the agreement for the purposes of—

(A) conducting visitors through the property; and

(B) interpreting the property for the public.

(3) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(A) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under a cooperative agreement entered into under this subsection shall be not more than 50 percent.

(B) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of an activity carried out under a cooperative agreement entered into under this subsection may be in the form of donated property, goods, or services fairly valued.

(4) CHANGES OR ALTERATIONS.—No changes or alterations shall be made to any property or project covered by a cooperative agreement entered into under paragraph (1) unless the Secretary and the other party to the agreement agree to the changes or alterations.

(5) CONVERSION, USE, OR DISPOSAL.—Any payment by the Secretary under this subsection shall be subject to an agreement that the conversion, use, or disposal of a property or project for purposes contrary to the purposes of this section, as determined by the Secretary, shall entitle the United States to reimbursement in any amount equal to the greater of—

(A) the amounts made available to the property or project by the United States; or

(B) the portion of the increased value of the property or project attributable to the amounts made available under this subsection, as determined at the time of the conversion, use, or disposal.

(g) LIMITED ROLE OF THE SECRETARY.—Nothing in this Act authorizes the Secretary to assume overall financial responsibility for the operation, maintenance, or management of the Historic District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2888, the Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park Establishment Act, sponsored by Representative JASON SMITH from Missouri, would establish the Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park in the city of Ste. Genevieve, Missouri. It would also authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land for the park by donation, purchase, or exchange.

Founded around 1750 by French Canadian settlers, Ste. Genevieve was Missouri's first settlement. Settlers from present-day Illinois crossed the Mississippi River attracted to the rich soil in the area. After severe floods in 1785, the town was moved 3 miles inland, where it still exists today, retaining many of its historic buildings, landscapes, and community characteristics.

Ste. Genevieve is one of the oldest National Historic Landmark districts in the country, with a portion of the landmark designated in 1960. It is famous for the use of French vertical log architecture.

In 2009, Congress authorized a National Park Service study of the area,

which concluded that the Ste. Genevieve historic district is nationally significant and suitable for direct National Park Service management.

There is widespread local support for the establishment of a historical park, including the city, county commission, and Chamber of Commerce.

Ste. Genevieve is an important part of our Nation's expansion and agricultural history and merits becoming a unit of the National Park System.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2888 establishes the Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park in the State of Missouri.

Ste. Genevieve, Missouri, is a small town on the banks of the Mississippi River that was established by French settlers in the mid-eighteenth century.

Due to its unique collection of French vertical log architecture, the town was designated as one of the Nation's first National Historic Landmarks in 1960.

In 2016, the National Park Service completed the special resource study and determined that the area exemplifies an important aspect of American history not adequately represented and protected elsewhere, therefore, meeting the suitability criteria for inclusion in the National Park System.

This site went through the process and has fulfilled all the criteria for becoming a new unit of the National Park System.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), the original sponsor of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to speak on behalf of this bill, the Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park Establishment Act, and on the behalf of the community of Ste. Genevieve.

Ste. Genevieve, Missouri, is home to one of the largest collections of French colonial architecture in the United States and is one of the oldest colonial settlements west of the Mississippi River dating back to the early 1700s.

For years, the community of Ste. Genevieve has celebrated its history and unique culture through numerous festivals and annual events. Over time, the Federal Government has begun to catch on. One of the town's historic homes is a National Historic Landmark, several other homes are on the National Register of Historic Places, and a large area of the town itself is designated as a National Historic Landmark district, one of the oldest in the country.

In May of 2016, the National Park Service concluded and released a Final Special Resource Study and Environmental Assessment for Ste. Genevieve. This study was the result of legislation

passed over 10 years previously, which tasked the Park Service with determining whether or not the resources at Ste. Genevieve met the criteria for inclusion in the National Park System. Happily, the Park Service study concluded what the people of Ste. Genevieve already knew: that Ste. Genevieve's large and unique collection of vertical log houses rises to national significance. The study determined that certain areas are suitable for direct Park Service management.

My bill is very straightforward: it establishes the Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park as a unit of the National Park System; it sets the boundaries of the park as depicted on the map laid out by the Park Service; and it gives the Secretary of the Interior certain authorities within the boundaries of the Historical Park or any nationally significant property identified in the special resource study.

In order for the resources of Ste. Genevieve to be properly preserved, Park Service management is necessary. The work of local nonprofits, the city of Ste. Genevieve, and the State of Missouri to manage, preserve, and showcase these historic structures cannot be understated. However, there are still unmet needs for resource protection and interpretation, and the community looks forward to working with the Park Service to increase tourism in the area as well as properly preserve and study the town's resources.

Once again, I want to highlight and thank the community of Ste. Genevieve for their strong support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to swiftly pass my bill and move it one step closer to the President's desk.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out something that we do not normally see in the Public Lands and Environmental Regulation Subcommittee of Natural Resources, and that is the people of Ste. Genevieve feel so strongly in what they do that they actually came to support those testifying in time-sensitive dress. As we looked at the various photographs of what they do to preserve their town, they were there before us in those same costumes. This is how serious the people of Ste. Genevieve are of the preservation of their site.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to please support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Ste. Genevieve is an important part of our Nation's expansion and agriculture history and merits becoming a unit of the National Park.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that all vote for it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona

(Mr. GOSAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2888.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GATEWAY ARCH NATIONAL PARK DESIGNATION ACT

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1438) to redesignate the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in the State of Missouri as the "Gateway Arch National Park".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1438

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 "Gateway Arch National Park Designation Act".

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF GATEWAY ARCH NATIONAL PARK.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial established under the Act of May 17, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 450jj et seq.), shall be known and designated as the "Gateway Arch National Park".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial shall be considered to be a reference to the "Gateway Arch National Park".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, towering 630 feet above the banks of the Mississippi River, Gateway Arch has, for 50 years, commemorated both Thomas Jefferson's vision of expansion and America's enduring spirit of discovery.

Clad entirely in stainless steel, the Gateway Arch is the tallest man-made monument in the country and uniquely features two custom trams on either side, which shuttle thousands of guests a year to a viewing deck at the apex.

The Gateway Arch National Park Designation Act would redesignate the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Missouri, as the Gateway Arch National Park. The park would include not only the Gateway Arch, but a museum and the old St. Louis courthouse, the site of the Dred Scott trial.

People from across the country have been visiting the monument and surrounding buildings since 1965, when the memorial was established.

Passing this bill today would make the Gateway Arch National Park America's 60th National Park and allow the National Park Service to ensure that the site would be ready for a planned Fourth of July celebration this very year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill redesignates the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial as the Gateway Arch National Park.

The Gateway Arch has become synonymous with the St. Louis skyline, and this is an important change that gives this national icon an updated and recognizable name.

S. 1438 passed the Senate by a voice vote, so with our support today, we will be sending it to the White House for the President to sign.

I congratulate the Missouri delegation for coming together in a bipartisan fashion and working so hard to move this through the legislative process.

The House version of this bill was introduced by Representative Lacy Clay. Unfortunately, he was not able to be here this afternoon, but he deserves a hearty congratulations for his work on this initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of S. 1438, the Gateway Arch National Park Designation Act. And I would like to start by thanking Senator BLUNT and Congressman CLAY for their leadership on this issue. Renaming the Gateway Arch and the area surrounding it will finally make its name consistent with how people from around the world identify it, and our city. We are, indeed, the gateway to the West.

In 1935, the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial was created as a unit of the National Park Service, and, today, it includes a museum, the old St. Louis courthouse and the Gateway Arch National Monument. It was built to honor the role that President Thomas Jefferson played in opening the American West and the settlers who followed the footsteps of Lewis and Clark and their Corps of Discovery.

In addition, it encompasses the old St. Louis courthouse, where Dred Scott filed suit seeking his freedom, furthering the fight to ensure that all men are, indeed, created equally. It was also the site where, in 1872, Virginia Minor asserted that women were

citizens of the United States and, therefore, were entitled to vote.

The Gateway Arch itself is the largest man-made monument in the United States of America and has been welcoming visitors to the banks of the Mississippi River since its construction in 1965.

When people come to visit the Gateway Arch National Park, the name will now reflect the Gateway Arch, but it will stand for so much more. Visitors will see how St. Louis embodies its history as the Gateway to the West.

Explorers, settlers, civil rights leaders, and many more have passed through our city and found promise in what lies ahead. That is the spirit our city embodies, and the name of our national park will now match what is at the heart of our culture.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, in closing, again, I congratulate the Missouri delegation for coming together in a bipartisan fashion and working so hard to move this legislation forward. We are going to, by passage of this legislation, give this very national icon an updated and recognizable name, as it has always represented, really, when you think about it, the Skyline of St. Louis.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues support this great piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1645

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this Gateway National Park has support from everybody. It is that gateway to the West that we are so eulogizing. I ask all Members to vote for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1438.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

EXEMPTION OF EXPORTATION OF CERTAIN ECHINODERMS FROM PERMISSION AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2504) to ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2504

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

SECTION 1. EXEMPTION OF EXPORTATION OF CERTAIN ECHINODERMS FROM PERMISSION AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) EXEMPTION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall amend section 14.92 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to clarify that—

(1) fish or wildlife described in subsection (b) are fishery products exempt from the export permission requirements of section 9(d)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1538(d)(1)); and

(2) any person may engage in business as an exporter of such fish or wildlife without procuring permission under such section of that Act or an export license under subpart I of part 14 of such title.

(b) COVERED FISH OR WILDLIFE.—The fish or wildlife referred to in subsection (a) are members of the phylum Echinodermata that are commonly known as sea urchins and sea cucumbers, including products thereof, that—

(1) do not require a permit under part 16, 17, or 23 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) are harvested in waters under the jurisdiction of the United States or are processed in the United States; and

(3) are—

(A) exported for purposes of human or animal consumption; or

(B) taken in waters under the jurisdiction of the United States or on the high seas for recreational purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2504, introduced by my Maine colleagues, CHELLIE PINGREE and BRUCE POLIQUIN, is a bipartisan effort to right a bipartisan wrong. In regulations created by an outgoing George W. Bush administration and carried on by administrations since, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has imposed unnecessary fees and duplicative and costly inspection requirements on what was once a growing industry that aims to export niche seafood to overseas markets.

Even the National Marine Fisheries Service, a bastion of Federal regulatory growth, disagrees with its sister agency on this matter. The stories of spoiled food shipments, loss of jobs, and bureaucratic indifference embody the arrogance of an agency gone wild.

This bill preserves and promotes jobs as a counter.

I will include in the RECORD an exchange of letters with Chairman ROYCE of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who also received a referral of this bill. I thank him for his cooperation in allowing this bill to go forward today.

Again, I commend our two Maine colleagues for working on a bipartisan basis to address this matter. I urge adoption of this commonsense measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2018.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: H.R. 2504, To ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms, was introduced on May 17, 2017. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I thank you for allowing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support having the Committee on Foreign Affairs represented on the conference committee. Finally, to memorialize our understanding, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the bill is considered by the House.

Thank you for your response and cooperation. I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 3, 2018.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 2504, a bill to ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms.

I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be discharged from further action on this bill, subject to the understanding that this waiver does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. The Committee also reserves the right to seek an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this bill, and would appreciate your support for any such request.

I ask that you place our exchange of letters into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), the sponsor of this bill.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Hawaii for the time.

I rise today as well in support of H.R. 2504, a bill that will end the practice of duplicative export inspections for sea urchin and sea cucumbers that are being shipped overseas.

This is the second time that the House has considered this legislation in recent years. I want to thank Chairman BISHOP; Subcommittee Chairman LAMBORN; Ranking Member GRIJALVA; and my good friend from California, Ranking Member HUFFMAN, for their support in bringing this bill again to the floor today.

I also want to thank my colleague from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for being here to speak in favor of this bill today.

Also, in the bipartisan effort that we are making here today, I want to recognize and thank my colleague from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), who well knows the importance of this issue and who has been an original cosponsor of this bill, both in this Congress and the last.

I think it is important to explain to the Members who are here today a little bit about why this bill is important and especially critical to our Nation's sea urchin industry.

As a few Members may know, but most probably don't, the sea urchin industry in Maine brings in over \$5.4 million to our State every year. It supports 600 jobs, which includes harvesters of the species. Also, we have businesses in Maine which process the urchins harvested here, as well as those imported from Canada and Chile, before being exported overseas.

The need for this bill revolves around ending a duplicative inspection of exported product that is unnecessary and costly. Urchins imported to Maine from other countries to be processed are inspected by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service when they get to the United States. This scrutiny is necessary to ensure the integrity of the imported products.

However, in recent years, the Fish and Wildlife Service has inspected products once again before leaving the country, usually in New York or New Jersey. This occurs before they are shipped to Asia and Japan, in particular, where they are considered a delicacy.

I have spent the past few years working with my colleagues in the Maine delegation to better understand the impact of this policy on small businesses in our State and others where the urchins are harvested. I believe these extra inspections are unnecessary. There is really no reason why sea urchins should be treated differently than shellfish, which have been exempted from these export inspections for decades.

This process often leads to costly delays and lost product, as urchins may end up sitting in hot warehouses waiting for days. At times, the Fish and Wildlife office closes right when a shipment arrives for inspection. The

highly perishable product must then sit there because of bad timing.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has worked with my office to try to find solutions, and I know they have tried to work with us on particular problems and trouble spots. But the continual delays, despite their best efforts and that of harvesters, means that the only real solution is to get rid of this duplicative inspection. Again, that is what this bill will do.

This bill is a commonsense solution that will take away an unnecessary inspection, while ensuring that the Fish and Wildlife Service can continue to do their work and their jobs on other important issues affecting our coast and coastal communities.

It will put our sea urchin and sea cucumber businesses on equal footing with their partners in the shellfish industry who do not have this extra scrutiny. It will help the hardworking men and women who harvest and process in this fishery to dedicate their time and efforts to that fishery, not to the bureaucracy.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, as we did in the past Congress.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to salute CHELLIE PINGREE, my cosponsor on this bill, H.R. 2504, for the great work that she has done and that we have done together.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that the job of government is to help our families, to help our small businesses, such that the kids and the young adults in Maine can stay in our State, such that they can raise their families and have a wonderful life.

The best part of the world is in the State of Maine. Now, Ms. PINGREE represents the southern part of our coast, Mr. Speaker, the southern half, from Camden down to Kittery. I represent the downeast part of our coast, from Lincolnville up to Eastport.

Now, in the downeast part of our coast, mostly we are the folks that dive for the sea urchins and cucumbers. These are little critters that are delicacies in the Far East. We might not eat them here in Washington, but they are delicacies in the Far East. And in Chellie's district, the southern part of the coast, they process these critters.

Mr. Speaker, this is very dangerous work. The folks that harvest these sea urchins and cucumbers strap on tanks and go into deep, dark, cold waters off the coast of Maine, and they are doing a great job getting this product to market.

This product is incredibly perishable, so it is very important to get them from the bottom of the sea floor in coastal Maine onto their boats, down to Portland where they are processed in Ms. PINGREE's district, and then onto a truck, down to JFK, get them on a plane, and get them to the Far East and sell as many of these critters as is humanly possible.

This is where the problem comes in. As Ms. PINGREE said, we already inspect this perishable delicacy in Maine. We do not need, Mr. Speaker, a second set of regulations that inspect them down in New York.

And God forbid that it is on a holiday and folks don't show up to inspect them.

What happens to this very perishable product?

It sits in a warehouse on a tarmac where it is exposed to things that would cause them to go bad.

So we need to do commonsense Maine stuff here, which is to eliminate over-regulation. We already inspect this product in Maine. We don't need to do it again down on a tarmac in New York.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everybody, Republicans and Democrats, to work the way CHELLIE and I have on this, in a bipartisan manner, to make sure our families in Maine have an opportunity to dive for sea cucumbers and sea urchins and get them to market as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for giving me the time to speak on this; I thank Ms. PINGREE for the same. I really appreciate leadership moving this through the floor here. I hope we have a very big, bipartisan, unanimous vote on this, because it is commonsense Maine. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. PINGREE. I appreciate her work on this. Congratulations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I can make this even more real for people. Hawaii, as you know, my home State, is very close to Asia. We have many of the cuisines of Asia, and I can tell you that these are delicacies. Sea urchins are also called uni, for those who frequent sushi bars, and sea cucumbers are called namako. I grew up eating both, and they are very critical and a major part of what we consume, especially, not only in the sushi bars, but during festive holidays in Hawaii. So you can imagine what it means in terms of an export industry for Maine, not only to my home State, but also to the Asian market.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I join the introducers of this bill, the sponsors, and I ask that my colleagues support this.

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

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

I, too, want to compliment the two Representatives from Maine. They gave us a hands-on and a palate-trying type of opportunity in our hearing. It doesn't get better than that, and I want to compliment them for both.

I ask all of my colleagues to vote for the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2504.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES-JORDAN DEFENSE COOPERATION EXTENSION ACT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2646) to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2646

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 “United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Extension Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In December 2011, Congress passed section 7041(b) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-74; 125 Stat. 1223), which appropriated funds made available under the heading “Economic Support Fund” to establish an enterprise fund for Jordan.

(2) The intent of an enterprise fund is to attract private investment to help entrepreneurs and small businesses create jobs and to achieve sustainable economic development.

(3) Jordan is an instrumental partner in the fight against terrorism, including as a member of the Global Coalition To Counter ISIS and the Combined Joint Task Force – Operation Inherent Resolve.

(4) In 2014, His Majesty King Abdullah stated that “Jordanians and Americans have been standing shoulder to shoulder against extremism for many years, but to a new level with this coalition against ISIL”.

(5) On February 3, 2015, the United States signed a three-year memorandum of understanding with Jordan, pledging to provide the kingdom with \$1,000,000,000 annually in United States foreign assistance, subject to the approval of Congress.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Jordan plays a critical role in responding to the overwhelming humanitarian needs created by the conflict in Syria;

(2) Jordan, the United States, and other partners should continue working together to address this humanitarian crisis and promote regional stability, including through support for refugees in Jordan and internally displaced people along the Jordan-Syria bor-

der and the creation of conditions inside Syria that will allow for the secure, dignified, and voluntary return of people displaced by the crisis; and

(3) the Governments of the United States and Jordan should negotiate a new Memorandum of Understanding, for fiscal years 2018 through 2022, to significantly enhance Jordan’s military capacity and local economy.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF UNITED STATES-JORDAN DEFENSE COOPERATION ACT OF 2015.

Section 5(a) of the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015 (22 U.S.C. 2753 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “During the 3-year period” and inserting “During the period”; and

(2) by inserting “and ending on December 31, 2022” after “enactment of this Act”.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF ENTERPRISE FUND FOR JORDAN.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF JORDAN ENTERPRISE FUND.—The President is authorized to establish and operate an enterprise fund to provide assistance to Jordan.

(b) PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS.—The provisions contained in section 201 of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5421), excluding the provisions of subsections (a), (b), (c), (d)(3), (f), and (j) of that section, shall be deemed to apply with respect to the Jordan Enterprise Fund and to funds made available to the enterprise fund in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply with respect to enterprise funds established pursuant to such section or to funds made available to such established enterprise funds.

(c) OPERATION OF FUND.—

(1) EXPENDITURES.—Funds made available to the Jordan Enterprise Fund shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payments for projects and activities.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 3 percent of the funds made available to the Jordan Enterprise Fund may be obligated or expended for the administrative expenses of the enterprise fund.

(d) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Jordan Enterprise Fund shall be governed by a Board of Directors comprised of private citizens of the United States or Jordan, who—

(A) shall be appointed by the President, in consultation with the chair and ranking member of each of the appropriate congressional committees; and

(B) have pursued international business careers and have demonstrated expertise in international and emerging market investment activities.

(2) MAJORITY MEMBER REQUIREMENT.—The majority of the members of the Board of Directors shall be United States citizens.

(e) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the Jordan Enterprise Fund terminates in accordance with subsection (g), the Board of Directors shall—

(1) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the administrative expenses of the enterprise fund; and

(2) publish, on an Internet website administered by the enterprise fund, each report submitted pursuant to subsection (b) in accordance with section 201(p) of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5421(p)).

(f) LIQUIDATION.—Any funds resulting from any liquidation, dissolution, or winding up of the Jordan Enterprise Fund, in whole or in part, shall be returned to the Treasury.

(g) TERMINATION.—The authority of the Jordan Enterprise Fund to provide assistance shall terminate on the earlier of—

(1) the date that is 7 years after the date of the first expenditure of amounts in accordance with subsection (c)(1); or

(2) the date on which the enterprise fund is liquidated in accordance with subsection (f). (h) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their support for this measure and for their leadership in helping to bring H.R. 2646, the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Extension Act, to the floor today.

I also want to thank my friends and colleagues Nita Lowey, Ted Deutch, Hal Rogers, and Adam Schiff for joining me in introducing this bill.

This is a strong bipartisan bill that underscores the importance of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in helping both of our nations work toward achieving shared goals of security and stability in the Middle East.

It acknowledges what we have all known for many years, and that is that His Majesty and the kingdom are indispensable allies in the fight against radicalism and terror in the region.

Jordan and its military have played important roles in many of our counter-ISIS operations, and in many ways our relationship with Jordan has served as a force multiplier and has allowed the coalition to make all the positive gains that we have made over the past year or so.

But that would have not been possible without a robust foreign military financing—FMF—program that we have in place with our allies in Jordan. That is why in 2015, Mr. Speaker, I introduced and the President signed in 2016 the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act.

This bill authorized the administration to enter into a memorandum of understanding—MOU—with Jordan.

Why?

To increase our military cooperation with Jordan and to provide the kingdom with increased FMF assistance.

It also allowed Jordan to be included in a list of close and trusted allies that are eligible for streamlined and expedited defense sales.

Why is that important?

Because Jordan is on the front lines in the fight against terror and we rely heavily on Jordan's cooperation.

That bill also authorized the administration to increase our economic support for the kingdom. We recognize the great contributions that Jordan has made in response to the Syrian refugee crisis. Since the Assad regime began its campaign of destruction, murdering over half a million people in the process, millions of Syrians have fled their war-torn nation. Hundreds of thousands, if not over a million, Syrians have crossed over the border into Jordan seeking refuge from the fighting. For a country of just a few million in population, an influx of this magnitude would strain the government's already limited resources.

Yet, Jordan recognized the need to provide refuge to those fleeing the murderous Assad regime and its cronies; the Putin regime; and Iran and its proxy, the terror group Hezbollah. We, in return, recognized the strategic importance of Jordan's security and stability. That is why we must ensure that the kingdom does indeed have the resources that it needs, both in the fight against terror but also in support of the larger refugee population.

That memorandum of understanding was signed 3 years ago this week, and it ran through fiscal year 2017. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Jordan's current and future security and stability are far from guaranteed. Most of the refugees remain, and despite having made great progress in defeating ISIS, the terror threat is far from being eliminated.

That is why I authored this bill before us today, along with this bipartisanship coalition of colleagues, to extend the provisions of the original United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act for another 5-year period through 2022.

We need to enhance Jordan's military capacity and its local economy significantly, and it is my hope that our two governments will soon enter into a renewed memorandum of understanding—MOU—at an increased level that meets the needs of the kingdom.

In addition to extending the provisions of the Defense Cooperation Act, this bill provides for the establishment of a Jordanian Enterprise Fund. An enterprise fund would attract private investment and help entrepreneurs and small businesses create jobs in a way that would foster sustainable economic development in Jordan for the long term and in a self-sustaining fashion.

Mr. Speaker, Jordan's security and Jordan's stability, they are both vital not just for our ally, but they are vital for the region and for our own national security interests. It is vital that we send a strong bipartisanship message of support. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), our esteemed chairman, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN; as well as my colleague, the ranking member of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee, Ted Deutch, for their work on this important piece of legislation.

The United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Extension Act would ensure Jordan's continued eligibility for a more streamlined process for accessing defense articles, acknowledging the very difficult challenges that Jordan faces from extremist organizations both within Jordan and on its borders.

The legislation supports a new memorandum of understanding to enhance Jordan's military capacity and economic growth, and it authorizes an enterprise fund that would invest in Jordan's economy.

I am glad that this bill reflects our comprehensive relationship with Amman, which is so vital at this point in history in the region.

□ 1715

The legislation acknowledges the key role Jordan plays as a partner against ISIS, or Daesh, and as a home to thousands of Iraqi, Syrian, and Palestinian refugees.

I would like to note the important work that Jordan does in facilitating cross-border assistance to Syria, preventing further destabilization. Jordan also plays a critical role in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, and I hope that Jordan and Israel are able to soon return to the normal level of diplomatic cooperation.

The bottom line is this: it is in our national security interest to work with Jordan on the security threats facing the region, as well as opportunities for economic growth within Jordan. This bill will help advance both of those goals.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are here, really, to reaffirm a very important commitment that we have to one of our closest partners in the Middle East, and that is Jordan. I think all of us agree that, over the generations, it has been astounding the way Jordan has always offered safe haven and refuge through the generations to others.

This bill gives us an opportunity to continue that close working relation-

ship that we have with Jordan because, as we know, Jordan is locked—has been locked—in a struggle with ISIS, or Daesh, as they call it in that part of the world. They have been involved on the battlefield, and this bill addresses both the military and economic elements of the close relationship we have with Jordan.

As they valiantly fight ISIS, Jordanians have struggled to absorb, most recently, more than 1 million Syrian refugees; and they are doing this, obviously, while coping with a tough economy, with an overburdened infrastructure, and with high unemployment for their youth. I have been to some of the schools in Jordan to see the Jordanians as they once again reach out a hand of friendship to help those who are in this predicament.

Although Jordan has successfully worked with the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the World Bank to address some of the economic challenges, it really has not been enough to create the level of vital economic growth needed in the circumstances that Jordan is in.

Economic opportunity and prosperity in Jordan are one element of our bulwark against extremist groups, against the Iranian regime, the IRGC, who seek to spread chaos and destruction, and as ISIS seeks to spread death.

In addition to supporting existing efforts, including regional water and energy projects that bring needed resources and will bring increased cooperation between neighbors, this bill calls for the establishment of an enterprise fund for Jordan. This is a measure previously authorized, previously funded by this body, and this fund will help create economic opportunity through private-public partnership, through investments in small and medium enterprises, and it will also create market development in Jordan.

Although not a familiar measure to many, enterprise funds have already been very successful in Tunisia, and we have seen that. We have seen that success.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our colleagues for their support for this measure for our ally and friend, Jordan, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to go ahead and close now and just reiterate what I said earlier. This is such important legislation and really achieves both goals on the security front as well as the economic front.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I would like to thank my colleagues. I would like to thank the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ENGEL, but I would also like to thank Mr. Eagle over there, BRENDAN BOYLE, and I would

like to thank ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN as well.

Jordan, of course, is a key partner in our struggle against ISIS and against the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and other destabilizing actors in the Middle East. This bill supports our joint efforts on the battlefield and will help Jordan achieve much-needed economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and, once again, extend the arm of friendship to our closest partner, Jordan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) be allowed to reclaim his unused time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

We have one of the two main sponsors for the bill who has just joined us and wants the opportunity to speak.

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania, and I greatly appreciate the chairman for his unanimous consent request.

I want to thank Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN for her tremendous leadership in helping advance H.R. 2646, the United States Jordan Defense Cooperation Extension Act. This bill is important because our partnership with Jordan is important, and I want to quickly explain why my constituents back home believe that this is important.

Those good-news headlines that we have read about, U.S. military success against ISIS, are, in part, thanks to Jordan. Jordan is a key partner in the international coalition to defeat ISIS and has fought airstrikes right alongside us. Just last week, the U.S. finished delivery of Black Hawk helicopters to Amman that are used to take terrorists off the battlefield, helping to keep both our nations safer.

The bill before us today ensures that Jordan continues to get this critical military assistance, but it does more than that. It also ensures that Jordan gets the economic support it needs to care for over 1 million Syrian refugees now living in Jordan as a result of the war next door. This influx has taken a huge toll on Jordan's resources.

Today, we are helping ease that burden with emergency services, education, and access to clean water. In fact, Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN and I had an opportunity just a few years ago to see firsthand a USAID project: a wastewater treatment facility that, today, is providing access to clean water for millions of Jordanians.

This is the right thing to do both for America's strategic interests and for American values. Jordan's stability is vital to regional stability. Our com-

mitment to an enduring strategic partnership with Jordan is critical to our mission of defeating ISIS, caring for the victims of war, and pursuing end-of-conflict agreements throughout the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank my colleagues for their bipartisan support of this piece of legislation, and I urge all of us to vote "yes" for H.R. 2646.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2646, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UKRAINE CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1997) to encourage United States-Ukraine cybersecurity cooperation and require a report regarding such cooperation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1997

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 "Ukraine Cybersecurity Cooperation Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States established diplomatic relations with Ukraine in 1992, following Ukraine's independence from the Soviet Union.

(2) The United States attaches great importance to the success of Ukraine's transition to a modern democratic country with a flourishing market economy.

(3) In an effort to undermine democracy in Ukraine, hackers targeted the country's voting infrastructure just days before its 2014 presidential election.

(4) In December 2015, a malicious cyber intrusion into Ukrainian electric utility companies resulted in widespread power outages.

(5) As a result of the December 2015 cyber incident, the United States sent an interagency team to Ukraine, including representatives from the Department of Energy, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, to help with the investigation and to assess the vulnerability of Ukraine's infrastructure to cyber intrusion. The visit was followed up by another interagency delegation to Ukraine in March 2016 and a May 2016 United States-Ukrainian tabletop exercise on mitigating attacks against Ukraine's infrastructure.

(6) In response to an escalating series of cyber attacks on the country's critical infra-

structure – including its national railway system, its major stock exchanges, and its busiest airport – President Petro Poroshenko declared that "Cyberspace has turned into another battlefield for state independence."

(7) In May 2017, Ukraine cited activities on Russian social media platforms, including pro-Russian propaganda and offensive cyber operations, as threats to Ukrainian national security.

(8) Following the June 2017 Petya malware event – a global cyber incident that primarily affected Ukraine – the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) said "the cyber attacks we have seen . . . very much highlight the importance of the support, the help NATO provides . . . gives . . . or provides to Ukraine to strengthen its cyber defenses, technical and other kinds of support. We will continue to do that and it's an important part of our cooperation with Ukraine."

(9) In September 2017, the United States and Ukraine conducted the first United States-Ukraine Bilateral Cyber Dialogue in Kyiv, during which both sides affirmed their commitment to an internet that is open, interoperable, reliable, and secure, and the United States announced \$5 million in new cyber assistance to strengthen Ukraine's ability to prevent, mitigate, and respond to cyber attacks.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) reaffirm the United States-Ukraine Charter on Strategic Partnership, which highlights the importance of the bilateral relationship and outlines enhanced cooperation in the areas of defense, security, economics and trade, energy security, democracy, and cultural exchanges;

(2) support continued cooperation between NATO and Ukraine;

(3) support Ukraine's political and economic reforms;

(4) reaffirm the commitment of the United States to the Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances;

(5) assist Ukraine's efforts to enhance its cybersecurity capabilities; and

(6) improve Ukraine's ability to respond to Russian-supported disinformation and propaganda efforts in cyberspace, including through social media and other outlets.

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION WITH UKRAINE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should take the following actions, commensurate with United States interests, to assist Ukraine to improve its cybersecurity:

(1) Provide Ukraine such support as may be necessary to secure government computer networks from malicious cyber intrusions, particularly such networks that defend the critical infrastructure of Ukraine.

(2) Provide Ukraine support in reducing reliance on Russian information and communications technology.

(3) Assist Ukraine to build its capacity, expand cybersecurity information sharing, and cooperate on international cyberspace efforts.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on United States cybersecurity cooperation with Ukraine. Such report shall also include information relating to the following:

(1) United States efforts to strengthen Ukraine's ability to prevent, mitigate, and respond to cyber incidents, including through training, education, technical assistance, capacity building, and cybersecurity risk management strategies.

(2) The potential for new areas of collaboration and mutual assistance between the United States and Ukraine in addressing shared cyber challenges, including cybercrime, critical infrastructure protection, and resilience against botnets and other automated, distributed threats.

(3) NATO's efforts to help Ukraine develop technical capabilities to counter cyber threats.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to talk about Ukraine and the U.S.-Ukraine cyber cooperation. Ukraine, of course, is on the front lines of digital combat as we have learned. Few countries have endured as great a level of cyber invasion and aggression as has Ukraine at the hands of Russia and at the hands of other malicious actors as well.

I led a delegation of four Democrats and four Republicans into the east, into Dnipropetrovsk in the Donbass region, and we had an opportunity to hear about what is being done to try to tear that country apart.

This is in addition to the invasion in the east, the occupation of the east. This is the farthest east one can go in Ukraine today, and you can see the struggle that everyday people are having with the disinformation campaign launched against them relentlessly. As President Poroshenko said, "Cyberspace has turned into another battlefield for state independence," and that is so true for Ukraine.

Their struggle to defend their independence and their territorial integrity from Russian aggression extends far beyond the armed conflict of the occupation of its territory. In 2014, hackers targeted Ukraine's electoral infrastructure just days before its presidential election. The following year, a malicious cyber intrusion shut down the country's electric grid, turning off the lights and turning off the heat in the dead of winter.

Ukraine's critical infrastructure, including its national railway system, its major stock exchanges, and its busiest airport, have been repeatedly targeted by sophisticated cyber attacks.

Most of these continuing assaults have been identified by experts as Russian in origin. By working with the government in Kiev, we can better pre-

pare ourselves as well as our friends in partner countries against similar aggression, including combating Russian disinformation efforts that rely heavily on disseminating propaganda. That propaganda poses as legitimate news.

So this bill will enhance our cooperation with Ukraine in addressing shared cyber challenges, including cybercrime and the protection of critical infrastructure.

Modern society requires an internet worldwide that is open, that is reliable, that is secure, which can only be ensured if all those who seek to preserve it join forces to defeat those who wish to destroy it.

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing up my bipartisan bill, and I especially want to thank the chairman of our committee, Mr. ROYCE of California, for his action and moving on our bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe cybersecurity is the national security challenge of our time. Cyber warfare is inexpensive to carry out and easy for adversaries to hide behind, making it especially damaging, difficult to detect, and impossible for the victim to quickly respond.

In January, the CIA attributed to Russian military hackers a cyber attack that crippled computers in Ukraine last year. This attack wiped data from the computers of banks, energy firms, senior government officials, and an airport. The virus went on to affect computer systems in Denmark, India, and even here in the United States.

For years, Putin has been using Ukraine as a field test for these cyber attacks. Ukraine, after all, is on the front line for these nation self-directed cyber attacks, and they are potential harbingers of attacks on the United States.

By assisting Ukraine, we can learn best practices to best defend ourselves. For these reasons, I introduced H.R. 1997 with my Republican colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman Brian Fitzpatrick, which encourages cooperation between the United States and our ally Ukraine on matters of cybersecurity and requires a report from the State Department on best practices to protect ourselves—to the benefit of both nations.

□ 1730

In Ukraine, it is no coincidence that cyber attacks against itself increased when the Ukrainian people self-organized to demand an open and democratic society in 2014 contrary to Putin's interests.

Days before the 2014 Presidential election, hackers infiltrated Ukraine's Central Election Commission with a series of attacks that disabled the website in an attempt to sow distrust in the outcome of the election of President Poroshenko.

In December of 2015, hackers remotely shut down power at three regional electricity distribution companies, creating a power outage affecting more than 200,000 people. We can only imagine what it must feel like to lose electricity and heat during the winter in Ukraine.

Cyber attacks, unfortunately, have only continued since. Ukraine's next Presidential election is just next year. Our own elections are right around the corner later this year, and, of course, the Presidential election is in 2020.

Both the United States and Ukraine have clear interests in strengthening our cyber defenses. Moreover, our cooperation toward this goal will send a strong and important signal of Western support for Ukraine at a time when it is literally fighting to protect its own democracy.

We must stand strong with the people of Ukraine and our NATO allies and come together in furtherance of our cybersecurity defenses. This bill is a reasonable first step to do just that, and it is obviously very timely.

I thank Chairman ROYCE again, as well as Ranking Member ENGEL for their hard work and support for this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it. It is time we address this vital issue.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), who is an esteemed member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. And besides Brendan Boyle here, he is another big Philly Eagles fan.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman so much for all the work he does on the committee and for bringing the bill to the floor. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for all of his work on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my full support for H.R. 1997, the U.S.-Ukraine Cybersecurity Cooperation Act.

During my career as an FBI agent, I was assigned to the U.S. Embassy in Kiev, Ukraine, where I worked closely with our Ukrainian counterparts on a whole host of issues to include cybersecurity.

Mr. Speaker, one thing is clear: we must strengthen our relationship with Ukraine wherever possible and by whatever means possible. They have acted as a steadfast ally to the United States against a hostile Russia.

Further, there should be no doubt that cybersecurity and cyber warfare are the rising threats of our time. We have seen plenty of occasions where bad actors—state-sponsored or otherwise—have executed cyber attacks against private companies, government entities, and the very institutions upon which our Nation was founded. These attacks will only continue to increase both in sophistication and frequency as we continue into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues, Democratic and Republican alike, to support this crucial and necessary piece of legislation both for the United States and Ukraine, and for all our allies.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), who is someone who grew up a strong Philadelphia sports fan.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from the Philadelphia area who has introduced this important piece of legislation with Mr. FITZPATRICK, another fine Representative from the Philadelphia sports-loving area, which gives me the opportunity on the House floor to claim my Pennsylvania roots and to congratulate the Philadelphia Eagles.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the U.S.-Ukraine Cybersecurity Cooperation Act introduced by Mr. BOYLE and Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank Chairman ROYCE for his ongoing leadership on this issue.

The director of the CIA, Mike Pompeo, said last week that he has every expectation that Russia will again try to meddle in our elections. That should concern us. It should also concern us that the President has decided to ignore Congress and not impose sanctions against Russia.

But Russia's attacks on the United States follow a playbook that they have used in their own region, most recently against Ukraine.

In addition to rampant disinformation campaigns and political interference, Russia has launched numerous cyber attacks against Ukraine, including knocking out large swaths of its electrical grid in massive attacks. Those capabilities could one day be used against us here at home.

That is why the U.S.-Ukraine Cybersecurity Cooperation Act is so important. The United States has an interest both in defending Ukraine from Russian aggression and in securing our own defenses. Helping Ukraine actually teaches us best practices for hardening our own defenses against potential Russian attacks on our critical infrastructure.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1997, the U.S.-Ukraine Cybersecurity Cooperation Act.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Let me say one thing that strikes me and saddens me. When I hold townhalls or meetings with constituent groups, usually some variation of this comment will be made: Why don't you guys get along? Why don't you do something?

Actually, I then tell them about our work on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I tell them that, under the leadership of Ed Royce and Eliot Engel as well as the other members of the committee from both sides of the aisle, a lot of work does get done and a real spirit of cooperation prevails in our

committee meetings. I think that this piece of legislation is an example of that.

This is an important issue. We are standing up for Ukraine, but as I mentioned earlier, we are also doing what is clearly in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of sounding immodest, I urge passage of my legislation, legislation that I have worked on very hard with BRIAN FITZPATRICK.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to also recognize and thank my colleagues, especially Mr. BOYLE and Mr. FITZPATRICK, one Democratic and one Republican, both from Philadelphia, the sponsors of this bipartisan legislation. I want to thank Mr. BOYLE for his work on this important bill because I think the threat to Ukraine and cyberspace is not isolated. It shouldn't be ignored. I think that when we talk to the researchers, they have warned that the attacks on Ukraine by state and by nonstate actors might be a test run for even larger additional attacks in the future on the United States and on our NATO allies.

While we must bolster our own capabilities, we should also cooperate with our friends and partners such as Ukraine because we have got to be sharing best practices; we have got to improve joint capabilities; and we have got to provide that mutual assistance to prevent, mitigate, and respond to those international cyber attacks.

This legislation is going to enhance that effort. And in so doing, it is going to strengthen our ability to protect our own country from those who seek to do us harm.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan Ukraine Cybersecurity Cooperation Act of 2017. Let me first thank the hard work of Representative BRIAN FITZPATRICK, fellow Ukraine Caucus chair and Representative BRENDAN BOYLE, as well as Chairman ED ROYCE and the Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for their support.

As we know all too well, Russian aggression towards Ukraine is not a new threat. Russia's hostile behavior continues to threaten Ukraine's freedom and destabilize its critical infrastructure and institutions. Since Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea in 2014, over 10,000 people have been killed and two million people have been uprooted, internally displaced. Ukraine finds herself on the front lines of hybrid war and an assault on her sovereignty—this time in the form of cyber warfare.

We as Americans have also been attacked by this insidious form of hybrid warfare. It is our duty to help other nations resist threat to liberty. To this day, the fallout of Russian interference in our sacred electoral process continues to plague our political landscape. At least 21 states, including Ohio, reported Russian hacking attempts in the 2016 election.

Experts in the intelligence and defense communities have all warned that this threat is not going away. In fact, cybersecurity threats tested in Ukraine will likely be turned on the U.S. in elections this year.

By supporting this bill, we provide Ukraine with critical upgraded safeguards she needs to protect herself, her institutions, and her liberty. Upgrading Ukraine's current technological infrastructure grants her freedom from Russian technology. It gives her the ability to share sensitive information on an international level. And, we will strengthen our own cybersecurity through lessons learned from increased cooperation with Ukraine.

Ukraine and her people have every right to sovereignty and self-determination as they seek a more democratic future. It is paramount that the United States uphold our longstanding commitments to our allies, as hybrid threats loom. This measure will provide the citizens of Ukraine with the support they need to defend themselves. That's why I strongly support this measure, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1997—the Ukraine Cybersecurity Cooperation Act—offered by our Foreign Affairs Committee colleague from Pennsylvania, BRENDAN BOYLE.

This bill focuses on how the U.S. and Ukraine can work together to address cyber threats and how the U.S. can help improve Ukraine's domestic cybersecurity capabilities.

But it also serves as a reminder to this body, and especially to this administration, that we need to work to improve our own cybersecurity defenses and we need to hold those who target us accountable.

Mr. Speaker, the events in Ukraine that spurred the necessity for Mr. BOYLE's bill were a harbinger of things to come for the United States.

Ahead of the 2014 Presidential elections in Ukraine, Russian or pro-Russian elements hacked into Ukraine's Central Election Commission in a series of attacks in an attempt to undermine the results and stir up unrest throughout the country.

Then in December 2015, Putin-backed hackers attacked Ukraine's infrastructure, compromising three energy distribution companies, leaving nearly a quarter of a million people without electricity for several hours.

Imagine being without electricity during this period, when the daily average high temperature in Ukraine in December is below freezing.

Those were not the last of the attacks against Ukraine orchestrated by Putin.

But they were, perhaps, practice runs for what Putin had planned for the U.S. and others.

Because true to form, Putin then targeted the U.S. electoral system in 2016 the same way he targeted Ukraine's in 2014.

This is not in dispute—yet for whatever reason, we were ill prepared to prevent it, and the administration has been deficient in our response to hold this meddling accountable.

So while I fully support this measure and I urge my colleagues to do the same, I also urge my colleagues and the administration to take action against the totality of Russia's illicit activity aimed at us and our like-minded allies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the

rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1997, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

WAR CRIMES REWARDS EXPANSION ACT

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3851) to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to provide for rewards for the arrest or conviction of certain foreign nationals who have committed genocide or war crimes, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3851

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 “War Crimes Rewards Expansion Act”.

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF STATE REWARDS PROGRAM.

Paragraph (10) of section 36(b) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(b)) is amended by striking “defined under the statute of such tribunal.” and inserting the following: “defined—

“(A) under the statute of such country or tribunal, as the case may be; or

“(B) under United States law;”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just start by thanking the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) who is very engaged on this issue; and my ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee as well, ELIOT ENGEL. They introduced this bill together.

For the last 33 years, the Department of State War Crimes Rewards Program has authorized the Secretary of State to offer rewards for the arrest or the conviction of certain dangerous individuals. Originally drafted to be used against international terrorists, this successful program has been expanded over the years to include the use against others who threaten our safety and our security. So this now includes drug traffickers, war criminals, and perpetrators of genocide, some of those efforts I had authored years ago.

But in 2012, we expanded it further to transnational organized crime. At that time, my subcommittee held a hearing where the State Department testified that one captured target, a narco terrorist, told DEA agents that he could no longer trust anyone in his organization after a reward was offered on his head.

What he said was: I felt like a hunted man.

Exactly. That is the rationale behind that program, and that is why we expanded it then with my legislation and why we expand it today with the legislation of VIRGINIA FOXX and ELIOT ENGEL, because our goal here is to turn the table on these dangerous criminals and help ensure that they have no safe haven from justice.

The bill before us today clarifies these authorities. The current statute authorized rewards for the arrest or conviction of foreign nationals for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. Many people often think of those things in connection with international tribunals. But the U.S. also has domestic statutes on the books that criminalize war crimes and criminalize genocide. This bill makes clear that the State Department's rewards can be used in connection with the prosecution of foreign nationals in U.S. courts for those crimes, as well to make sure that inducement is there.

Tragically, these authorities continue to be necessary and we know continue to be important. We live in a world where crimes against humanity are perpetrated. We have seen two declared genocides in as many decades. One in Darfur in 2004. I remember seeing firsthand a young boy who had his hand amputated by the Janjaweed and by ISIS in 2016. Any of us can pick up our iPhone and see the results of that kind of terror. We also see tragic ethnic cleansing against the Rohingya right now in Burma.

So I again want to thank Congresswoman FOXX and Mr. ENGEL for their work on the bill. It deserves our support.

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

I would like to recognize Congresswoman VIRGINIA FOXX and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, along with Con-

gressmen RANDY HULTGREN and JAMES MCGOVERN, for their work on this bipartisan piece of legislation.

The War Crimes Rewards Expansion Act would clarify the War Crimes Rewards Program. This program is an important tool for bringing to justice the perpetrators of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide.

Under current law, the United States uses the program to pay rewards for the arrest or conviction of foreign nationals who commit some of the most heinous acts. In the past, bounties have helped find fugitives from the former Yugoslavia to Rwanda.

The statute providing authorization for this program specifies that rewards can be paid to individuals who furnish information leading to arrests or convictions for war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide, as those terms are defined under the statutes of international tribunals.

H.R. 3851 clarifies that the Secretary of State can also choose to pay rewards for arrests and convictions that take place under the laws of the United States as well as other individual countries.

□ 1745

Under certain circumstances, prosecutions will have the greatest impact when they take place in domestic courts within the societies in which those crimes occur. Doing so can help ensure the parties understand the law, witnesses have access to the trials, and public awareness is maximized. The clarification provided in this bill will help build on the program's success, providing the State Department with clear authority to use rewards for a wide range of prosecutions, when appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), chairwoman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and the author of this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE very much for his help on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak in support of the War Crimes Rewards Expansion Act, introduced by my good friend ELIOT ENGEL and me. It is another excellent example today of bipartisanship here in the House.

As Chairman ROYCE said, this bill expands and reforms the War Crimes Rewards Program, which provides bounties for perpetrators of the world's worst human rights abusers.

The current program authorizes these rewards only for the purposes of prosecutions in international tribunals. While experts can attest to the necessity of international tribunals or mixed court tribunals in limited circumstances, the program fails to offer

the same advantages and incentives to prosecutions in national jurisdictions using national courts.

There is already broad consensus that prosecuting perpetrators of atrocities like the genocide that plagues religious minorities at the hands of ISIS has the greatest impact when the prosecutions are conducted within the society in which the crimes occurred.

When governments can keep these prosecutions within national jurisdictions, witnesses have easier access to courts, public awareness of these brutal atrocities is maximized, and parties will more likely understand domestic laws. Furthermore, domestic trials are often cheaper, quicker, and less resource intensive, meaning more resources can be devoted to items like discovery and analysis.

Congress has already attested to the threat that these crimes posed to U.S. interests, including the heavy price tag in the forms of regional instability, refugee flows, economic losses, and reconstruction costs.

A related program, the Rewards for Justice Program, authorizes similar bounties for terrorists wanted by the United States for violations of United States law, most famously, the one that was placed upon Osama bin Ladin. The bounties have led to the disruption of terrorist activities, but also to the prosecution of terrorists like Ramzi Yousef, who was convicted in the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center.

Our bill would bring the War Crimes Rewards Program into conformity with that standard by explicitly listing violations of U.S. law as a basis for issuing the reward, not just the conviction by an international tribunal. It would also allow the U.S. to work with our allies to issue joint rewards, another provision in the terrorism authorization that the human rights provision lacks.

This bill will leave important safeguards already incorporated into the current program in place. These safeguards include the ineligibility of government officials, consultation with the Attorney General, and congressional notification of the awards.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, national governments are sovereign, and the U.S. Government shouldn't be neglecting their proper role by offering this tool solely to tribunals. Currently, there are efforts to encourage the prosecution of ISIS perpetrators of rape and genocide against Yazidis in national courts using domestic laws that provide for such prosecutions. This bill would make it clear that the U.S. Government should also be encouraging such efforts.

The genocide by ISIS fighters in the Middle East; war crimes perpetrated by Syria's brutal dictator, Bashar al-Assad; and the North Korean regime's crimes against its own people must all be opposed by the United States. It is my hope that the passage of this bill will send the signal that these brutal atrocities and the cowards who per-

petrate them will be hunted down and punished with all means possible.

I thank my good friend and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ELIOT ENGEL, for his role as the lead Democrat cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation. Again, I thank Chairman ROYCE for bringing this to the floor. Lastly, I thank the committee staff for their thoughtful contributions and assistance.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Congresswoman FOXX, as well as Ranking Member ENGEL, for their legislation, as well as the other legislators who worked on it.

This bill will help ensure that the War Crimes Rewards Program can be used to the greatest possible effect, bringing the perpetrators of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide to justice. It will give the State Department clear authority to use rewards for perpetrators who are brought to justice under international tribunals and in domestic courts.

America must stand against human rights abusers and war criminals abroad, and this bill helps advance that goal.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, when we consider the human cost in terms of those who commit war crimes or crimes against humanity, I reflect on some of the victims of Charles Taylor's activities in Liberia and Sierra Leone. We saw young children who had limbs amputated at the hands of the Revolutionary United Front, supported by Charles Taylor. We have met with children whose parents have been murdered by the perpetrators of violence who believed they were beyond justice.

The concept behind having the Department of State Rewards Program serves such an important purpose when we consider that it has helped bring to the bar of justice around this planet those who have been involved in war crimes. It has turned the table on dangerous war terrorists and criminals.

This bill, sponsored by VIRGINIA FOXX and ELIOT ENGEL, continues to expand that very effort to help ensure that they face justice but, just as importantly, to send the message that others in the future who contemplate behaving like Charles Taylor or committing this kind of mayhem will also face the bar of justice. It will also encourage those who are working with them to turn them over in order to get that reward, leaving them in a state of perpetual anxiety so that they know that, at any time, anyone in their organization could turn them over for international justice. This bill helps advance that effort.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and

my good friend from New York (Mr. ENGEL), as well, for sponsoring this bill to make clear that this important authority includes justice meted out by U.S. courts under U.S. law. This makes it clear that the international provisions we seek to expand include the actions taken here in the United States, and I congratulate them for bringing this bill forward.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3851, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SWAN LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT BOUNDARY CORRECTION ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 219) to correct the Swan Lake hydroelectric project survey boundary and to provide for the conveyance of the remaining tract of land within the corrected survey boundary to the State of Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 219

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 "Swan Lake Hydroelectric Project Boundary Correction Act".

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND WITHIN THE SWAN LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT BOUNDARY.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall—

(1) survey the exterior boundaries of the tract of Federal land within the project boundary of the Swan Lake Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2911) as generally depicted and labeled "Lost Creek" on the map entitled "Swan Lake Project Boundary—Lot 2" and dated February 1, 2016; and

(2) issue a patent to the State of Alaska for the tract described in paragraph (1) in accordance with—

(A) the survey authorized under paragraph (1);

(B) section 6(a) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (commonly known as the "Alaska Statehood Act") (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21; Public Law 85-508); and

(C) section 24 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 818).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank my good friend from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) for coming over here to help manage the bill. I know it was an imposition, but I thank her. It means a great deal to me.

Mr. Speaker, the Swan Lake hydroelectric project is a remote facility in southeast Alaska that provides electric power to nearly 20,000 of my constituents in the cities of Petersburg, Wrangell, Ketchikan, and the surrounding areas.

In 1994, the project's operator began work to raise the dam height by 15 feet, working with the State of Alaska to secure 1,500 acres of land from the Federal Government inside the reservoir's new coverage area. The land was surveyed by the Federal Government and transferred to the State of Alaska in 1997.

In 2012, the project operator discovered an error in the Federal Government's survey and determined an additional 25.8 acres of Federal land would be inundated if the water level were raised. There is no disagreement among the Federal and State agencies concerned that an error occurred. H.R. 219 will fix the error by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to correct the survey and transfer the remaining acreage to the State of Alaska.

This is a commonsense bill that promotes green energy development at zero cost to the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to share the floor with my good friend from Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 219 instructs the Secretary of the Interior, after consulting with the Forest Service, to resurvey the Lost Creek section and other additional lands by the Swan Lake hydroelectric facility so the Interior Department can modify the boundary and convey land necessary for the facility's expansion.

The Swan Lake hydroelectric facility is a tall concrete arch dam at the head of the Carroll Inlet. The project was

authorized by FERC, and operation began in 1984. It is currently operated by a not-for-profit Alaskan Joint Action Agency called the Southeast Alaska Power Agency. These utilities provide an estimated 62 percent of the power consumed by the communities they serve.

The survey that was used to convey land for the expansion project contained a mistake and omitted the Lost Creek section and other additional areas.

□ 1800

More land, however, needs to be conveyed to the State of Alaska to utilize the additional reservoir storage from the recently finished expansion project. Because this bill corrects that mistake, conveys needed land for the facility expansion, and was supported by the U.S. Forest Service, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that, given the nature of this bill—and we all know that when it comes to Alaska, no one is a better advocate and the strongest proponent of what is right and for the State of Alaska than my good friend, the Representative from Alaska. This is a bill that corrects that mistake, it conveys the needed land for the facility expansion, and it is supported by all the necessary Federal agencies. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I wish my good friend from Hawaii good luck in the upcoming election. I know it is against the rules, but I am going to say it anyway. The gentlewoman will make a fine Governor as she made a fine Congresswoman; believe me.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 219.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4547, by the yeas and nays; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

STRENGTHENING PROTECTIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4547) to amend titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act to improve and strengthen the representative payment program, as amended, 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 motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—396

Abraham	Brat	Collins (NY)
Adams	Bridenstine	Comer
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Aguilar	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Allen	Brown (MD)	Connolly
Amash	Brownley (CA)	Cook
Amodei	Buchanan	Cooper
Arrington	Buck	Correa
Babin	Bucshon	Costa
Bacon	Budd	Costello (PA)
Banks (IN)	Burgess	Courtney
Barletta	Bustos	Cramer
Barr	Butterfield	Crawford
Barragán	Byrne	Crist
Barton	Calvert	Crowley
Bass	Capuano	Cuellar
Beatty	Carbajal	Culberson
Bera	Cárdenas	Curbelo (FL)
Bergman	Carson (IN)	Curtis
Beyer	Carter (GA)	Davidson
Biggs	Carter (TX)	Davis (CA)
Bilirakis	Cartwright	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	DeFazio
Bishop (MI)	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Delaney
Blackburn	Cheney	DeLauro
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	DeBene
Blunt Rochester	Cicilline	Demings
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Denham
Bost	Clarke (NY)	Dent
Boyle, Brendan	Cleaver	DeSantis
F.	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Brady (PA)	Coffman	DesJarlais
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	Deutch

Diaz-Balart	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (SC)	Woodall	Yoho	Young (IA)	LaMalfa	Newhouse	Sessions
Doggett	Kuster (NH)	Richmond	Yoder	Young (AK)	Zeldin	Lamborn	Noem	Shea-Porter
Donovan	Kustoff (TN)	Roby				Larson (CT)	Norman	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	LaHood	Roe (TN)		NOT VOTING—34		Lawrence	Nunes	Shimkus
F.	LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	Black	Gutiérrez	Palazzo	Lawson (FL)	Olson	Simpson
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Blum	Jenkins (WV)	Pearce	Lewis (MN)	Panetta	Smith (MO)
Dunn	Lance	Rohrabacher	Clay	Johnson (LA)	Rosen	Lipinski	Pascrell	Smith (NE)
Ellison	Langevin	Rokita	Cohen	Johnson (OH)	Rush	Long	Pelosi	Smith (NJ)
Emmer	Larsen (WA)	Rooney, Francis	Cole	Kaptur	Shuster	Loudermilk	Perlmutter	Smith (TX)
Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Rooney, Thomas	Cummings	Labrador	Sires	Love	Peters	Smith (WA)
Espallat	Latta	J.	Davis, Danny	Lee	Vargas	Lowey	Pingree	Smucker
Estes (KS)	Lawrence	Ros-Lehtinen	Dingell	McEachin	Walz	Lucas	Pocan	Speier
Esty (CT)	Lawson (FL)	Roskam	Duffy	Meeks	Wilson (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Polis	Stefanik
Evans	Levin	Ross	Duncan (TN)	Meng	Yarmuth	Lujan Grisham, M.	Posey	Stewart
Farenthold	Lewis (GA)	Rothfus	Engel	Nolan		Luján, Ben Ray	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)
Faso	Lewis (MN)	Rouzer	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Rourke		Lynch	Reichert	Takano
Ferguson	Lieu, Ted	Roybal-Allard				Maloney, Carolyn B.	Rice (NY)	Thornberry
Fitzpatrick	Lipinski	Royce (CA)		□ 1855		Marchant	Rice (SC)	Titus
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Ruiz		So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.		Marino	Roby	Torres
Flores	Loeb sack	Ruppersberger		The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.		Marshall	Roe (TN)	Trott
Fortenberry	Lofgren	Russell		A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.		Massie	Rogers (KY)	Veasey
Foster	Long	Rutherford				Matsui	Rohrabacher	Vela
Fox	Loudermilk	Ryan (OH)				McCarthy	Rokita	Wagner
Frankel (FL)	Love	Sánchez				McCaul	Rooney, Francis	Walberg
Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal	Sanford				McClintock	Rooney, Thomas	Walden
Fudge	Lowey	Sarbanes				McCollum	J.	Walker
Gabbard	Lucas	Scalise				McHenry	Ross	Walorski
Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Schakowsky				McMorris	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi
Gallagher	Lujan Grisham, M.	Schiff				Rodgers	Royce (CA)	Wasserman
Galleo	Luján, Ben Ray	Schneider				McNerney	Ruppersberger	Schultz
Garamendi	Lynch	Schrader		THE JOURNAL		Meadows	Russell	Waters, Maxine
Garrett	MacArthur	Schweikert		The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of Georgia). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.		Mitchell	Rutherford	Webster (FL)
Gianforte	Maloney, Sean	Scott (VA)		The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.		Moolenaar	Sanford	Welch
Gibbs	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Scott, Austin		The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.		Mooney (WV)	Scalise	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Marchant	Scott, David				Moulton	Schiff	Westerman
Gomez	Gosar	Sensenbrenner				Mullin	Schneider	Williams
Goodlatte	Marino	Serrano				Murphy (FL)	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Gosar	Marshall	Sessions				Nadler	Scott (VA)	Wittman
Gottheimer	Massie	Sewell (AL)				Napolitano	Scott, Austin	Womack
Gowdy	Mast	Shea-Porter					Scott, David	Yoho
Granger	Matsui	Sherman					Sensenbrenner	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Shimkus						
Graves (LA)	McCaul	Simpson						
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Sinema						
Green, Al	McCollum	Slaughter						
Green, Gene	McGovern	Smith (MO)						
Griffith	McHenry	Smith (NE)						
Grijalva	McKinley	Smith (NJ)						
Grothman	McMorris	Smith (TX)						
Guthrie	Rodgers	Smith (WA)						
Hanabusa	McNerney	Smucker						
Handel	McSally	Soto						
Harper	Meadows	Speier						
Harris	Meehan	Stefanik						
Hartzer	Messer	Stewart						
Hastings	Mitchell	Stivers						
Heck	Moolenaar	Suozzi						
Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Swalwell (CA)						
Herrera Beutler	Moore	Takano						
Hice, Jody B.	Moulton	Taylor						
Higgins (LA)	Mullin	Tenney						
Higgins (NY)	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (CA)						
Hill	Himes	Thompson (MS)						
Himes	Holding	Thompson (PA)						
Holding	Hollingsworth	Thornberry						
Hollingsworth	Hoyer	Tipton						
Hoyer	Hudson	Titus						
Hudson	Huffman	Tonko						
Huffman	Huizenga	Torres						
Huizenga	Hultgren	Trotter						
Hultgren	Hunter	Tsongas						
Hunter	Hurd	Turner						
Hurd	Issa	Upton						
Issa	Jackson Lee	Valadao						
Jackson Lee	Jayapal	Veasey						
Jayapal	Jeffries	Vela						
Jeffries	Jenkins (KS)	Velázquez						
Jenkins (KS)	Johnson (GA)	Visclosky						
Johnson (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Wagner						
Johnson, E. B.	Joyce (OH)	Walberg						
Johnson, Sam	Katko	Walden						
Jones	Keating	Walker						
Jones	Kelly (IL)	Walorski						
Jordan	Kelly (MS)	Walters, Mimi						
Joyce (OH)	Kelly (PA)	Wasserman						
Katko	Kennedy	Schultz						
Keating	Khan	Waters, Maxine						
Kelly (IL)	Kihuen	Watson Coleman						
Kelly (MS)	Kilmer	Weber (TX)						
Kelly (PA)	Kinzie	Woodall						
Kennedy	Kinzie	Yoder						
Khan	Kinzie	Young (AK)						
Kihuen	Kinzie	Zeldin						
Kildee	Kinzie							
Kilmer	Kinzie							
Kind	Kinzie							
King (IA)	Kinzie							
King (NY)	Kinzie							
Kinzie	Kinzie							
Knight	Kinzie							

□ 1855

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of Georgia). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WOODALL. 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 232, noes 159, answered “present” 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—232

Abraham	Collins (GA)	Garamendi	Adams	Gallagher	Neal
Aderholt	Collins (NY)	Gianforte	Aguilar	Garrett	Norcross
Allen	Comer	Goodlatte	Amash	Gibbs	O'Halleran
Amodei	Comstock	Gowdy	Barragan	Gohmert	Pallone
Arrington	Cook	Granger	Bass	Gomez	Palmer
Babin	Cooper	Griffith	Beatty	Gosar	Paulsen
Bacon	Courtney	Grothman	Bera	Gottheimer	Payne
Banks (IN)	Cramer	Guthrie	Bergman	Graves (GA)	Perry
Barletta	Crawford	Hanabusa	Beyer	Graves (LA)	Peterson
Barr	Culberson	Handel	Biggs	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Harper	Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Curtis	Harris	Bishop (MI)	Green, Gene	Poliquin
Bishop (UT)	Davidson	Hartzer	Blackburn	Grijalva	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Heck	Bost	Hastings	Raskin
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling	Boyle, Brendan	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Bonamici	DeGette	Higgins (LA)	F.	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Higgins (NY)	Brady (PA)	Hill	Renacci
Brat	DelBene	Himes	Brooks (AL)	Holding	Richmond
Bridenstine	Demings	Hollingsworth	Brownley (CA)	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Hoyer	Buck	Huffman	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (MD)	DeSaulnier	Hultgren	Carbajal	Huizenga	Roskam
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Hunter	Cárdenas	Hurd	Rouzer
Bucshon	Deutch	Issa	Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Budd	Doggett	Jeffries	Carter (GA)	Jayapal	Ruiz
Bustos	Donovan	Johnson (GA)	Castor (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, E. B.	Clark (MA)	Jones	Sánchez
Byrne	Dunn	Johnson, Sam	Clarke (NY)	Jordan	Sarbanes
Calvert	Ellison	Joyce (OH)	Coffman	Katko	Schakowsky
Capuano	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)	Conaway	Keating	Schrader
Carter (TX)	Estes (KS)	Kelly (MS)	Connolly	Khanna	Serrano
Cartwright	Ferguson	Kelly (PA)	Correa	Kihuen	Sewell (AL)
Castro (TX)	Fleischmann	Kennedy	Costa	Kilmer	Stevens
Chabot	Fortenberry	Kildee	Costello (PA)	Kind	Suozzi
Cheney	Poster	King (IA)	Crist	Kinzie	Taylor
Chu, Judy	Frankel (FL)	King (NY)	Crowley	Knight	Tenney
Cioccine	Frelinghuysen	Krishnamoorthi	Cuellar	LaHood	Thompson (CA)
Cleaver	Gabbard	Kuster (NH)	DeFazio	Lance	Thompson (MS)
Clyburn	Gallego	Kustoff (TN)	Delaney	Langevin	Thompson (PA)
			Denham	Latta	Turner
			DeSantis	Levin	Upton
			Diaz-Balart	Lewis (GA)	Valadao
			Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Velázquez
			F.	LoBiondo	Visclosky
			Emmer	Loeb sack	Watson Coleman
			Espallat	Lofgren	Weber (TX)
			Esty (CT)	Lowenthal	Woodall
			Evans	MacArthur	Yoder
			Farenthold	Maloney, Sean	Young (AK)
			Faso	Mast	Zeldin
			Fitzpatrick	McGovern	
			Flores	McKinley	
			Fox	McSally	
			Fudge	Meehan	
			Gaetz	Moore	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—38

Black	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Blum	Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Pearce
Clay	Johnson (OH)	Rosen
Cohen	Kaptur	Rush
Cole	Labrador	Shuster
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lee	Tsongas
Dingell	McEachin	Vargas
Duffy	Meeks	Walz
Duncan (TN)	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Engel	Messer	Yarmuth
Gonzalez (TX)	Nolan	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1902

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 4547 (as amended) and "yea" on approval of the Journal.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 772, COMMON SENSE NUTRITION DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1153, MORTGAGE CHOICE ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4771, SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY RELIEF ACT OF 2018; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-546) on the resolution (H. Res. 725) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 772) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1153) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4771) to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1057

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1057, a bill originally introduced by Representative TIBERI of Ohio, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Resolution
Condemning Representative Paul Gosar

Whereas, on January 30, 2018, Representative Paul Gosar tweeted a series of statements that included "Today, Congressman Paul Gosar contacted the U.S. Capitol Police, as well as Attorney General Jeff Sessions, asking that they consider checking identification of all attending the State of the Union address and arresting any illegal aliens in attendance.";

Whereas Representative Gosar went on to tweet "Any illegal aliens attempting to go through security, under any pretext of invitation or otherwise, should be arrested and deported," said Congressman Gosar;

Whereas Representative Gosar's comments explicitly targeted the DACA recipients that Members of Congress brought as their guests to the State of the Union;

Whereas DACA recipients have been granted deferred action, are contributing to this country, and have been thoroughly vetted by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services;

Whereas Representative Gosar's actions to inappropriately pressure the U.S. Capitol Police to detain and deport Dreamers, who are staying in the country according to U.S. Department of Homeland Security regulations, intimidated these young people who are already facing fear and uncertainty;

Whereas Representative Gosar abused the power in an attempt to interfere with and politicize the United States Capitol Police's efforts to provide for a safe, secure, and open environment during the State of the Union;

Whereas Representative Gosar has violated clause 1 of rule XXIII of the Code of Official Conduct which states that "A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the House of Representatives strongly condemns Representative Paul Gosar for his inappropriate actions that intimidated State of the Union guests and discredited the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as

a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from New Mexico will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

GOOD LUCK TO OLYMPIANS FROM MINNESOTA'S THIRD DISTRICT

(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, I rise to recognize four athletes from Minnesota's Third District who will be competing in the 2018 Winter Olympics.

Three are representing the United States on the women's ice hockey team: forward Kelly Pannek, from Plymouth, graduated from Benilde-St. Margaret's and is a senior now at the University of Minnesota; forward Dani Cameranesi, also from Plymouth, graduated from Blake and is also from the U of M; defender Sidney Morin, from Minnetonka, graduated from Minnetonka High School and also the University of Minnesota Duluth.

On the men's side, forward Ryan Stoa is representing the United States on the men's ice hockey team. He graduated from Bloomington Kennedy and, also, the University of Minnesota.

These four athletes join 16 other Minnesotans and the 238 other United States athletes as they compete in Pyeongchang, South Korea, later this week. Mr. Speaker, these athletes go day in and day out with dedication, hard work, and commitment to achieve their dreams of competing in the Olympics and bringing home a medal.

So, to Kelly, Dani, Sidney, Ryan, and all of our Olympians, we wish you good luck, and we are cheering you on.

NUNES MEMO HAS NO IMPACT ON THE RUSSIA PROBE

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Nunes memo was released over the objections of the FBI, the Department of Justice, Democratic Members of the House Intelligence Committee, and several Republican Senators. This selectively edited document was political in nature from the outset, as is evident in the gap between what some of my colleagues claimed it contained and what the memo actually says.

The Nunes memo focuses on the most recent warrants for surveillance of Carter Page, who has reportedly been

under watch since 2013 for his relationship with the Russian Government, years before his involvement with the Trump campaign. Yet this document in no way questions those facts, while new reporting has since revealed that Mr. Page boasted of his role as a Kremlin adviser as far back as 5 years ago, when the first FISA warrants against him were reportedly issued.

As Oversight Chairman GOWDY has noted, the Nunes memo has no impact on the Russia probe, and Special Counsel Mueller's work must continue unabated to allow the American public to know the full truth.

SIESTA SENATE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Harvey hammered the great State of Texas in August. It devastated over 300,000 homes in the Houston area, not including businesses.

Last year, the House passed a crucial \$81 billion disaster relief bill. This funding will not only help repair the devastation caused by the hurricane, but it will also go toward disaster prevention in the future. But Texas, Florida, and Puerto Rico are still waiting to see this hurricane relief money.

Why?

Because the "Siesta Senate" still hasn't taken any action. And the reason they haven't is because the Senate still uses an archaic, outdated 60-vote rule to pass simple legislation.

The people of Texas are still suffering in their wait. The Senate needs to change the 60-vote rule and go back to 51. The Gulf Coast is in Hurricane Alley. Maybe the Senate doesn't realize hurricanes come around every year.

Mr. Speaker, there are also over 401 House bills awaiting Senate action, and this bill is one of them. The Siesta Senate must vote. Nap time is over.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1915

RECOGNIZING THE LEGACY OF MT. ZION BAPTIST CHURCH

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the legacy of Mt. Zion Baptist Church on Evans Avenue in Fort Worth during its 123rd founding celebration.

Since its founding, Mt. Zion has served as a beacon of light, pillar of support, and a place of refuge. In 1894, Reverend Frank Tribune, Katie Patterson, Laura Purvis, Josephine Wells, and Ella and Lee Brooks founded Mt. Zion. They planted the seed for what would become a ministry of solace and guidance.

The church began on a small lot on the corner of Louisiana and Rosedale in the southside Fort Worth commu-

nity. Soon after, the congregation moved to its current location on Evans Avenue. In 1919, the church expanded to include an auditorium. It has since grown to include a facility for weekly Sunday school, a daycare and educational services, and it also served as a meeting place when Dr. Martin Luther King visited Fort Worth.

Although the church staff of leadership has changed since its founding, the congregation has never lost sight of its mission. The current pastor is Carl McElroy.

Many great people in Fort Worth are members of the church. My good friend Gwen Hicks, former House Clerk Lorraine Miller, and I stand with them today to honor the recognition of these founders, leaders, and the congregation of Mt. Zion Baptist Church.

RECOGNIZING THE SOMERVELL COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize a local fire department from Texas' 25th District, the Somervell County Fire Department. They recently had their annual banquet to honor firefighters for their bravery and their valor.

This year, Mr. Matt Peelman and Mr. Brandon Fipps received two of the top awards for 2017. Matt was named the Career Firefighter of the Year, and Brandon was selected as the Volunteer Firefighter of the Year.

Committing one's life to protecting others is no easy task; so to both of these heroes, I want to say thank you. I thank them for their dedication and for putting their life on the line to get everyday Texans out of harm's way.

In addition to these two, there are many others at the station who were recognized for their courage: Nathan Huhn, Michael Laviada, Donna Owens, Blaine Stroud, Emma Turner, Jason Sanchez, Jerry Darnell, Ashileen Shepard, Brad Smith, Dakota Stroud, Trevor Crawford, Ben Welch, Fallon Wirsing, Tyler Brown, Kelby Bridwell, David Culp, Nicole Gilbert, Mandy Bradford, Kaine Popejoy, Randy Hurtado, Andrew Vance, and John Mark Thomas.

Mr. Speaker, these men and women who serve their local community are a rare find. They are heroes, and I am honored to represent them in the 25th Congressional District of Texas.

With that being said, may God bless Texas, may God bless the first responders, and God bless the United States of America. In God We Trust.

CONGRATULATING THE ROSELLE PARK PANTHERS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Roselle Park High

School wrestling team for reaching the milestone of 1,000 varsity wins after beating Scotch Plains last week. The Roselle Park Panthers became only the fourth program in the country and just the second in New Jersey to reach this milestone.

The entire community played a part in propelling the Panthers to this milestone. The Panthers have always had strong support from local businesses, community groups, and, of course, their loyal fans and neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, Head Coach Ryan Rooney and his team have worked hard to get to this point, but they aren't letting the record distract them from their ultimate goal: winning another State championship.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Coach Rooney and the Roselle Park Panthers for their 1,000th win and wish them continued success on their way to another State championship.

Go Panthers.

RECOGNIZING JOHN LEWIS AND DENNY BARNEY OF MARICOPA COUNTY

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize two gentlemen in my district: JOHN LEWIS and Denny Barney.

Since 2015, JOHN LEWIS has served as the president and CEO of the East Valley Partnership and previously served as the mayor of Gilbert. The East Valley Partnership works with our cities and towns to maximize their economic potential and to help create jobs. John has done exceptional work, and I wish him the best as he and his wife will be leaving this summer to serve a church mission in Cambodia.

Denny Barney is a wonderful choice to replace Mr. LEWIS as president and CEO. Mr. Barney's record of service in the private sector and on the Maricopa Board of Supervisors gives him a unique perspective as he accepts this new responsibility. He is a dynamic, bright, and great leader. The East Valley Partnership will benefit from his leadership for years to come.

I am grateful for all of our leaders in the East Valley Partnership who work diligently to foster an attractive environment for families to live and businesses to grow.

DECORUM IS MISSING IN THE WHITE HOUSE

(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, in the House we have a procedure that if words are untoward and not becoming of our stature as Members of the United States Congress, by any Member those words can be asked to be taken down.

It is unfortunate that in a tweet this morning the Commander in Chief said, of a Member of Congress who is a Federal official, he "must be stopped," words to that effect.

I left my hometown early this morning and had hoped there would have been some decent response from the Chief of Staff or other staff members of the White House to be able to say that that is an inappropriate attack on any Member of Congress or Federal official. I have yet to hear a clarification or apology that indicates that providing provocative words to take a Member down, or he must be taken down, is an inappropriate action or words for any Federal official.

I hope that we can establish decorum not only in this body, but I hope we can establish decorum in the White House. It is sorely missing.

TRAIN ACCIDENT HEROES

(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, tragically, in the last week, I have been impacted by two train wrecks, and I have also seen firsthand civilian heroes rise to the challenges.

The first, on Wednesday, was the trash truck collision in Crozet, Albemarle County, Virginia, where my wife, Roxanne, and I were passengers. It was inspiring to see immediately physician Members of Congress race to those injured in the wreck led by Congressman Brad Wenstrup from Ohio and Roger Marshall from Kansas and heroically assisted by registered nurse Lily Knight, wife of Congressman Steve Knight from California. First responders and emergency personnel were professional and showed great courage.

Yesterday, an Amtrak train collided with a parked freight train in my home community of Pine Ridge, South Carolina. The passengers thoughtfully cared for each other as emergency personnel and law enforcement from Cayce and Pine Ridge, and Lexington County Sheriff Jay Koon, working with State officials, provided assistance coordinated by Governor Henry McMaster. The American Red Cross, along with Lexington School District Two, established a shelter for victims.

I am grateful that Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao called with her sympathy and assurance of Federal support. Our deepest condolences go out to the families who have suffered a loss in these accidents and our prayers for the quick recovery for all injured.

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

COMMEMORATING OFFICER GLENN ANTHONY DOSS, JR.

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Officer Glenn Anthony Doss, a Detroit police officer who died while serving in the line of duty.

Officer Doss, who joined the police force nearly 2 years ago, was answering a call when a gunman opened fire and shot Officer Doss in the head before he could get out of his patrol car. He was immediately rushed to the hospital, but, unfortunately, he died on Sunday, January 28, 2018.

Officer Doss is what we call an American hero. He did what any police officer does the moment they put on their uniform and go out and serve their community with courage and honor, knowing that even the smallest interaction may put their life in harm's way.

Officer Doss followed in his father's footsteps who has been a member of the Detroit Police Department for nearly 20 years.

I want to say God bless his memory, his family, his friends, and the Detroit Police Department for the work they do. He had a 9-month-old child.

RECOGNIZING FLO FABRIZIO ON A LIFETIME OF SERVICE

(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 honor a true public servant, State representative Flo Fabrizio.

Representative Fabrizio has served the Erie region for nearly 45 years. He announced last week that he would not seek reelection to a ninth term representing the State's second legislative district.

Mr. Speaker, there are probably few issues that Representative Fabrizio and I agree on politically, but he has always been a gentleman and someone who truly represents his constituents.

Representative Fabrizio began his service in 2002 in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Prior to that election, he served for 20 years as Erie County clerk.

He is a lifelong resident of Erie and has been active in the community serving as a charter member for the Erie Museum Authority, board member for Pleasant Ridge Manor, and as a member of many other philanthropic and charitable organizations.

Mr. Speaker, Representative Fabrizio has been diligent and dedicated, and he has served his hometown and the Commonwealth with distinction. I wish him the best in his retirement, and I hope he will enjoy spending time with his wife, Victoria, and his children.

THE DREAM ACT

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

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, I rise to tell the story of a young teen who came to

our country with nothing but hope for a better future. No English, no money, just a dream. This story may sound familiar, but it is special to me. It is a story of my grandfather, Adam Christodoulos.

The story of America is a story of immigrants. Now we have a whole new generation of immigrants who embody our American values: family, hard work, service, love for the United States, and dreams for the future.

Without immigrants, from the construction worker in St. Petersburg to the CEO in Clearwater, there is no middle class. Let's remember the golden rule, treating all of God's children the way we want to be treated, fairly and with compassion.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass a clean Dream Act today. We have the votes. We just need the will.

RECOGNIZING CRITZ FARMS

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Critz Farms in Cazenovia, New York.

This month the New York State Agricultural Society honored Critz Farms with the 2018 Business of the Year Award. The award recognizes the quality, leadership, and innovation demonstrated by State farms and particularly agribusinesses.

Critz Farms was established in 1985 by Matthew and Juanita Critz. The family-run farm offers various educational tours for visitors such as apple cider production, pumpkin patch browsing, and maple sugaring tours. Their mission is to educate people about farming and the origins of food, all while providing fun for the whole family.

Critz Farms grows a variety of crops, including apples, strawberries, blueberries, and conifer trees for Christmas. The family-run farm also produces apple cider, award-winning hard cider, craft beer, and pure maple syrup.

Congratulations again to Critz Farms for being honored as the New York State Agricultural Society's Business of the Year. I am looking forward to visiting Critz Farms, as I do each year, for maple syrup season this March. Many of you may be surprised to know that the best maple syrup in the world is produced in New York State.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANDREA CASTILLA

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Andrea Castilla. Andrea was a daughter, sister, and a friend. She went to the Route 91 music festival in Las Vegas to celebrate her 28th birthday with her friends, her family, and her boyfriend,

Derek. Derek had planned to propose to Andrea that night.

She had a passion for makeup and hoped to use this passion to help cancer patients feel beautiful. Andrea will always be remembered for her free spirit and positive outlook.

I would like to extend my condolences to Andrea's family and friends. Please note that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

□ 1930

CLASSIFIED MEMO

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the House Intelligence Committee for voting to release the classified memo alleging misconduct by senior FBI officials involved in the Russian probe. Chairman NUNES has done a great job of steering this through evenhandedly, with dignity, and with the ultimate goal of fairness in mind.

I also thank the President for approving the release of the memo, as well.

The contents of this document are troubling. I previously joined many of my colleagues in urging the committee to release this memo to the public, as they have demanded.

This is not an attempt to undermine anything. This document outlines some very serious misconduct at a very high level at a powerful government agency, and the American people have the right to know.

Contrary to the narrative created before its release, this memo in no way jeopardizes our national security but, indeed, shines a light on a lot of misconduct.

As promised, the committee today approved releasing the Democratic version of the memo. That is fair. We will let the people compare them.

THREATENING WORKERS' RIGHTS

(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 today to express grave concerns about the Supreme Court case *Janus v. AFSCME* Council 31.

This case threatens the freedom of working people to join together in strong unions to fight for their right to fair pay, safe working conditions, and a voice in the decisions that will affect their retirement security, healthcare, and the fate of their families.

Since 1980, incomes for most Americans have risen just 1 percent, while incomes for the wealthiest among us rose by 204 percent.

Incidentally, organized labor membership has seen a precipitous decline in this time period.

I want to recognize some of my own constituents who are fighting back against the *Janus* case, so-called right to fire laws, and the antiworker agenda:

Lorraine Aumic of Schenectady from Local 688;

Bryan Schaeffer of Delanson from Local 886 in Schenectady;

Michele Kuiber of Amsterdam from Local 671; and

Judi Aubin of Clifton Park from Local 655.

I thank them for their leadership in fighting for an increase in the household income for the great majority of Americans coming through the strength of unions.

A BETTER DEAL

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber last week, the President came and touted that the stock market was roaring and the unemployment rate was down. Today, he called us traitors for not applauding those numbers.

A couple of days later, Speaker RYAN said a secretary at a public high school noticed that her pay had gone up \$1.50 a week because of the GOP tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, the economy is not the stock market. It is not the unemployment rate. It is us. It is how we are doing. The stock market only matters if you are able to invest in it; and the unemployment rate only counts if you have a job you can count on, where your paycheck grows and you can plan for retirement and save for a better future.

Mr. Speaker, the measurement of the economy is how we are doing. If you are only getting six quarters from a tax cut that gives millions to the richest among us, you are not doing very well. You deserve a much better deal.

ECONOMIC JUSTICE IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here representing the Congressional Black Caucus and our chairman, CEDRIC RICHMOND, who has initiated

this particular Special Order for the Congressional Black Caucus to have this opportunity to speak to the issues specifically connected to the African-American community.

As a result of the chairman's leadership, we have laid out an agenda that we think is very appropriate to lay out. We think it is important that all of our constituents, particularly all Americans, recognize that the Congressional Black Caucus has solutions.

There is a document here that was put together under the leadership of Chairman RICHMOND. When the President stated sometime in August of 2016: "What do you have to lose?" the chairman came up with the idea of a document that we would lay out, "We Have a Lot to Lose: Solutions to Advance Black Families in the 21st Century."

Over this next year or so, we will be talking about solutions relating to African-American communities. We think that African-American communities, like all Americans, should recognize that there are solutions to some of these challenges.

With the President giving his speech last week on the state of the Union, the topic that we will talk about today is economic justice in the Black community. The topic, again, is economic justice in the Black community.

First, I thank my wonderful colleagues for joining me here today to speak about economic justice in the Black community, an important topic to us all.

The Black community has a lot to lose under the current administration. The racial wealth gap is widening. The GOP tax cut bill will not help, especially when the Speaker of the House tweets about a \$1.50 increase and actually believes that this is a fair solution to our Nation's problems.

Costco membership for the middle class and others in need, new yachts and Gulfstreams for millionaires and billionaires—that is just not right. We are in the business of doing no harm.

To add to this, the President stands up and brags that the unemployment rate for Blacks is at the lowest, even while the unemployment rate for Black Americans actually went up a whole percent last month according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. We did not hear from the President on that.

You can't take credit for the good, but not accept the bad. It is all about accountability and credibility, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing to brag about.

To gain wealth comparison to White high school dropouts, Black people have to complete high school and some college, which is a very sad fact. This means that Black Americans need to invest more resources and time to achieve the same resources as White citizens, to make the same level of investments.

Generally, the typical Black American has little room for error. The demands placed on Black families to generate income while navigating the

problems that always arise are numbing.

Black Americans have levels of net worth that are one-tenth the net worth of White Americans.

Black Americans have only 8 percent of their wealth in businesses. Research shows that Black entrepreneurs have higher wealth levels and higher levels of wealth mobility than the Black non-entrepreneur. The lack of wealth makes it harder to start and maintain a business.

According to data from various reports, including the Census Bureau, the Federal Reserve's survey of small businesses, and the Kauffman Foundation, Black-owned businesses are more reliant on their own investment in their businesses because access to capital from external sources is too difficult to obtain.

To give you some context of what is at stake in our neighborhoods nationwide, I represent a district with a poverty rate of 26 percent. That means 196,000 people in my district are at the poverty level.

We know that one of the best solutions to addressing poverty is quality of jobs.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. We know that one of the best solutions to addressing poverty is the quality of jobs.

The President and his administration talk a big game about creating jobs and lowering unemployment, but we all know too well that this is not the reality in our neighborhoods nationwide. A 2015 CFPB report found that 15 percent of Black Americans are credit invisible, meaning that they have no or limited credit.

Black Americans have higher levels of student debt, on average. Forty percent of Black Americans between 25 and 55 hold student loan debt. Black Americans have higher levels of those debt loads, holding an average of \$43,725.

Let me repeat that. They have an average of \$43,725 in student debt, compared to an average of \$31,367 for Whites.

Our Historically Black Colleges and Universities must be capable of delivering a world-class education and continuing to attract top-notch students.

Let's talk about the solutions to economic injustice. Let's talk about the solutions.

In this document, we talk about the solutions. For example, don't cut taxes for the superrich while others are struggling to make ends meet. Adopt a fair Tax Code that doesn't pick winners or losers.

Work to implement the Congressional Black Caucus 10-20-30 formula all across all agencies. This bold and innovative idea would require Federal agencies to commit 10 percent of their budget to the 485 counties where 20 percent or more of the population have been living below poverty lines for 30 years.

We should also address food insecurity by providing access to healthy, af-

fordable food. Mr. Speaker, more than 30 million Americans live more than a mile from the nearest grocery store.

Let's be clear: our food policy is our foreign policy. Our food policy is our foreign policy. When America helps with food and development aid around the world, it sends a signal that we are leaders in the global campaign to help end hunger.

In addition, as a member of the Small Business Committee and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access, it is critical that we support and expand small business and entrepreneurship opportunities.

One of the things the President can do is increase the budget of the Minority Business Development Agency instead of slashing its budget, as it did last year. That is one of the solutions that we have in this document.

We can also increase the Small Business Administration's budget, while ensuring the Small Business Development Centers are capable of providing assistance expanding the SBA 7(a) Microloan program, which would give small businesses \$50,000 to start or grow their firms, a capital fusion that can help individuals who have ideas and a dream but no cash.

Mr. Speaker, every day, graduates of our fine universities in Pennsylvania go to work but still find themselves behind or just keeping up with their student loans. This is an opportunity to show support for entrepreneurs by forgiving part of the student loan debt in terms of entrepreneurs.

The President should also make new markets tax credits permanent. He should also condition the fintech charters of compliance with truth in lending and equal credit access, using a template similar to that in the Community Reinvestment Act.

He should set up the 21st Century Technology Fund and reauthorize the improvement of the Community Development Block Grant program.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman, whom I will later introduce, presented this document to the President, along with the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), someone whom I have known for an awful long time. He knows a lot about economic development. I know that he has led the effort on business development.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS) for hosting tonight's Special Order. I am glad to see that his celebrating allowed them to get here on time, since his team was victorious yesterday in the Super Bowl.

□ 1945

Let's see. For 84 percent of the American voters, the economy is the number one issue to care about. Tonight's Special Order is made even more important after the huge drop in the stock market today. But, of course, the stock

market is not the only measure of a healthy economy or economics of our community.

Building wealth matters. Wealth is what families accumulate and pass down generation after generation. It is the house you pay for and give to your children so they can grow their families without paying rent.

It is the retirement fund you live off of and pass on to your children so they can pay for their own children's college education. By building wealth, we are building a safety net that allows us to start a business or survive if we lose our jobs. Yes, building wealth matters, but the Black community has been shut out from building its wealth.

More than 25 percent of the Black community has zero net worth or has a negative net worth, and the median Black family is worth 12 times less than the median White family.

Why is that?

One reason for the vast majority of households in the United States, two-thirds of the family's wealth is tied up in the value of their home. That means the racial gap in wealth is mostly a racial gap in housing, and the housing wealth gap is not by chance.

For decades, Federal law and policy favored Whites and discriminated against Blacks. For decades, private banks discouraged lending to Black people, and for decades, restrictive covenants outright prevented Black people from owning homes in certain areas of town.

There are young people today struggling to rent apartments in major cities because, in 1950, their grandfather was denied a loan by a bank because of his race. The young people of color are, in essence, forced to play catchup with their White colleagues.

To build wealth in Black communities, we need to work towards ending the racial unemployment gap. As the President has repeatedly proclaimed, Black unemployment has been dropping for the past 8 years, reaching a historic low this year, but that statistic doesn't tell the whole story.

While unemployment has gone down, the gap between Black and White pay has not been going down. Black men only earn 70 cents an hour for every dollar a White individual makes. As long as that remains true, our communities will continue to struggle economically.

To close the economic gap, it requires us to close the wage gap. Workers everywhere need to be free to bargain collectively. We need to make unions and their workers stronger, not weaker. We need to raise the minimum wage for both tipped and untipped workers. We need to strengthen the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

These basic steps will help generate Black wealth by closing the wage gap. Those are a few of the short-term solutions to closing the wealth gap and the wage gap among people who are in the workforce today. But we need a long-

term plan. We need to increase the participation and the success of Black, Latino, and female students in careers that rely on science, technology, engineering, and math.

Fewer than half of all high schools in the United States offer calculus. Many high schools across the country don't even offer physics or chemistry. And the students who don't have access to senior-level science or math classes are disproportionately students of color or low-income students. This is a national disgrace.

This disparity continues through college, where only 4 percent of engineering majors are Black or African American, and only 8 percent are Hispanic or Latino.

Look, the world around us is undergoing rapid change and will continue to evolve, and there is a growing gap between jobs that are in high demand and the people who have the skills to fill them. Over the next 10 years, 80 percent of careers will require a deep understanding of STEM skills, but our young women, Black youth, and people of color are being left behind. They are among the least likely to pursue studies in the most in-demand STEM fields, despite the fact that they are among the fastest growing demographics in the country.

It is our duty to create an educational system that encourages young people, whatever their backgrounds, to dream big, to achieve big. Only then will we be positioned to create a future in which technology reflects the strength of America's diverse communities.

I would just like to say we are here tonight to discuss this matter that has plagued our community for decades, as I stated, but it is time for us to level the playing field once and for all, for all families to be able to benefit from what this country has to offer, the great American Dream.

It is a dream for everyone, and we are bent on making sure that all communities have an opportunity to benefit from this great Nation's wealth.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would continue to yield to the gentleman for an answer to a question.

I am going to—since he is from the great State of New Jersey—say that I heard the President in his State of the Union address last week. And this topic is about economic justice in the Black community, and I think Mr. PAYNE did an excellent job in laying out very specifically on the issue about the need for increase of the minimum wage.

I yield to Mr. PAYNE so he can speak to that a little bit and talk about how he thinks that would provide economic justice, particularly in the Black community. I was, as a matter of fact, sitting right next to Mr. PAYNE. I don't think I heard the President speak anything about the minimum wage.

Did I miss something?

I just want to know if I missed something that he was speaking on.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, if Mr. EVANS missed it, I missed it because I

don't believe the President mentioned it at all.

Look, I mean, people who are struggling in this country making \$7 an hour, \$8 an hour, \$9 an hour, \$10 an hour, it does not meet their essential needs. It is not enough money to live in this Nation, to have decent housing.

Sure, you can make \$7 or \$8 an hour, but what are you going to be able to afford as a home?

Sure, you can make \$7 or \$8 an hour, but what does your children's future look like in terms of saving money for education?

You are using everything primarily to feed and to clothe them.

It has been discussed over the past 5 to 6 years that a minimum of \$15 is needed for people to survive in this country. So we need to get up off of this high horse that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said: Well, just pull yourself up by your bootstraps.

Those days are over. And we were never given the bootstraps to hold onto. There is always, always something in our way.

Anytime an African-American family finds themselves in a position to move forward, the goalpost is moved and it is further away, the rules are changed. Every time we get to a point where there might be equality, somehow there are different issues which don't allow you to move forward as your counterparts in the majority population. It is wrong and it needs to stop. We need to continue to bring light to it as a Congressional Black Caucus.

It is our duty, as the voice of people in this country of color, to make sure we know that this travesty is going on, we understand it, we see it, we are not going to tolerate it anymore, and we are going to have to fix it. That is the way I feel.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate Mr. PAYNE's comments because what I am hearing Mr. PAYNE say is we should give people a raise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. PAYNE for any additional comments he would like to make.

Mr. PAYNE. They have to. It is the only way for people in this country to make it.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PAYNE very much for his comments.

Someone who is from a great State that has done—was a mayor in a State that manufactured and did a huge opportunity in creating wealth, I couldn't think of a better person to speak about this subject: economic justice in the Black community. She knows a lot about this issue. She has been hands-on about it. She has been in the forefront. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the congresswoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a great colleague from the 14th Congressional District.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman EVANS for his strong representation of his constituents of the Second District of Pennsyl-

vania and his leadership and support of civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address racial inequality with America's wealth gap. As we continue to celebrate Black History Month, we remember victories such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968. We can look back and celebrate these victories that brought us closer to the American principle of liberty and justice for all.

But the fight for equality, fairness, and justice continues. I am proud to stand with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus to call for true economic justice for the Black community. Still, today, Mr. Speaker, in 2018, Black people in America have to earn a high school education, a high school diploma, and complete some time in college to catch up to the wage of White high school dropouts.

The Black-White wage gap is larger today than it was in 1979. This tragic truth does not affect Black men and women the same. Since the year 2000, young Black women have been hit the hardest. However, the racial wealth gap is even greater. The average wealth for White families is seven times higher than the average wealth for Black families.

Mr. Speaker, with facts like this, no wonder many find it difficult to stand and applaud President Trump's belief that there is a trend of lower Black unemployment rates. Lower unemployment rates does not address this imbalance of wealth and opportunity, and backward policies do not deserve our cheers.

When we have an administration that puts forth policies that would eliminate programs to support minority businesses, drain the Black labor pool by doubling down on the war on drugs and mass incarceration, put forth a tax plan that gives billions to corporations and the wealthiest while leaving crumbs for the hardworking middle class, Mr. Speaker, this does not deserve our applause. Certainly, under this administration, African Americans and minorities have a lot to lose.

□ 2000

We heard that often during the campaign: "What do you have to lose?"

Today, this administration is surprised we are not standing and applauding.

A chain is only as strong as its weakest link. The strength of America is at its best when we are all strong.

Mr. Speaker, that is why this fight from the Black Caucus—we are raising our voices—this isn't just about Black America; this is about America. We are a country that the stronger each and every one of us is—regardless of our race, our religion, or where we came from—if we are in America and we are Americans, if we are all strong, the United States of America is strong.

Equality is smart economics, and justice for all is our American way.

Today, we stand and call on this administration and this Congress to fight to make America strong, to make America the best it can be. We call for equality and we call for economic justice for all.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to do a colloquy with my colleague on something that really got my attention; what she said about that chain. I would like her to talk about that chain, what that means in real life and what it means when it is not functioning.

What happens when that chain is not strong?

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, let me use the example of mass incarceration.

In my State and in this budget in Congress, we are constantly cutting programs for education. In America, if you do not educate a child, their choices are very limited. Statistics have shown that the lower the education, the higher the rate of incarceration.

I will share with the gentleman that if we truly want to reduce the cost of mass incarceration, if we truly want a workforce that is trained and available to address economic opportunities and invest in technology, and ensure that we are paying taxes and growing our tax base, it will be more efficient to invest in education.

But, instead, we systematically, with budgets and cutting funds, empower the prison system, while at the same time create a disadvantage for people who then become what we so often hear: a burden to society, social welfare, and all these other things.

When you create the opportunity to provide leadership to say, "We, in America, understand an educated American is an economic advantage," and we have systematically ignored that—we sit here as if every child in America is getting equal education—it is not a reality. It should be an outcry from every CEO in America. All of these corporations are getting billions of dollars in tax cuts.

Instead of saying, "Oh, do you know what, we are going to open up a new factory," or "We are going to do this," they should say that in conjunction with, "We are going to make sure that every child who is our customer, every community will be able to improve the educational system." Because the larger our work base, the more powerful our corporation and our economy becomes.

Why do you think these corporations go overseas and say they have to go to other countries to get workers?

And, excuse me, you don't see the reality slapping you in the face when you have these children who are not educated, and you have school systems that don't have adequate books and technology to allow this child to reach their highest potential?

That is a weak link.

And this America that says that we are one of the best economies in the

world, we are being attacked every day because our workforce is diminishing because we are not providing education that is competitive with other countries.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman may have heard our colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) talk a little bit about the minimum wage and raising the minimum wage.

How would she see that aspect of raising the minimum wage being a part of strengthening that chain?

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, when you have what we call the working poor—they are going to work every day—think about a mother who is raising a family. She is not asking for a handout. She is actually going to work every day. Some of them are working two jobs and still cannot provide the basics of food, shelter, and clothing for their children. And then when she says, "I need help," they say, "Oh, these handouts, this social welfare these people are asking for," when these are people who are working every day to achieve the American Dream, not to have luxuries, but to have the basics, the minimum wage is a beginning. But you tie that to education. We must address that.

Many of these individuals, who have never committed a crime—they are not criminals, they are not bad people—they did not get the education that prepared them, and now they are working, they are trying, they are pursuing the dream of: "If I work hard every day, if I do the work and show up and be a good employee, I will be able to provide for my family." That is not a reality. In America, we should be ashamed of ourselves to have people working and still considered poor in America.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I greatly appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, who is really not a stranger to this topic of economic justice in the Black community. He has been leading this caucus for the last year and he has been very consistent about the need to address economic justice. He understands, from his perspective, from the caucus perspective, the importance that the best poverty buster is economic justice.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to congratulate the city of Philadelphia, the great people of Pennsylvania, on winning the Super Bowl last night. And I will just say, as we talk about economic justice, one of the reasons why Philadelphia or the Eagles were able to win the Super Bowl was not just because of their outstanding player Malcolm Jenkins, which they all got from the New Orleans Saints, but part of the reason why is because the rules are the same for everybody. When the

rules are the same for everybody, then you get rewarded for your hard work, your dedication, your sacrifice, and all of those things. Last night was the reward of the Eagles' hard work, dedication, and sacrifice.

The problem with what we face in this country is that the rules are not the same for everybody, which is why it takes an African American to have a high school diploma and some college education to earn what a White dropout makes. And, look, it is what it is. It is the rules we find ourselves. But in a great nation such as this, you correct it so that the playing field is even and that the rules are the same.

Some people are born on third base. They hit a single and think they hit a home run and earned all of their success. So often in minority communities, we go to the plate already with two strikes, and we are expected to hit that same home run or that same single.

Well, this morning, as I prepared to say good-bye to my 3-year-old—little Cedric—and drop him off at daycare and go to the airport so that I could fly up here and do the people's work, I noticed that the CBC was getting criticized for not standing when the President said that African-American unemployment was at an all-time low. I am grown. I accept what I do. To my colleague from Pennsylvania: No, I didn't stand.

But for anyone who is listening—and I hope that the White House is—why don't you just call me and ask me why I didn't stand?

Because I will tell you, and I don't care if it hurts some feelings, ruffles some feathers, or send people in a little tizzy.

I didn't stand because we haven't done enough. I didn't stand because Black unemployment has been going down since 2011 at a steady rate. The decline this past year is less than the decline in other years.

But if I stood and applauded, it would make someone think that I was happy. It would make someone think that he was doing a good job.

I also didn't stand because I just didn't believe the words that I was hearing.

I also didn't stand because I could hear the words of my grandmother in the back of my head saying: "Baby, he means you no good."

But part of the other reasons why I didn't stand was because, in a country as great as this, I was sitting there that night—and I am a Southern boy—and I was thinking about how cold it was outside while we were in here listening to the State of the Union; and when the weather gets really cold and it is snowing or it is raining and cold, I try to bundle up so I can hurry up and get in my car, and then hurry up and get in the office, and then hurry up and get in the house so that I don't have to be exposed to the elements long.

Do you know what I realized?

That there are people in this great country who go to bed and wake up

outside. We can't consider ourselves a great nation if that is true.

The other thing I realized is that there are mothers who go to work every day and they bust their tails to provide for their kids, and at the end of the week, they still don't have enough to make ends meet. But she is working for a corporation whose profits are at an all-time high, while her wages are at an all-time low. She is making the corporation a profit, but she can't pay for the basic needs for her family. You can't be a great country when that happens.

So what does she do?

Not to mention that she has to work two jobs to earn what a White male makes. So she is working two jobs to make what a White male makes. Then we criticize her for not educating her children. Well, she can't help with homework. She is working her second job.

But in this country, we have to be better than that. So to stand and give a State of the Union and just look at the unemployment rate really means you are looking at it like a 3-year-old.

Part of our job as the CBC—the Congressional Black Caucus—is to educate, which is why we did prepare this document.

And, look, White House, if it is too long, if it is too complicated, if the words are too big, call me. I will send you the cliff notes version. Lord knows I used them once or twice in school.

But I will tell you: If you want to know our solutions, it is on page 17. If you want to hear us talk about economic justice and how to improve the economy, it is on page 31. If you want to know how to improve education and the workforce and healthcare, those are pages 40, 43, and 49.

If you want to talk about rural America—because, as the CBC, I want to make this crystal clear to the country: Yes, we are the Congressional Black Caucus, but we work for the entire country. So when we start talking about solutions, we are talking about solutions for rural America, like investing in infrastructure, broadband, and all those things, so rural people, both Black or White or any other race, can succeed.

But what most of the country doesn't know is, yes, we have 48 members of the Congressional Black Caucus; we represent 78 million people, but only 17 million of those are African Americans. So we fight for the entire country. So when we marched in the civil rights movement, and when the CBC fought for a civil rights bill, and a voting rights bill, they weren't just fighting for African Americans. First of all, they were fighting to redeem this country's soul because it was so lost. We find ourselves at a similar place in history where we are fighting to redeem this country. We are here to help you save you from yourself because in this country, with the wealth that we have, we should not have the poverty.

□ 2015

I want to be clear about another thing. I applaud the fact that people make a lot of money. Look, I think it is absolutely phenomenal.

There is a guy in California right now building a 100,000-square-foot house for \$500 million. God bless him, and God bless this country that he is able to make that much money.

But you can't tell me that, in the same country where he is able to do that, we can't take care of a hungry 3-year-old or a hungry 4-year-old or help that mother who is working two jobs to make ends meet. And because she is getting subsidized rent, we have the nerve to call her lazy?

No one in this body works two jobs. First of all, we are prohibited. But we don't work two jobs, and there are too many families all across this country where people are working two and three jobs.

You hear me talk about civil rights often, and you hear me talk about Dr. King often—not only because he was one of the greatest leaders ever in this country; not only because he went to Morehouse College, the greatest institution in this country; but because his words had meaning and, more importantly, his actions and his deeds were those that changed this country.

So let's think, as April 4 we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of his assassination in Memphis at the Lorraine Motel. What people don't realize about Dr. King, he was down there fighting for sanitation workers. He was fighting for people who woke up every day, got on the back of a truck. We call them "hoppers." They would hop on and hop off the truck, put your trash in it, worked very hard, but they didn't work with decent wages, decent work conditions, or anything else.

He was down there not fighting for chronic voters, not pandering to a base, not trying to appeal to what is popular; he was down there fighting for garbage men and garbage women so that they could work with dignity and respect. That is what the CBC embodies.

So I am so glad that tonight the gentleman is leading this Special Order Hour on economic justice. I know I went all over the place, but I want people to understand.

First of all, I am not apologetic for not standing. Make me. Make me stand. And I am not talking about in a physical sense. That is too easy. All these sergeant-at-arms around here and all the security that the President has, yeah, they can make me stand, but make me want to stand.

See, that is what makes this country great. Anybody, any little infant in this country can criticize. There are a whole bunch of people who criticize. Oh, they won't stand for the Pledge of Allegiance or the Star-Spangled Banner. What makes this country great is that they don't have to if they want to protest.

But this country is so great, we should make people want to stand. We

should make those players feel not that they are sons of Bs, but that they are contributing members of society and that we cherish every community; that we are going to actually talk about police misconduct, not just from the White House where we get—you are in the White House. You get to beat up on the FBI, the CIA. You get to beat up on all law enforcement, and nobody says a word. But if one little football player says that police relations in my community are so bad that, no, I am not going to talk about the FBI publicly, I am not going to criticize them, I am just going to, in a very reverent way, take a knee to show that I am not happy with police community relations in my community, all of a sudden they are despicable people. But you can stand and sit in the White House and tweet about the FBI, CIA, and everyone else, and all of a sudden it is acceptable.

So, look, the rules should be the same for everybody. The solutions we have in this book, like investing in the minority business development agencies, those would make a real difference in the lives of African Americans achieving better. But what did this budget do? Propose to cut them out completely.

So we just have to be very cognizant of where we are, what we are doing, and know that you have to have a plan. Economic injustice will not cure itself because it wasn't created overnight.

I know I am probably way over the heads of all the people in the White House, but we learn in physics that, if a ball is rolling downhill, the only way you stop it from rolling downhill is to apply equal or greater force in the opposite direction.

So if we know that discrimination and racism and injustice has been involved in our economic system since the slaves built this hallowed building, then we know that that discrimination and that inequality has been rolling down the hill for centuries. So if it has been rolling down the hill for centuries, then we need an equal or greater force to meet it.

That is what this document is. It is saying, "Mr. President, implement these policies." That will be the equal or greater force to meet that. All of a sudden, we have an equal playing field and we have a chance to make this a more perfect Union, what we all strive for, so that little Black boys and little Black girls can be judged by their character, not by the color of their skin. That is what we strive for. Too often, too many politicians forget it because they are pandering to chronic voters and to a base.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, from Philadelphia, who has on his green tie celebrating his Super Bowl victory.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on something that the gentleman said that sort of registers.

He says this April it will be 50 years since Dr. King's assassination. I am interested in the gentleman's perspective

as he looks at that 50 years. And the gentleman and I both have this honor of sitting in this great House and what it means.

But that economic justice aspect, as the gentleman looks back and thinks about—and I am glad he brought up the issue about fighting for the sanitation workers and what Dr. King was doing. So if the gentleman is looking back and looking where we are today, speak to a little bit of where he thinks we are, because just last Tuesday we sat in this House and we heard the President give the State of the Union.

The gentleman heard what the President said in his State of the Union, and we know about Dr. King, that issue about economic justice in the Black community. If the gentleman had to measure it, where are we?

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania, how you describe the state of our Union depends on what ZIP Code you live in in this country these days. There are ZIP Codes where the state of our Union is great, where people are overjoyed that the stock market was over 25,000, that they are bustling because of the economic recovery that was started under President Obama. They are doing very well, and they did very well as we ended the Great Recession.

But there are too many people in other ZIP Codes who still find themselves without raises in the last 10 years, but the cost of gas, the cost of milk, the cost of electricity, all those costs are going up. All of your expenses are going up, but your salary is staying the same. That does not make for a balanced balance sheet. That makes for a deficit, which is why we talked about and challenged the tax cut that we just did.

We just spent \$1.4 trillion. BERNIE SANDERS' free college plan was only \$800 billion. We could have done his free college plan and still had \$600 billion left over to do infrastructure or something else, because the best way out of poverty and the best way to do these things is through investing in education.

So the state of our Union is divided, is fractured; for vulnerable people, it is scary. They are anxious. For too many people, they are angry.

We have pitched this whole idea in this country that if you are poor and you are White, the only reason you are poor is because minorities keep cutting the line and keep taking what should be yours. And to perpetuate that doesn't help poor White people or poor Black people because, at the end of the day, they are both poor, and we need to realize that that is not what this country is about, and we need to uplift both.

That is why I would say the state of our Union is in paralysis, and we are paralyzed in a broke state. But it is our job, the Members of this House, all 435, to figure out ways to come together to

fix it. We know we have very specific ideas. We know that they have very specific ideas. They won the majority, and elections have consequences.

But if you want to talk to me in good faith about finding a solution, then be open to hearing what you don't want to hear. I am open to not getting everything I want because I know that we didn't win the House.

But this institution has to be better than that. I hope we can come together at some point and realize that spending money on American families is actually an investment that gives you a return, and it is not just wasteful spending.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS) has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the gentleman another question, because this issue of economic justice in the Black community is what I view as probably the issue, because we heard our colleagues from Michigan and New Jersey talk about that gap that exists.

There is somebody out there listening to you or listening to us tonight, and if you turn around and you are speaking to them, what sense of hope can you give to them that you see some way of addressing this economic justice? Is there something specifically that you can say to them that gives a little sense of optimism about that growing gap?

I mean, I ride in cabs and all, and they wonder if there is a fundamental difference.

So I ask the gentleman, as the leader of the Congressional Black Caucus, all 48, 49 of us, as you think about it and you have been here, what can you say to them about this economic justice issue that we have today?

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RICHMOND. Well, first of all, I think they should take some comfort and glean some hope from the fact that we are sitting here in the House of Representatives talking about economic justice on this Monday night because we are concerned about it and because we are offering solutions to it.

Hopefully, some in the majority, maybe in the House, maybe in the Senate, maybe in the White House, will extend a hand to say we are interested in hearing your ideas; we will read your proposals; let's see if we can find some middle ground.

This is not just about African Americans. This is about American people. There are too many people in this country who are busting their tails but can't make ends meet, and that, we have to take as a reality.

Corporations, the profits are at an all-time high; wages are at an all-time low. We ought to have a better balance than that. I think that they should take comfort in the fact that we are dedicated to working on it, and I think

that there is some sense of corporate responsibility that will also level the playing field.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that I really have enjoyed this topic. I guess it is a topic that, like in his district and my district, it always comes down to about the Benjamins and always comes down to what exactly—I liked his analysis about the rules, that he started out relating to football games or whatever sport it is, there are some rules.

I do think some people really wonder, from an economic justice standpoint, how they fit into this particular situation. I guess the point is does the gentleman have any sense that you think—and you visit with the President—to your knowledge, that: “You have got a fine document; I strongly support it, the solutions that are addressed.” Does the gentleman sense from either him or his administration that they are going to take up anything that you see there in terms of discussion?

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RICHMOND. Not yet. Not yet is the short answer.

Let me say this, Representative EVANS, as I close. You mentioned that where we are from it is all about the Benjamins, which means the Ben Franklins, the money dedicated to the resources.

Far too often—and I challenge a lot of the norms and customs and sayings in our community that I think are harmful. One of the sayings we used to hear a lot was, “if it doesn't make dollars, it doesn't make sense,” which means that, if it makes money, it makes sense.

□ 2030

But the true saying should be: if it only makes dollars, then it doesn't make sense.

There has to be something else to it besides just corporations making as much as they possibly can. There still has to be some sort of community obligation that goes along with it to make the communities you are in a little bit better, whether it is the schools; whether it is the housing; whether it is the streets, the roads, the bridges, all of those things.

So when you start talking about our infrastructure, the question becomes: Are corporations paying their fair share? They benefit from our labor, they benefit from our consumers, they benefit from a whole bunch of things. But if it is only about the dollars for them, then this country has lost its soul, which is why we are having this conversation, because we have to save it from itself.

And it is not the first time this country has lost its soul. During slavery, during Jim Crow, during segregation, there were many people who woke up every day, went to church, prayed to the Lord, and then at the end of the day went right back to perpetuate Jim

Crow, segregation, slavery, racism, and all of those things. But it takes brave people to stand up and call it for what it is.

If you don't diagnosis the problem, you will never find a cure for it. So even in this House, we have people who claim to be the Christian right or the religious right who will say and espouse very hateful and racist things, all in the guise of religion.

But it is our duty as the CBC, and me as the chair, to remind people, one, that we are better than that, and, two, we have done an awful lot of despicable things in this country and blamed it on religion or blamed it on the Lord and don't blame religion or the Lord for wicked men. It is our obligation to make sure that we call it when we see it and we continue to fight for the least of these. Because the least of these can't afford lobbyists. They can't run commercials on TV congratulating people. They can't run commercials on TV opposing candidates. All they can do is continue to bust their tails every day to try to put a roof over their head, food on their table, and all of those things.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his knowledge and his information, and I hope that it has been very helpful on this subject of economic justice in the Black community.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order, I want to yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during his State of the Union address, President Trump was quick to tout how the unemployment rate among black Americans dropped to 6.8 percent in December 2017—the lowest level ever recorded since the Bureau of Labor Statistics first began tracking unemployment numbers by race in 1972. However, President Trump's rosy narrative ignores a host of other facts that paint a very different picture for members of the black community under the new administration.

For one, President Trump's statement ignores important context surrounding this figure. From January to December 2017 under President Trump, black unemployment dropped 1 percentage point. Comparatively, under President Obama, unemployment among black Americans dropped by 1 percentage point during the same period in 2016; then by 1.9 points in 2015; then by 1.5 points in 2014; and then by 1.8 points in 2013. We must not forget that it was President Obama who pulled our country out of the biggest economic downturn since the Great Recession, the effects of which we are still benefitting from to this day. Ultimately, in January 2018, we saw a huge jump in unemployment among the black community to 7.7 percentage points.

The unemployment rate is not the only important indicator for economic health. Average wealth is an important metric, and one that points to a larger problem within our country. For example, for every \$100 in wealth accumulated by an average white family, the average black family can expect to only have accumulated \$5.04. For every \$100 in income

earned by the average white family, black families earn just \$57.30 on average. This wealth disparity has serious implications for housing, education, social mobility, and other factors that impact future earnings and wealth. Yet, in the face of these economic indicators, President Trump still proposes making drastic cuts to federal programs that help vulnerable segments of our population to escape poverty.

Mr. Speaker, access to wealth is more important than simply providing the means to purchase goods and services. Wealth enables families to grow without the hindrance of debt, gain access to safer neighborhoods and better schools, and become more equipped to pay for better education. In the absence of this, you see what we are witnessing within the black community—a racial wealth gap that continues to widen as time marches on. We need to overcome the economic disparities that have plagued the black community for generations and create new opportunities to lift our most vulnerable out of poverty.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, thank you Congressman EVANS for yielding and for anchoring this very important special order on the state of economic inequality in the United States, especially regarding its citizens of color.

The President would have us believe he is bringing the country together and growing the economy for all Americans but this could not be further from the truth.

First and foremost, Trump has nothing to do with the African-American unemployment rate being at its current level.

The President inherited a strong and rescued economy, including the downward trend in black unemployment from President Obama.

The African-American unemployment rate was cut in half during the Obama Administration.

The African-American unemployment rate actually jumped nearly one percentage point in January 2018, right after President Trump took credit for it being the lowest on record.

During the Obama era, the economy added 15 million new jobs, the black unemployment rate dropped and the high school graduation rate for African Americans soared.

The members of the CBC are here to tell the American people: "Stay Woke, Don't Be Fooled."

The racial wealth gap is much larger than the wage or income gap by race.

Average wealth for white families is seven times higher than average wealth for black families.

Worse still, median wealth (wealth for the family in the exact middle of the overall distribution—wealthier than half of all families and less-wealthy than half) for white households is twelve times higher than median African-American wealth.

Black-white wage gaps are larger today than they were in 1979.

Young African-American women have been hardest hit since 2000.

The wage gap for African-American men was 22.2 percent in 1979; in 2015 it was 31 percent.

Wage gaps are growing primarily because of discrimination and racial differences in skills and worker characteristics.

Declining unionization has also had a role in the growing African-American-white wage gap, particularly for men newly joining the workforce.

African Americans have been disproportionately affected by the growing gap between pay and productivity.

Not only are the President's policies divisive along racial and cultural lines, they also serve to further increase economic inequality due to their clear design in favor of the wealthiest among us at the expense of everyone else.

Trump's billionaire tax heist robs the U.S. Treasury of \$1.5 trillion in resources that could be invested in economic growth in underserved communities.

Trump has proposed eliminating programs that help minority businesses and that help minority communities access bank lending.

Trump has opposed increasing the minimum wage and eliminating labor protections for middle and lower income workers in the black community.

Trump has proposed doubling down on mass incarceration and the war on drugs, which drains the African-American labor pool.

Trump has taken every opportunity to harm health care for African-Americans from sabotaging the ACA to ending Medicaid as we know it.

Donald Trump is no friend to African-Americans' pocket book.

Trump also wants you to believe that he wants a bipartisan infrastructure plan.

"Stay Woke; don't be fooled."

Trump's proposal is yet another giveaway to his wealthy friends.

Instead of providing a robust federal investment in our infrastructure, including roads, bridges, mass transit, schools and broadband, Trump wants to give tax incentives to wealthy firms and individuals to build infrastructure that will cost the middle and lower income Americans money to use.

Instead of making it easier for state and local governments to invest in needed projects, he will make it more expensive for them to do so by reducing the federal cost share.

A recent National Urban League report titled "Protect Our Progress" gives a detailed look at the conditions of African Americans today.

The report suggested that the nation should invest in a "Main Street Marshall Plan" that would ensure that the gains made by African-Americans during the Obama administration aren't lost.

The plan includes expanding pre-K, increasing the number of college students receiving Pell grants, increasing the minimum wage and summer youth employment programs and incentivizing more doctors to accept Medicaid.

But we are in a climate where the current administration is looking to make cuts in many of these areas.

As it has for more than a decade, the Urban League used its Equality Index to track how close black America has gotten to white America in five major areas: education, health, social justice, economics and civic engagement.

There was not much change between 2015 and 2016 in the five areas the Urban League measures.

For this reason, the overall 2017 Equality Index of Black America was 72.3 percent, compared to 72.2 percent the year before.

An index of 100 percent would mean full equality in the particular measure between African-Americans and whites.

The biggest increase came in the area of education, which rose from 77.4 percent in 2015 to 78.2 percent in 2016.

In economics, African-Americans went from an equality index rate of 56.2 percent in 2015 to 56.5 percent in 2016.

In healthcare, the equality index between African-American and white Americans went from 79.4 to 80 percent between 2015 and 2016.

The only decrease came in social justice, from 60.9 to 57.4 percent.

In the category of civic engagement, African Americans actually surpass whites, according to the Urban League, with the number between 2015 and 2016 remaining at 100.6 percent.

As for Hispanics, there was a bigger increase in the overall Equality Index, from 77.9 percent in 2015 to 78.4 percent in 2016.

The Urban League also ranked the 70 metropolitan areas from the smallest gap in unemployment between African Americans and whites (and Hispanics and whites) to the largest gap.

For African Americans, the area with the smallest black-white unemployment gap was San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX, where the African Americans unemployment rate was 6.4 percent (down 1.9 percentage points from the previous year).

The white rate was 4.5 percent (down 0.4 percentage points).

The area with the largest gap was Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI, where the unemployment rate for African Americans was 13.8 percent, while just 2.7 percent for whites.

In income inequality, Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA for the third consecutive year had the smallest difference between African Americans median household income and white median household income.

The city with the biggest income gap was Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI, where the chasm was 41 cents for African Americans for every dollar earned by a white person.

For both African Americans and Hispanics, the area with the highest median household income was Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV, at \$68,054 for blacks and \$69,481 for Hispanics.

It also had the highest white household income at \$112,177.

Mr. Speaker, our nation still has a long way to go before we achieve economic equality for all its citizens.

THE RIGHT TO LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and I appreciate the honor and the privilege to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor here tonight to talk to you and address the body about the issue that is so important to so many millions of Americans, and that is the issue of life, the issue of protecting innocent, unborn human life that doesn't have the ability to speak out for itself, doesn't have the ability to scream for its own mercy, but it

does have the ability to squirm and move and belch and do all the things that we do outside the womb and can feel pain, a beating heart, and a throbbing heart of a heartbeat.

I mentioned this on the floor here a couple weeks ago of an ultrasound that was sent to me with a little baby with 158 beats per minute.

I would take people through some of the pro-life legislation that has been moved or attempted to be moved here in the United States Congress, Mr. Speaker. I would take you back to 1973 and *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*. Those two Supreme Court cases, working in conjunction with each other, essentially translated into abortion on demand. We saw abortions go from about 35,000 abortions a year in America, a number that I would say I thought was horrible then, to something like 1.6 million abortions in America, now ratcheted down with the weight of the conscience of our society to some number about 1 million or maybe a little bit less than 1 million.

Mr. Speaker, we don't get to count that difference between 1.6 million, roughly the peak, and a little under 1 million as 600,000 babies saved every year. Instead, it goes on our conscience the other way. That is a cumulative total of 60 million babies who have been sacrificed at the altar of this subject called pro-choice, judicial activism.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that human life is protected in our United States Constitution. It is protected under the 14th Amendment, and we have a constitutional right here in Congress to protect and defend life. In fact, I believe we have a duty to protect and defend life.

So I would first take us to that case of *Roe v. Wade*, and *Doe v. Bolton*, and the two cases taken together, January 22, 1973, and we have marched every year since then, including just last month on January 19.

But essentially this: *Roe v. Wade* was a case that was built on several Supreme Court precedents, but the one that strikes me the most is the *Griswold v. Connecticut* case. That was back in the mid 1960s sometime, maybe 1964, where Connecticut had outlawed contraceptives. They were a strong Catholic State at the time, and so they outlawed contraceptives.

Griswold went to court and said: No. We are married. We should be able to buy contraceptives, and the State of Connecticut shouldn't interfere in that.

So the Supreme Court manufactured this thing called a right to privacy, which was the privacy was protected by contraceptive activities within the marriage. So that case went in as a precedent case that established the right to privacy.

And then there was a follow-up case, and that would be the *Eisenstadt* case, that said: Well, it doesn't matter whether you are married, you have got a right to privacy whether you are

married or not, so you should be able to buy contraceptives if you are cohabiting rather than being joined together in holy matrimony. The Supreme Court found in their favor in that case.

And then, not that long later, 1973, here comes *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*. *Roe v. Wade* says: Well, there is a right to privacy, so I guess if we are not going to interfere with reproductive choices of married couples or non-married couples, then we are not going to interfere with whether they want to terminate the life of that innocent, beautiful, miraculous little baby.

So they came down with the decision that a right to privacy was more important than the right to life. And on this floor, Mr. Speaker, I brought this issue up numerous times to remind the body that our Declaration of Independence articulated this very clearly. It laid out the parameters for our Constitution. Our Constitution reflects those parameters in the Declaration.

So there is a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And those are prioritized rights. The priority is this: life is paramount. It can't be subordinate to anybody's liberty, and somebody's pursuit of happiness can't trample on anyone's liberty or their life.

Yet the Court decided this right to privacy, this liberty, this right to privacy that was manufactured in *Griswold v. Connecticut* in roughly a decade or less earlier, was more important than the right of the life of the innocent unborn.

And then they got into the concept of viability. But *Doe v. Bolton* is the one that gave essentially the broad license. The viability piece says: Well, can a baby survive at the end of the first trimester? No. The end of the second trimester? Probably not. But into the third trimester? That became more likely.

Yet even that didn't protect that innocent, unborn baby because *Doe v. Bolton* put these exceptions in here for the health of the mother, and that was defined and included the physical health, the emotional health, the psychological health, the familial health, and age-related factors.

So if you get into the emotional health, that is impacted by mental stability. It is impacted by cash flow. It is impacted by anything. What it amounts to is that this long list carried within it someplace there that anybody could look at it and say: Well, that's a license to abort a baby under any circumstance anytime, provided that the mother just simply wants the abortion.

And we, just a little over a year ago, saw a President leave office who stood on the floor of the Illinois State Senate and, multiple times, took the position that if a woman goes to an abortionist and wants an abortion, if the baby survives the abortion, she still has a right to a dead baby.

And by the way, all the people speaking over here a little bit ago all voted

against the bill that protected a baby who was born alive and survives an abortion.

And it is abhorrent to me to think that you would abort a baby. But the second thing is that if that baby survives the abortion, to go forward and kill that baby anyway or put that baby off in a cold room until that baby freezes to death, close the door, shut off the sound, plug your ears, and come back and check in an hour or two or five and see if it is done.

It is an appalling place that this country has gone. Sixty million babies. And I have supported every piece of pro-life legislation that has come before this Congress, including the Born-Alive bill. I support the ban on abortions for sex selection. I support the Pain-Capable bill, which passed the House here last October and went over to the Senate where, thankfully, the Senate had a vote on the Pain-Capable bill, and it failed, and we knew it would fail.

But it did establish that there is a pro-life majority, at least under those parameters, in the United States Senate. And I believe there will be some Senators who are held accountable for that vote.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I believe this: I believe that life begins at the moment of conception, begins at fertilization. From that point forward, it is a unique being that is growing and multiplying and shaping; and within about 18 days, we have scientific evidence that the heart starts to beat. We know that there is nerve activity.

We know that that baby—by about 20 weeks, it is clear, and I say it is actually irrefutable, that the baby feels pain. We have watched them in ultrasound move around in the womb and squirm.

We held a hearing last November 1 where we watched probably the youngest witness to ever testify before the United States Congress, and his name is Lincoln Glen Miller. This little boy was 18 weeks into development, and we watched him on ultrasound as he jerked his arm towards his face, sucked his thumb, moved his lips like he was trying to talk to us, squirmed around.

This little guy, Lincoln Glen Miller, showed us the humanity inside the womb here in this United States Congress for the first time.

So at the funeral of Phyllis Schlafly, who, prior to her death, was a living, breathing icon, a very principled individual, someone who was the clearest thinker of our time, I read most all of Phyllis' writings and followed her closely and counted her as a friend, and she has had a powerful impact upon this country, but at her funeral, Janet Porter of Faith2Action and I sat down and talked about something that Phyllis had asked: Would I bring a Heartbeat bill to the floor of the House of Representatives and push it through for a vote here on the floor successfully? Phyllis never wanted to do any-

thing unsuccessfully, and I don't either, Mr. Speaker—and send it over to the Senate and work to nurture it over there so it can get to the President's desk for a signature, because we have gone through 45 years of incrementalism. Forty-five years of a little bill here, a little bill there, that saved a few lives here and a few lives there.

Henry Hyde, the leader in the pro-life movement, and he was a glorious man who I had the privilege to serve with here in this Congress, and I enjoyed that time with him, Henry Hyde brought the Hyde amendment, and that extrapolated into the Mexico City policy. The Hyde amendment, coupled with the Mexico City policy, has saved 1 million lives, perhaps as many as 2 million lives, during that period of time.

I was involved in the ban on partial-birth abortion, and there we first saw the Supreme Court overturn our ban on partial-birth abortion, that ghastly tactic of turning a baby around in the womb and delivering the baby breech, feet first, until that baby's head and face are still inside the mother, and then poking a pair of scissors or a scalpel into the back of that baby's head and sticking a suction in and sucking the brains out to collapse the skull and removing the balance of that baby as that baby squirmed for mercy until the brain tissue was emptied from his skull.

□ 2045

Mr. Speaker, that sickening and ghastly and ghoulish tactic was outlawed by this Congress, and it went to circuit courts around the country. And those circuit courts found it unconstitutional because they couldn't overturn *Roe v. Wade* or *Doe v. Bolton*, so it came to the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court, in the first round of the ban on partial-birth abortion, found that killing a baby in that ghastly fashion was entirely constitutional because Congress had failed to precisely define to the satisfaction of the Supreme Court the act of partial-birth abortion, and had failed to demonstrate by congressional findings that a partial-birth abortion was never necessary to save the life of the mother.

Mr. Speaker, we went back to work. We went back to the Judiciary Committee and we held hearings before the Judiciary Committee, hearing after hearing after hearing. We got out the word processor again—it was a word processor in those days—and we precisely defined the act of partial-birth abortion.

When I describe it here, it is more ghastly than I have ever spoken publicly, and I regret the damage that it does to the ears and the psyche of the people who are listening tonight, Mr. Speaker, but it needs to be said. We defined that act absolutely, precisely, from a medical perspective, and we had a lot of sets of eyes and ears on it to weigh in on all approaches that we

could do. And with those hearings, medical doctor after medical doctor came through and testified. In the end, we had congressional findings that concluded definitively that a partial-birth abortion was never medically necessary to save the life of the mother.

So we defined the act. We proved it was never necessary to save the life of the mother. We passed the legislation, House and Senate, and it went off to be litigated again to three separate Federal circuits, one of them in Lincoln, Nebraska, which I attended in front of Judge Kopf. I will not forget that. But each of those circuits all found that our bill was unconstitutional in partial-birth abortion, not because we didn't define the act precisely enough, and not because our congressional findings weren't that, but because they did prove that it was never necessary for a partial-birth abortion to save the life of the mother.

They found our second bill unconstitutional because of the precedent called *stare decisis*. *Stare decisis* is the precedent that the court respects a previous decision. So anybody who thinks that there is a piece of pro-life legislation that will save any lives, that is going to be upheld at the lower court level, is, I think, barking up the wrong tree.

It is not going to happen that any lower court and lower Federal court in the United States is going to overturn a Supreme Court decision, because they will respect *stare decisis*, the decision of the Supreme Court. And there are too many Justices who have served in the past on the Supreme Court who would also honor that *stare decisis* decision.

If a similar case comes before them, they would look at the decisions that were made before and say: Well, I guess the court has already resolved this. There is no reason for us to relook at this. There is going to be no *de novo* review. It is simply going to be whatever the court has decided in the past. We are not going to challenge that going forward. We will build all case law on the case law that is behind us as we go forward.

That is an adherence to *stare decisis* and that is what we must overturn if we are ever to put an end to abortion in this country.

That is why we have written legislation in the Heartbeat bill that is designed to challenge *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* and ask a new Supreme Court, after we pass the Heartbeat legislation, H.R. 490, and bring it to this floor, get this vote, and pass it over to the Senate. When the day comes that we have got the votes in the House and Senate and we have a President that will sign the legislation—today, if we could get there—and a Vice President that seems to be enthusiastic about this—and I notice that the political adviser for the President, Kellyanne Conway, had a heartbeat pin on her dress as she spoke just a week or so ago.

I appreciate that support that is there.

But with the votes that are here now in this House, and the votes that need to be compiled in the Senate, and a Presidential signature, we can ban abortion. If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby shall be protected.

That is the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490. But when it is passed—I pray to God it is and soon—it will go to the lower courts because the pro-abortion lobby will litigate everything. Nothing seems to get to their conscience. They will litigate it. And we don't expect to win at the lower court level. It all has to go to the Supreme Court.

When we designed this path for this legislation, it was designed for a pro-life majority in the House, which we have; a pro-life majority in the Senate, which was proven just a week ago we have; and a President that will sign that legislation, a pro-life President who said just a few days ago that he is a pro-life President again. I appreciate that reinforcement.

We designed it for all of that with the expectations it would go before not the court at the time we wrote the bill and not the court now—perhaps the court now, but more likely a court that would be formed by a subsequent appointment or two made by this President, Donald Trump. All of that needs to be lined up for the Heartbeat bill to have success. And we should remember that. This isn't a function of waiting for the Supreme Court to be where we think it is favorable alone.

It is, instead, a function that there has to be four windows that are opened in the right sequence and we have to fly through those windows. So the first window is open right now: the House of Representatives. We just need a Speaker and a majority leader that will schedule the vote here on the floor, with 170 cosponsors on this legislation, and a good long list of folks who want to vote for the bill that just weren't ready to sign on yet.

We will get there, Mr. Speaker. That is window number one. We have got to fly the Heartbeat bill through window number one, and then send it over to the Senate. And we have got to fly the Heartbeat bill through window number two. That is harder. It is harder with the filibuster rule, a 60-vote majority. But with 60 million lives at stake, maybe the 60-vote majority is not such a requirement.

Perhaps they would be willing to waive that long tradition for the purpose of saving lives. That will be my argument. We have got 60 million lives we have lost in this country and you are requiring 60 votes in the Senate, and that sets the stage for another 60 million lives to be aborted if you can't get rid of that filibuster rule and let a simple majority pass something through the Senate.

The window in the House is open now. The window in the Senate can be opened if the Heartbeat bill goes over there. The window at the White House

is open right now. And the court is going to take a little time. But if we sit back and we decide we don't want to send something out this window of the House because we don't think that the Senate is ready—the President is ready, by the way—or if we don't think the court is ready, then there will be a window closed and it will be too late.

We have got to move this legislation through. It is H.R. 490, the Heartbeat bill that says this: that before an abortionist can ply his trade, he must first check for a heartbeat. And if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. It is that simple, that clear. And we have the technology now that shows that definitive heartbeat on ultrasound, where you can watch the baby move and squirm and gurgle and suck its thumb and try to talk, and do all of those loveable things.

We have the technology that shows that in ultrasound. We have a take-home kit where you can listen to the heartbeat of your baby. I get them texted to me from young ladies who are moms already and they are already bonding with this unborn baby. That technology says that, at about 6 weeks, we can determine the definitive nature of that heartbeat. And if that heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected.

Mr. Speaker, here is the problem that we have: 170 Members signed onto this bill and another good bunch of them want this bill to come to the floor and they want to vote on it. The will of the people is reflected through the United States Congress, especially the House of Representatives. Unelected people on the outside of this Congress are the ones who are holding this bill back.

When I talk to the leadership up the line and I say, "I want to vote on the Heartbeat bill and so do 170 Members who signed on and multiple others who want to vote for it," the will of this Congress is clear, but the leadership says, "We don't want to divide the pro-life community. We want to make sure that the pro-life community is unanimous in this before we move legislation."

I think that is an old rule that was put in place. It wouldn't be my rule.

So the top organizations along the way would be National Right to Life, the oldest and largest pro-life organization in the country. Now, I have named them. I can name every other organization from Family Research Council to Susan B. Anthony List, to Faith to Action, on down the line. And I will name a bunch of them a little later this evening, Mr. Speaker. Every other organization that I name supports this bill.

The only organization that doesn't support it is National Right to Life. National Right to Life, protecting Americans since 1968. The oldest pro-life organization, the largest pro-life organization.

I say: We need you on this bill because it is not going to move until you say you support it or the rest of Congress rises up in a very strong way.

So here is their answer. They tweeted this out here a little while back: "National Right to Life does not oppose the Heartbeat bill."

That was their message: "... does not oppose. . . ."

But in order for a piece of pro-life legislation to move—according to what I think is an archaic rule—it has to be unanimous.

So that means Family Research Council, Susan B. Anthony List, and National Right to Life, if they all say, "We like this bill; we want to move it," then H.R. 490, the Heartbeat bill, moves. If they don't say they like the bill, it is a de facto veto that blocks the bill.

So the will of 170 Members who signed on, and a good number of folks who are willing to vote for the bill who didn't sign on, the will of the American people reflected in this constitutional Republic that we are, is all being stifled and frustrated by one organization. It happens to be the oldest and the largest pro-life organization in the United States of America: the National Right to Life. Since 1968, they say: "National Right to Life does not oppose the Heartbeat bill." That is H.R. 490. There is no doubt about that.

I have had my conversations with Carol Tobias, and I have had my conversations with David O'Steen. By the way, not in person, only by phone. We couldn't get an in-person meeting. But a couple of their lawyers came in and we had that conversation, too. They all say the same thing. They all say: Well, our board doesn't like the Heartbeat bill and doesn't support the Heartbeat bill, so we can't act unless our board tells us to act.

I asked: So when was your last board meeting?

They said: Oh, several months ago. And there won't be another one until after the March for Life.

This conversation took place the first week in December.

So call a special board meeting because this is important. The Heartbeat bill grew a lot more momentum than you ever thought it was going to. It wasn't your idea, I know. I will give it to you as an idea if that is what National Right to Life wants. They can't meet with their board. They can't call a board meeting. They can't poll their board. They have to wait until the next scheduled board meeting.

Who are these board members?

I don't know. Fifty of them.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine 50 dedicated pro-life people in America who are on the board of National Right to Life and all of them sitting there intransigently saying, "Nope, I don't want to see the Heartbeat bill move. It is not something I want to do. I don't support protecting babies from the moment that a heartbeat can be detected"?

How in the world is it that you are the preeminent right to life organization in the country and the best you can say is you do not oppose the Heartbeat bill?

The real truth is, if you don't oppose it, neither do you support it. What it really means is the National Right to Life does not support the Heartbeat bill for whatever those reasons are, Mr. Speaker.

And I would sure like to know. Because I think if you truly are pro-life, then there wouldn't be a way you could sit there and say: I don't want to protect the babies that have a heartbeat.

In fact, if I look through their tweets and their literature, and they are full of references to heartbeat.

And I will get to that in a little bit, Mr. Speaker. But I wanted to hear from the gentleman from Texas and set the stage a little bit here. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), my dear friend, for all of his work in this area; not just his work, but his leadership.

I know his heart beats with a desire to make sure that any heart beating is protected.

□ 2100

I heard a comedian on television this last night saying something about, "Yeah, so many years ago I had an abortion because it is my choice," something of that order. The audience cheered and clapped. I thought, "A comedian?" My heart wasn't angry. My heart just broke for that child.

As my friend knows, my wife and I, our first child came 8 to 10 weeks early. They tried for 3 days to stop the contractions, and after 3 days it was clear our daughter was coming. Back then, it was far enough back that we really didn't know if we were going to be able to keep her.

The first day she was there in Tyler, we were losing her. I had had malpractice cases as a judge that involved the condition. I know for preemies they don't like to give too much extra oxygen because you get to 100 percent and it may cause blindness. It is a condition called retrolental fibroplasia. The retina has not matured enough, and in the presence of oxygen, the blood vessels constrict and cause little fibers to come out and separate from the back of the wall. I knew all of that. I knew all about what was going on.

When the pediatrician came in and tried to intubate our child, tried to get that tube in—he didn't intubate a lot of children. He was just a wonderful, caring doctor. They lost her three times. The monitors went off. They got her going again, tried to get the tube in so they could get more oxygen to her little, undeveloped lungs. He didn't know I was sitting there in the nursing station watching. It was like a horror movie. I was sorry I ever started watching it, but I could not leave until I found out how it came out.

Also, they were praying for my child and the doctor's hands and what he was doing. But he finally got her intubated and came out sweating profusely be-

cause he had that little child's life in his hands. I had already held our child. I could hold her in one hand. I was careful and preferred to use two.

But anyway, he made clear we needed to take her either to Dallas or Shreveport. At that time—now all kids, if they have to go somewhere, they go to Dallas, instate, from Tyler.

But at that time, I said: Well, which is more successful?

He said: It seems like the survival rate in Shreveport right now is a little better.

I don't know what it is now.

But I said: Let's get her to Shreveport.

So I wasn't sure. Kathy had to stay in the hospital there in Tyler, but I followed the ambulance and made sure she was checked in.

When I got over there, the doctor, I could understand why they had such a good survival rate. His name is Dr. Tsing. He, with one of the nurses, got me over to our daughter's isolette. It is open-air. They had the monitors hooked up. They had the halo around her head piping in extra oxygen.

He said: Please sit down here on this stool.

He said: Now, you are probably aware that her eyes are not functioning properly. She can't recognize you when she opens her eyes and tries to see, but she knows your voice. She has been listening to your voice for months. She knows you, and she is comforted by your voice because she knows you. So you sit here, and you talk to her, and you caress her little arms and face and talk to her, and you will do some good for her.

They said: We have a 2-hour limit on how long you can sit here, and then you have to take a break for a couple hours and you can come back.

The last thing Kathy had asked was that I do anything I could to help our little girl. So there I sat, and I caressed her little face.

The danger of a child born prematurely, the number one danger is the lungs not being properly developed to get enough air in to actually keep the child alive. So her breathing from the first moment of birth was very, very shallow, and her heart rate was erratic, very fast. You could see it on the monitors, very shallow, very fast, and very erratic breathing and heartbeat. But she had a heartbeat.

As the gentleman from Iowa has said many times, my friend, and Janet said many times: Gee, you walk in a room. You see a body not moving. You check to see if there is a heartbeat; and if there is a heartbeat, you know you have to call an ambulance. You have to do everything you can to try to keep that person living, which is, again, the principle behind the Heartbeat bill.

Her heart was beating just so very fast and erratically, but when I was playing with her little hand, she took her whole hand, it wrapped around the end of my finger, and she held on tight. It was a tight grip. This was a child

whose lungs are not working so well, eyes aren't working that great, but she was holding on and holding tight.

I was there for 3 or 4 hours before Dr. Tsing came back. When he came back, he said: Have you looked up at the monitors?

I had not for a couple of hours or so. I looked up, and the breathing was very shallow, but it was no longer erratic. It had a regular beat, a regular rhythm to it. The heartbeat was still very fast, but it was not erratic. It was a regular heartbeat with a regular pattern.

Dr. Tsing said: She is drawing strength from you. She is drawing life from you.

I can tell you, when you know this little child is drawing life from you and strength from you, you don't want to leave. Finally, after 8 hours, the nurses and the doctor came over.

They said: You have to leave. It has been 8 hours.

I said: I don't want to leave. The monitors show she has a regular heartbeat, regular breathing. I don't want to leave.

They said: You were supposed to leave 6 hours ago. You have to leave now. Go somewhere.

I did leave and went to McDonald's. My heart was up there with our daughter, and so I rear-ended a lady right there by McDonald's. The policeman was very nice, and the lady that lived there in Shreveport was extremely nice, but I couldn't wait to get back to our child.

She is extraordinary, absolutely extraordinary in every way, one of the top artists in the world. She was chosen to be one of the first 12 artists that Swatch Art Peace Hotel dedicated to the arts in Shanghai, one of the first 12 they selected to live there as artist-in-residence from all over the world. She was one of the first 12—amazing talent.

I think about the talent of so many, 60 million children. Every one of them had some kind of gift, and they are gone.

I have appreciated the National Right to Life when I was in college, when I was out of college, and when I was a prosecutor after law school. When I was a practicing lawyer, local businessman, my own firm, I was elected a judge, I never wavered in my appreciation of the National Right to Life.

I want to make sure that people understand, we also have a Texas Right to Life. It is not National Right to Life. It is its own organization.

I have talked to the Grahams. The Grahams that head up the Texas Right to Life, God bless them. They have done incredible work, but they make clear, we don't care whose bill it is, we don't care who came up with the idea; if there is any bill that will prevent even one precious life from being aborted, that life being saved and allowed a chance to be loved and to love and to not be aborted, then they are on board.

That is the way everybody I knew who is pro-choice, meaning you choose

to live, that is the way I thought everybody was. So it has been quite an awakening to be here in Washington and to have any groups, especially one that I put up on a pedestal for so many years, for decades now, that says: Our board doesn't support a bill.

We have a bill, the pain-capable bill, heck, any bill—pain-capable? Yes, sign me on—that saves 5 to 15 percent of abortions, count me in; I am there.

Then, National Right to Life may save 80, 90 percent of the children who are being killed; count me in. I am in.

I thought that is where everybody would be. I don't know. I really don't understand. If it is a turf battle, it wasn't our idea. Why is it that any group doesn't support saving an additional life?

I do read the Bible every day. I made that promise I would read the Bible, and I do that. I have just gone, again, through some of the Old Testament books, and when I read the prophets talk about how evil a society was, they said that this king did right in the eyes of the Lord, and this king did evil in the eyes of the Lord. When the writer wants to really illustrate the point that a society had become so evil that it was an abomination to God, they would point out that they sacrificed their children on the altar of an idol.

I remember reading that as a kid, and I thought: What could be worse than that? I just cannot imagine a parent being willing to sacrifice their child. I can imagine my parents, lots of parents, fighting to the death to protect their child, but I just couldn't imagine how that could happen in these Old Testament days.

Then I came to realize we have been doing that since the seventies. We have been sacrificing these children who could survive on their own on the altar of individual choice: I am too busy to do other things. I don't have time for a child when there are parents begging for children to adopt.

So I just appreciate so much my friend speaking up on behalf of the unborn. We have heard from our Democratic friends so many times that a society is judged by the way they protect those who cannot protect themselves and help those who cannot protect themselves. Clearly, there is nobody more innocent and more in need of protection than a child not quite born that someone wants to kill.

So I appreciate my friend's illumination of what is going on. I thank him for his efforts not just tonight, but every day.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I so much thank the gentleman from Texas for that, indeed, heartfelt description of what it was like, that miracle little child who also is intelligent and beautiful as well as a world-class artist.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here, and I don't understand National Right to Life either. This is exactly what they are formed for. The Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490, is an exact fit, as near as I can determine, into their very mission state-

ment. I made it a point to look up that mission statement, and I happen to have it here.

The National Right to Life mission statement, Mr. Speaker, goes this way: "The mission of the National Right to Life is to protect and defend the most fundamental right of humankind, the right to life of every innocent human being from the beginning of life until natural death."

Now, if that is the National Right to Life's position and mission, "from the beginning of life until natural death," I certainly support that. I don't think we disagree on when life begins. But one might read that statement literally to say "from the beginning of life until natural death" may be National Right to Life's position is something other than the moment of fertilization or the moment of conception on when life begins because the mission statement doesn't say "from the fertilization until natural death" or "conception until natural death." It says, "from the beginning of life until natural death."

□ 2115

But I dig a little deeper. On their website, they have a statement that starts with a question: When does life begin?

It answers its question this way: The life of a baby begins long before he or she is born. A new individual human being begins at fertilization when the sperm and ovum meet to form a single cell.

Perfect. I agree with that answer.

So the mission is to protect and defend the most fundamental right of humankind, the right to life of every innocent human being, from the beginning of life to natural death, the National Right to Life's mission statement, and they define the beginning of life as when, at fertilization, the sperm and ovum meet to form a single cell.

There should be no argument any longer on where National Right to Life stands. They should be standing for protecting all innocent life, from fertilization to natural death.

It is a fine, honorable position, and the history of National Right to Life has actually spoken to the heartbeat issue in the Heartbeat bill.

For example, there was a Heartbeat bill that passed out of the North Dakota State Legislature back in 2009. It went to a Federal circuit court. It was not upheld by that Federal circuit court. Just as I described a little earlier, the lower courts will not overturn a decision made by the Supreme Court. It has to be appealed to the Supreme Court level. This was not. But they were supporting the Heartbeat bill then.

So they are on record supporting the Heartbeat bill, and here are a number of other times on their positions on heartbeat.

Heartbeat has been showing up pretty often in the information that has come out of the National Right to Life. I would point out again their lead, Carol Tobias or David O'Steen.

This is February, 5, 2013, Right to Life's tweet that went out. It is @NRLC, if you want to send them a message. It says: An unborn child's heartbeat is "the most beautiful music," says Beyonce.

I looked that up because I wondered what that was. Beyonce was pregnant. She actually had a miscarriage and lost that child. She loved that child before that child was born. I don't have any doubts that her heart was broken.

But she said: An unborn child's heartbeat is "the most beautiful music."

That is posted on National Right to Life's Twitter page. That is February 2013.

Here is a July 2013 Tweet from them: Unborn babies can feel pain, they can dream, they have a heartbeat, they respond to their mother's voice. Abortion ends their life.

It looks like National Right to Life understands the importance of a heartbeat. I think they know something that I think I also know: that beating heart is in our ears now.

Many of us have heard that beating heart on ultrasound. When we hear that on ultrasound, we know that that is life. We also know that if that heartbeat can be detected and the baby is protected, that baby has at least a 95 percent chance of a successful birth.

So that is how viable that baby is at 6 weeks with a heartbeat.

Here is another Tweet, September 24, 2014, from Right to Life's Twitter account: Listen to an unborn baby's heartbeat at just 6 weeks.

Just the amount of time I gave it.

Another heartbeat message, going on down the line, this is 2014, also, a Right to Life tweet: Did you know, babies by 20 weeks can feel pain? They already have a heartbeat and detectable brainwaves by then.

That is the Pain-Capable bill that just failed in the Senate.

Heartbeat about 6 weeks. So they are telling us this heartbeat matters. A heartbeat is a sure sign of life. If there is a heart beating there, there is a live baby there—a baby with a 95 percent chance, or better, of a successful birth.

Moving on in 2014, also. Here is Carol Tobias, the lead in the National Right to Life. She tweets out on this day, 24 March 2014: New smartphone appcessory allows moms to hear unborn child's heartbeat.

I am glad that we noticed this. It is important that we know that. That is the place where these heartbeat sounds have been texted to me from young mothers who are at 6, 7, or 8 weeks along. They will send me the sound of that heartbeat. It comes on my phone, and I can open that up and I can hear that heartbeat surging at, say, 158 beats per minute. That is one of the most precious things that came to me about 2½ weeks ago; 158 beats per minute.

Here is the next tweet, February 2015. This is an abortionist. The National Right to Life's tweet is quoting an

abortionist who said: “I know that the fetus is alive during the process”—meaning the process of abortion—“. . . I can see fetal heartbeat on the ultrasound.”

I can see the heartbeat on the ultrasound.

That abortionist stops that beating heart that ends the life of that baby. But this is why Right to Life put this up. They know that heartbeat beats also in our conscience. It beats in theirs.

They want to stop abortions. That is their mission statement. They are the oldest organization in the country, the largest organization in the country. The Heartbeat bill couldn't more perfectly fit their mission statement, their cause for being, or the messages that come out here time after time in what one would presume would be laying down the predicate for the Heartbeat bill itself.

Here is another one from Right to Life. Their tweet says: I have a heartbeat.

It is a baby.

It continues: I have detectable brainwaves. I can feel pain. Don't I deserve human rights?

Yes, as soon as we can possibly provide them and stop this carnage of abortion. Don't I deserve the human right to life, is what this quote is, the National Right to Life.

Going on to another tweet, this one is in November of 2017. There is a continuum here that brings this through to 2017. The National Right to Life's tweet says: Did you know an unborn child's heartbeat starts around 20 days into a pregnancy? Most mothers don't even know they are pregnant by that time.

It is not easily detectable. It is not detectable by the technology we call for in the Heartbeat bill, but that is how early that is.

The Knights of Columbus has put up billboards that say: My heart began beating at 18 days.

We all start small. Abortion stops a beating heart.

Heart, heart, heart. It rings in our conscience. It should ring in the conscience of National Right to Life.

Here is National Right to Life in their tweets: Heartbeat; heartbeat; heartbeat; heartbeat; heartbeat.

Why not support the Heartbeat bill? You are actually doing so verbally here, but you go back to this canard: the National Right to Life does not want to—they want to say oppose; but, instead, I say it is more appropriate to say do not support the Heartbeat bill. Why?

It is beyond my comprehension how an organization that has these kind of convictions cannot be supporting the Heartbeat bill.

We have polling that tells us where this stands. It is a majority opinion all the way across the board. In a Barna poll taken in 2017, 69 percent of adults support the Heartbeat bill. Actually, it has slightly more polling support than

the Pain-Capable bill that has already passed the House and just failed in the Senate, but with a majority vote.

Sixty-nine percent of adults support the Heartbeat bill, 86 percent of Republicans, and 55 percent of Democrats. Even pro-choice/pro-abortion Democrats, the people who vote for them, support them, also support the Heartbeat bill with what we call a landslide level, if it were an election, and 61 percent of Independents.

Eighty-six percent of Republicans support Heartbeat, 55 percent of Democrats, and 61 percent of Independents support the Heartbeat bill. We are getting down to the place here where it is making even less and less sense that National Right to Life would not support the Heartbeat bill.

There is another big set of reasons here. Mr. Speaker, this isn't the whole set of reasons. This is maybe half, maybe not quite half the set of reasons.

Not only 170 Members of Congress have signed onto this bill, and a good number of them that will vote for it on the whip card on top of that, but 130 pro-life organizations and leaders support the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490.

You can't read this from very far away because we tried to jam as many names on there as we could. There is another sheet and probably at least another one behind that. It is 130 pro-life organizations.

We look down through that, and who are we missing?

I couldn't come up with anybody that we were missing, as far as supporting this, other than the National Right to Life.

I am looking on top here. Here is Susan B. Anthony List at the top of the list. Here is Tony Perkins, the president of the Family Research Council. These are the top three organizations right here that some have referred to as the Holy Trinity that control pro-life legislation and whether it comes to the United States Congress or not, whether the will of the people can be realized as being stuck right here in red.

So we put this in red. I held this back and reserved this spot on the sheet for Carol Tobias of the National Right to Life. Just pick up the phone and call the Speaker is all, Mr. Speaker, that Carol Tobias needs to do and the Heartbeat bill comes to the floor of the House and the will of the people can be reflected. It can go over to the Senate, it can sit on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk, and they can have a vote over there and we will find out where those Senators all are. If it doesn't pass on the floor of the Senate, there might just be some new Senators sent in who will protect innocent, unborn human life.

So I can go down the list. Lila Rose, the president of Life Action, a strong supporter, enthusiastic supporter of the Heartbeat bill. Tom McCluskey, March for Life. We have sat down and had a conversation. He is supporting of this.

Then we have got Kristan Hawkins, the president of Student for Life. On

down the line. Anita Staver, president of the Liberty Council; Ed Martin, president of the Phyllis Schlafly's organization, Eagle Forum. He is the Eagle's president. He solidly supports the Heartbeat Bill. In fact, he was there in that church that day that we put that plan together and has been a driving force.

But the real, strongest driving force of all is Janet Porter, the president of Faith2Action. Janet Porter really carried this in the State of Ohio. I went to Ohio to help conclude that. What we found out in the State of Ohio is that not only did the Heartbeat bill pass in Ohio, Mr. Speaker, but it passed over the resistance of the local affiliate of National Right to Life.

They will tell me, and David O'Steen told me, they are not in control of their State organizations. You heard Congressman GOHMERT address that, also. The State organizations kind of run their own show.

But when it was resisted in Ohio, it made no sense. They lobbied John Kasich to veto the bill. Why?

Under the grounds that it would be found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in Ohio. Seriously?

Do we go through all that work and then just decide we are going to preempt the court decision, pass a law, sign it into law, and save the babies' lives?

Every step we take along the way saves lives.

Keith Rothfus made an argument that I want to give him credit for. He said that even just debating the Heartbeat bill saves lives, because the debate causes people to talk about it, to think about it differently, and to make different decisions about the lives that they are in charge of protecting, and that is the innocent unborn lives.

So here we are with 130 pro-life organizations and leaders supporting the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490. We look down through this list—and I will put it all public, if it needs be, Mr. Speaker—but I saved a spot up here in red for Carol Tobias and David O'Steen and the National Right to Life. Just give us a call. Send me an email, a text. Pick up the phone. Call the Speaker. We will move this bill, and we will save lives together.

Meanwhile, if that doesn't happen, I am going to continue to ask the question: How in the world can you not support this bill?

How in the world can the Nation's preeminent pro-life organization, the National Right to Life, who says they do not oppose the Heartbeat bill, and I say they do not support the Heartbeat bill, how can that be?

How can you form 50 people on a board of directors, all of them pledged and dedicated to your mission statement to protect life from the beginning of life to natural death, and not find one among those 50 who support the Heartbeat bill, when 170 cosponsors are already on it here in the House of Representatives and multiple others are

standing up ready to vote for the bill, and not one among your board supports the Heartbeat bill?

There is something wrong. There is something wrong inside an organization.

Those statements came both from Carol Tobias and David O'Steen. Maybe there were a couple along the way, there is a little clause in there, but generally this: Who on your board supports the bill?

You can't name any. That is essentially it.

□ 2130

If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, then there is something seriously wrong in the National Right to Life and something that seriously needs to be corrected because there are babies who must be protected. If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected, and we need the support of the entire pro-life community in order to get this legislation moved out of the House and over to the Senate, to the President's desk.

It will eventually get before a Supreme Court. We will eventually have one or two more appointments to that Supreme Court. It has got a shot today. It is clearly more constitutional than the pain-capable legislation because it is precisely drafted with these things all in mind. It is a solid case to go before the Supreme Court.

I would say, instead, there is no reason to litigate it, but I kind of think it will be because the enemies to life litigate everything that saves and protects lives. But these little babies are too precious, they are too unique, they are too miraculous for us to waste a minute in protecting their lives. I want every little baby that has got a heartbeat, have every little baby have that chance to be born, that chance to live, to love, to laugh, to learn, to worship, to be a parent of its own, and to be a gift from God to this country, to this planet, and to posterity. That is the miracle of every little child.

When Congressman GOHMERT spoke of being able to hold his little daughter in one hand, that sacred, protected little girl now has grown into a glorious and beautiful and intelligent woman who is contributing to this society and to this world, and that is true for everyone where all give glory to God. But 60 million babies—60 million babies—cannot continue. We have to put an end to this atrocity of abortion.

The Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490, does that, and there is only one entity standing in the way, and that is National Right to Life. And I plead with you, and I pray that you will come around to support. Your history says that is who you are and what you do, and it is time, now, to get on the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) until 10 p.m.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, first, I take a moment to acknowledge that we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Family and Medical Leave Act. Signed into law February 5, 1993, FMLA established the right for many workers to take an unpaid leave from work for serious illness, adoption, or to care for newborns or family members.

Unfortunately, unpaid leave is still inaccessible for 63 percent of working Floridians because they are ineligible for the FMLA or cannot afford to take unpaid leave. This means 63 percent of Florida's families face an impossible choice: work or family responsibilities.

Failure to guarantee paid family leave not only hurts our economy, it hurts our families, and it is women who suffer most. In Florida, 79 percent of Black mothers, 56 percent of Latina mothers, and 53 percent of White mothers are key family breadwinners. Paid family leave means these mothers can stay in the labor force and care for their families' medical needs.

We must also think about our seniors, medical circumstances arising from military service, and those in need of support battling addiction. Paid leave not only supports American families, it boosts economic activity. We must expand FMLA to cover more workers for the next 25 years and beyond.

HONORING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I take a moment to reflect on the invaluable contributions of African Americans and what they have done throughout our Nation's history and for our community in central Florida.

We are incredibly blessed to stand on the shoulders of so many greats who have come before us. We give thanks to Dr. King, Rosa Parks, my colleague, the legendary Congressman JOHN LEWIS, to A. Philip Randolph, and so many others who have been critical heroes in this story, countless brave men and women whom we honor for demanding equality for all.

Today, I want to celebrate and honor the leaders in central Florida who have influenced and continue to make an impact throughout their day-to-day lives in our community. They are an inspirational group who remind us that America is made stronger and greater by the countless contributions of our African-American community.

RECOGNIZING RICHARD HALL

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Mr. Richard Hall. Mr. Hall is one of the original Tuskegee Airmen, the country's first Black military aviators in the U.S. Air Force—back then, the U.S. Army Air Corps.

Born in Georgia, Hall moved to central Florida with his parents when he was 5 months old. A graduate of the Robert Hungerford Boarding School in Eatonville, Hall received a 4-year scholarship to Xavier University in New Orleans, Louisiana. He joined the Army Air Force Reserves and, in 1942, was sent to fight in World War II in France.

Mr. Hall was among the first African-American chief master sergeants after integration in 1949. He served his country for over three decades and completed tours on four continents, including the Korean and Vietnam wars, as well as World War II.

In 2007, Mr. Hall, along with other Tuskegee Airmen, received the Congressional Gold Medal from President George W. Bush, and in central Florida, he was honored with a life-sized sculpture that sits outside of Hannibal Heritage Center in Winter Park.

Mr. Hall retired to Maitland in the 1980s and continues to call central Florida his home.

I was honored to be able to interview Mr. Hall last week for the Library of Congress Veterans History Project, and it was an absolutely amazing story of a man from central Florida who traveled around the world defending our country and finally made it back home.

RECOGNIZING ELIZABETH JONES

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Elizabeth Jones. Mrs. Jones was born in 1942, in Savannah, Georgia. She made her career in military banking from Bank of America and retired with 29 years of experience in managing support for our soldiers in Germany.

Betty arrived in Orlando and started working for Presidential campaigns by volunteering on phone banks to get out the vote. She also worked for various candidates who were running for office by distributing campaign literature and helping the Orange County Democratic Executive Committee. As a member of the Orange County Democratic Executive Committee, she became the precinct representative for her community in Wedgfield.

In March 2016, Elizabeth joined the Orange County Democratic Hispanic Caucus and was elected to the executive board. She became a very active member within the Hispanic Caucus by registering new voters, being engaged in Orange County, and supporting various initiatives within the Hispanic community.

Elizabeth also volunteers for various organizations within her community, including Give Kids the World in Kissimmee, which cares for children with cancer; the VA hospital in Lake Nona that we are proud to have in our district to serve our veterans; and the Florida Baptist Mobile Dental Bus for communities that are disenfranchised and in need of free dental care. She has been volunteering for the mobile dentist bus with her husband for more than 5 years.

Ms. Jones, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING STEWART MOORE

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Stewart Moore. Stewart Moore coanchors WESH 2 News on CW 18 and has been an important voice for the central Florida community. He joined the WESH news team in August of 2011. He is originally from Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Since arriving in central Florida, Stewart has made a tremendous impact on our local community. He volunteers at schools, sits on multiple community boards, and has moderated several townhall discussions on major issues in our community.

While at WESH, Stewart has won two Emmys and two Associated Press awards for his breaking news coverage of the Pulse nightclub shooting and as a member of the team that won an Edward R. Murrow Award for the same coverage. He has covered major stories, including the George Zimmerman trial, Pulse shooting, and the 2012 and 2016 Presidential elections.

Before joining WESH, Stewart worked as a morning anchor in South Carolina and WTXL in Tallahassee, Florida. At WTXL, he began reporting and anchoring while still in college at Florida State University. He majored in creative writing and minored in communications.

Stewart also interned at CNN in Atlanta.

In South Carolina, Stewart won a consumer reporting award for his profile of a South Carolina shrimp and covered the 2008 Presidential election.

A news junkie who keeps us all informed, Stewart is a vital voice and an exemplary member of our central Florida community.

Stewart, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING ROXANNE "ROXSY" HARVEY

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Roxanne "Roxsy" Harvey. Roxanne Harvey is currently the president of the Democratic Women's Club of Osceola County. She is the senior pastor of the Real Love Christian Center, an international missionary, recording artist, and a prolific motivational speaker.

As president of the DWCO, Roxanne has had the honor of uniting people of this great community by recruiting new members, mentoring, educating, empowering others, and uniting the Democratic Party through events and education.

Roxanne established Real Love International, where her overall vision is to help people discover and develop new skills that will enable them to move from poverty into abundant living, from helplessness to hopelessness, and from victims to victorious living through ministry, education, and motivation.

She developed programs such as Transformation Technology Station, a 6-week computer training program that assists and educates low-income and at-risk families in computer technology, and Diamonds in the Rough, a mentoring program to help at-risk

teenage girls between the ages of 13 and 18 years of age to help develop self-esteem, academic achievement, social and interpersonal skills, and a spiritual foundation.

As a result of this explosive dedication, she has held crusades, clinics, and fed the poor in various countries such as England, Ireland, Scotland, Honduras, in my family's native island of Puerto Rico in the United States, Jamaica, Uganda, Africa, and has led thousands of people to hope, purpose, destiny, and, most of all, God.

Wherever Roxanne goes, she exhorts and encourages people to arise to their divine calling and destiny.

Roxanne, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING SHAWN W. KINSEY

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Shawn W. Kinsey. Shawn Kinsey is a true example of a servant leader in the city of Winter Haven, Polk County, in the State of Florida.

He is the current chairman of the Polk County Democratic Executive Committee and is the incoming chair of the Democratic County Chairs Association. He has been the president of East Central Polk Democratic Club and of Polk County Democratic Black Caucus, as well as assistant secretary for the Florida State Conference of the NAACP and board member at large.

Moreover, Shawn is a member of the Winter Haven Public Education Partnership board of directors and the immediate past president of the Winter Haven branch of the NAACP.

Lastly, he was the past president for the Democratic Black Caucus of Florida and Polk County Executive Committee in which he was recognized as the Lawton Chiles Outstanding Democratic Man of the Year.

Shawn attended and graduated from St. Joseph's Catholic School in Winter Haven and Santa Fe Catholic High School in Lakeland, Florida.

After graduating from high school, he attended Florida A&M University and the University of Phoenix, where he received respective degrees in business administration and health administration.

Shawn's consistent community involvement is clearly based upon his heartfelt commitment to contribute to the overall uplifting and engagement of all residents of Polk County in the State of Florida.

Shawn, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING RHETTA PEOPLES

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Rhetta Peoples. Rhetta Peoples has been working in the community as a community activist, journalist, and volunteering to help get voters to the polls and beyond with a career spanning back to the 1990s in media.

As a volunteer, Rhetta helped candidates get and maintain direct access to voters in central Florida all along the I-4 corridor through grassroots marketing and the promotion of forums and townhalls. Rhetta also served

as president of a thriving nonprofit organization, and she is a small-business owner.

She began studying media and marketing in high school and graduated from Florida A&M University, majoring in broadcast journalism. During college, she worked as a radio announcer in Tallahassee and with Cox Radio in Orlando.

Rhetta takes pride in being an award-winning journalist for the Black press because she says writing for Univision's *The Root* and an Orlando-based newspaper, the *Florida Sun*, unites her with the community.

Rhetta also studied the history of clinical trials in African Americans as a fellow at the University of Maryland in Baltimore and was awarded the outstanding reporter award for the Florida Public Health Association for excellence in communications and reporting in public health issues.

□ 2145

After working for Post-Newsweek, CBS, Cox Communications, and Comcast, Rhetta decided to start her own marketing and public relations firm.

Rhetta, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING DAWN CHANTEL CURTIS

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Dawn Chantel Curtis.

Dawn Curtis is a native of a small urban town called Franklinton, Louisiana. She has worked with the government sector for over 15 years. In conjunction with the government sector, she has also worked with nonprofit providers to help them build relationships in organizations within the community. Dawn has experience with assisting nonprofit committee boards in clarifying their organizational goals and identifying the leadership qualifications necessary to achieve those goals.

In addition to her professional experience with governmental and nonprofit agencies, Dawn is an active board member with a number of community organizations. She currently serves as the first vice president of the Orange County Democratic Black Caucus, treasurer for the Orange County Democratic Executive Committee, and secretary for the National Congress of Black Women.

Dawn is a member of the NAACP, where she serves as a member-at-large and is the chair of the Environmental Justice Committee. She is a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, Psi Theta Omega Chapter, where she serves as the co-chair of the Strategic Planning Committee.

Dawn received a bachelor of science degree from Florida State University and a master's degree in business administration and human resources from the University of Phoenix.

Dawn serves her community with great humanity and passion. She feels it is her moral obligation to give back to the community. Therefore, she has

dedicated her life to service and community activism.

Dawn, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING WANDA FAYE HOWARD

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Wanda Faye Howard.

Wanda Howard is a Lake Wales native. She became the first African-American female president of the Lake Wales branch of the NAACP. Prior to that, she was the former youth adviser of many years for the Lake Wales NAACP Youth Council.

Wanda has been a member of the Delta Sigma Theta Lakeland Alumnae Chapter since spring of 1998. At the regional level, she served on the regional committee in Tennessee and program planning and development at various regional and national conventions.

Wanda has been a school volunteer at two schools in Lake Wales, Florida. She was once a member of the League of Women Voters of Polk County and spent time volunteering at the Lake Wales Boys and Girls Club. She enjoys giving her time, talent, and resources to the Lake Wales NAACP ACT-SO and Back to School/Stay in School programs. Wanda is also a very active member of her church, the Allen Temple African Methodist Episcopal Church in Lake Wales, Florida.

Ms. Howard continues to visit with the Boys and Girls Club of Lake Wales, Florida, to talk with them about civil rights and Black history.

Wanda, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING DR. J.A. WILTSHIRE

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Dr. J.A. Wiltshire.

Dr. J.A. Wiltshire is the first African-American physician in Lake Wales. He was born in New Jersey and served in the Army Specialized Training Program from 1943 until 1946, reaching the rank of second lieutenant.

While serving in the Army, he earned his bachelor's degree from Fisk University in Tennessee and entered Meharry Medical College, graduating with honors in 1946. Dr. Wiltshire moved to Tallahassee to become the chief of staff at Florida A&M University's hospital in 1947. He moved to Lake Wales in 1948 and opened up his practice on B Street, later moving to another office on 1st Avenue.

Dr. Wiltshire delivered an amazing 2,500 babies in almost 50 years of practicing medicine in Lake Wales before retiring in 1995. His wife, Laura, said that he never turned away a patient and always stayed past office hours and made a lot of night house calls.

Dr. Wiltshire was a member of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity; Post Number 213 of the American Legion; and the Imperial Twenty-Five Club, a Bartow social club; and many other organizations, as well as helping the community with housing and medical care.

In 1984, he received the Annual Medical Award from the Polk County Chapter of the United Negro College Fund.

Dr. Wiltshire was chosen as Lake Wales Citizen of the Year in 1988. In 2004, a street in Lake Wales was named after him: Dr. J.A. Wiltshire Avenue.

Dr. Wiltshire, we honor you.

NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. SOTO. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a little bit about the national debt and what we see going into 2018.

It was reported this week that the U.S. Government is set to borrow over \$1 trillion in 2018—approximately \$955 billion—which is an 84 percent increase from 2017.

The Congressional Budget Office reports quite clearly: Tax receipts are going to be lower because of the new tax law.

This is increasing bond yields, which is directly related to the recent stockmarket decline of nearly 1,800 points that we have seen over the last 2 days of trading, because we see higher interest rates, the highest for bonds since 2014. As a result, we have been watching a precipitous decline—the largest in American history—by actual number of points.

President Trump's Department of the Treasury forecasts borrowing over \$1 trillion in 2019 and over \$1.1 trillion in 2020.

President Trump has described himself as the "King of Debt," despite campaigning on reducing the national debt. What we worry about is that the tax plan will be mortgaging our future for today.

And guess who pays the bill?

Our children, who will have to repay a massive debt; our seniors, who could face cuts to Medicare and Social Security; and every American, due to a declining economy.

We must take this seriously. And \$1 trillion being doubled the year before and going over \$1 trillion next year, and \$1.1 trillion the following year is not sustainable for our Nation. I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together to fix this growing crushing debt before it is too late.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COHEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of flight delay.

Ms. KAPTUR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of flight delay.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3888. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 22-232, "Historic Anacostia Vacant Properties Surplus Declaration and Disposition Authorization Temporary Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3889. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-231, "Paul Devroux Way Designation Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1778. A bill to provide that an order by the Secretary of the Interior imposing a moratorium on Federal coal leasing shall not take effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 725. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 772) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1153) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4771) to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 115-546). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 4921. A bill to require the Surface Board of Transportation to implement certain recommendations of the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 4922. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl analogues as schedule I controlled substances; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4923. A bill to make exclusive the authority of the Federal Government to regulate the labeling of products made in the United States and introduced in interstate

or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 4924. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to reform the procedures provided under such Act for the initiation, investigation, and resolution of claims alleging that employing offices of the legislative branch have violated the rights and protections provided to their employees under such Act, including protections against sexual harassment, 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. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 4925. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration to implement certain recommendations for management and collection of railroad safety data; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 4926. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emission fees, reduce the rate of the corporate income tax, provide tax credits to workers, deliver additional benefits to retired and disabled Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Veterans' Affairs, Energy and Commerce, 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. BRAT:

H.R. 4927. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the authority of district courts to provide injunctive relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 4928. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide that the United States district court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction over actions arising under the immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4929. A bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay Initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. CULBERSON:

H.R. 4930. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act with respect to Federal assist-

ance to individuals and households, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 4931. A bill to establish the Transition to Independence demonstration program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 4932. A bill to address the disparate impact of climate change on women and support the efforts of women globally to address climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. RUSH:

H.R. 4933. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to implement the policy changes in the notices terminating temporary status for natives of Nicaragua, Haiti, and El Salvador, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 4934. A bill to prohibit assistance to the Government of Pakistan, and to require the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to transfer amounts to the Highway Trust Fund equivalent to historic levels of assistance to Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SOTO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 4935. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for assault against journalists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 128. A joint resolution making a further extension of continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the birth of Frederick Douglass; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for a

ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BASS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 723. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of February 5, 2018, through February 9, 2018, as "National School Counseling Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H. Res. 724. A resolution requiring each employing office of the House of Representatives to adopt an anti-harassment and anti-discrimination policy for the office's workplace, establishing the Office of Employee Advocacy to provide legal assistance and consultation to employees of the House regarding procedures and proceedings under the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ethics, 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4936. A bill for the relief of Joel Perez Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4937. A bill for the relief of Ravidath Lawrence Ragbir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 4921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 4922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 4924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 5 of the United States Constitution

“Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.

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.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.”

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 4925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 4927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution states that The Congress shall have Power “To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.”

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 4928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution states that The Congress shall have Power “To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.”

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 4929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 4930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 4932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress Under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: “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”

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”

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .”

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 4934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 4935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4936

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the constitution, its amendments, and all Supreme Court Decisions relevant to the Article.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4937

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law” In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 66: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 364: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 365: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 389: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 547: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 692: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 754: Mr. KIHUEN and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 771: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 807: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 812: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 820: Mr. BACON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 846: Mr. VELA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MAST, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 850: Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 878: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 881: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 1192: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1266: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1300: Mr. JONES, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1434: Mrs. HANDEL and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1439: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1441: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1447: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1531: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1559: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1563: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1618: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1752: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1753: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1903: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1910: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 2004: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 2166: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 2259: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2317: Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. COOK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 2318: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2345: Mr. RUSH, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2452: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2575: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2583: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2591: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 2599: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2623: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 2646: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2666: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2670: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2712: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2740: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 2778: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2801: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2886: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2893: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 2991: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 2996: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 3032: Mr. BUCHANAN and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 3197: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 3222: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 3263: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3301: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3378: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 3458: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 3497: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3504: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3505: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3513: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 3528: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 3545: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3617: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3641: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3654: Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3692: Mr. NORCROSS and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3751: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 3770: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3792: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 3832: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 3842: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3889: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 3913: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 3942: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3976: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CALVERT, and Ms. HERERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 3984: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 4006: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 4074: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 4099: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.
 H.R. 4143: Mr. COOK, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 4198: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 4206: Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 4207: Mr. LANCE and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4221: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 4238: Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 4253: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 4306: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 4384: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 4413: Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.R. 4421: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4426: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 4474: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 4505: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 4527: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 4547: Mr. YODER.
 H.R. 4548: Ms. FUDGE.
 H.R. 4574: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 4575: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 4582: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 4631: Ms. NORTON and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 4677: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 4704: Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 4706: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 4720: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. DENHAM.
 H.R. 4736: Mr. HUIZENGA.
 H.R. 4820: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 4822: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. DENHAM.
 H.R. 4828: Mr. FASO and Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 4831: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 4840: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mrs. DEMINGS.
 H.R. 4844: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 4851: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H.R. 4860: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 4884: Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 4886: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. GAETZ.
 H.R. 4887: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 4906: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. LEE.
 H. Res. 31: Mr. GOMEZ.
 H. Res. 129: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H. Res. 157: Mr. YODER.
 H. Res. 466: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. DELAURO.
 H. Res. 545: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 652: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms.

CLARKE of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H. Res. 661: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H. Res. 700: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. GALLEGGO.
 H. Res. 711: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H. Res. 713: Mr. COHEN and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H. Res. 721: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H. Res. 722: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. NADLER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

H.J. Res. 128, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.