



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2018

No. 35

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
February 27, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable PAUL MITCHELL 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 10:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I offer my deepest condolences to Reverend Billy Graham's children and grandchildren on this very sad occasion.

Reverend Billy Graham will be remembered by millions of people for millions of reasons, which is a testament to the people he inspired. When I consider Reverend Graham's life and all of his many accomplishments, I

think of his humble beginnings and his dedication to bringing people to Christ.

Reverend Graham, North Carolina's favorite son, began as a farmer's son and was not born with the steadfast faith that we later observed. It was a faith he chose and that he dedicated himself to all of his life.

Later, he would be called America's Pastor, as he counseled Presidents and the poor alike. What is remarkable is how Reverend Graham heard the call and made the choice to follow the Lord and to take His word farther and more rapidly than it had ever gone before.

Mark 16:15 of the Good Book instructs us to, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to all creation." This is a charge that Reverend Graham took seriously and a charge which he spent a lifetime endeavoring to obey. This seemingly ordinary man went on to do extraordinary things because of his faith and because of his calling to follow the Lord.

In Chronicles 16:9, we observe that "for the eyes of the Lord move to and fro throughout the Earth that He may strongly support those whose heart is completely His." This scripture strikes true when we think of Reverend Graham's life and work. His heart was certainly filled with love for the Lord. Reverend Graham traveled the world preaching to the masses, but he did not crave fame or notoriety. Ever the humble servant, Reverend Graham craved the grace to bring others to Christ.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened that Reverend Graham is no longer with us, but I rejoice that he has joined the Lord, whom he loved so dearly. I am proud to join thousands of Americans in paying my last respects to Reverend Graham as his body lies in honor in the United States Capitol. This is only the fourth time in history that a civilian has earned this high honor and the esteem of a grateful nation, and this honor is richly deserved.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that everyone here and those watching at home will remember all of Reverend Graham's many lessons and will let his life serve as a reminder to us all that ordinary people can accomplish extraordinary things if we put our trust in the Lord.

### HONORING THE LIFE OF EDDIE OLCZYK

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a legendary Chicagoan, Mr. Eddie Olczyk, a former star player and a current voice of the Blackhawks. A native son of Chicago, Eddie exemplifies the heart, grit, and character of the city we both call home.

Eddie first made his way into Chicago's collective heart as a member of the 1984 U.S. Olympic Hockey Team at the young age of 17. From there, he went on to play 16 seasons in the NHL and later coached the Pittsburgh Penguins. In 2012, Eddie was inducted into the U.S. Hockey Hall of Fame.

Eddie currently works as a broadcaster for both the Blackhawks and nationally as a color commentator for NBC Sports. He is the best in the business. Those outside of Chicago may know Eddie from his time covering horse racing for NBC.

Today, Eddie is facing another battle. This one is off the ice. Last year, he was diagnosed with colon cancer. As he describes it, sometime last summer, he began feeling pain in his lower abdomen. Initially, the pain was intermittent and he thought nothing of it. But when it persisted for several days, he decided he should get things checked out. It was then that his doctor found a tumor, and he was quickly scheduled for surgery to have it removed. For the past 6 months, Eddie's been undergoing chemotherapy, and he just completed

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.

H1269

his 11th treatment. Thankfully, he has one more treatment to go.

Clearly, Eddie knows what it means to be tough. But to really be tough, men in particular must know that it is okay to say something when things don't feel right.

The American Cancer Society estimates that 1 in 22 men and 1 in 24 women are at risk for developing colorectal cancer in their lifetime.

Colorectal cancer is currently the third leading cause of cancer-related deaths in the United States. In 2017, it is expected to cause over 50,000 deaths. That is particularly important for men who don't want to consider the dangers of colon cancer. This doesn't have to be. When detected early, treatment for colorectal cancer is effective, especially when polyps are removed before they become cancerous.

More young men are being diagnosed with young-onset colorectal cancer than ever before. According to the Colorectal Cancer Alliance, 11 percent of colon cancers and 18 percent of rectal cancer diagnoses occur in those under the age of 50.

Young men, even those in their thirties and forties, must be aware of the risk for this disease and advocate for their health. Talk to your doctor regularly if you are feeling pain, and get screened regularly.

Back in his playing days, Eddie would have been nervous about what a coach or teammate would have thought if he complained of pain. But, in part, to voices like his, the sports culture is changing and more athletes are speaking up when something is wrong. We should all learn from his and their example.

After he was diagnosed, Eddie felt like his pride took a hit. Like many others who have faced cancer, he was concerned that he was letting people down and he began to question his mortality. But as he went through treatment and reflected on this ordeal, he started to recognize that it was okay to be scared.

He has used this platform to speak out about colon cancer, about the need for screening, and for research for a cure. He knows it is important to emphasize that there is nothing wrong with people getting colonoscopies at an earlier age. He knows that if he can help just one individual get a checkup sooner, he will feel like his battle was worth it.

Eddie has many people to thank for their support; most importantly, his family: his wife, Diana; and four children, Eddie, Nick, Zandra, and Tom; the entire Blackhawk organization, especially John McDonough and Jay Blunk; his broadcasting partner, Pat Foley.

To Eddie and to all fighting cancer, stay strong and know that we are with you.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a great American, a messenger for our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and arguably the finest man North Carolina has ever produced: the Reverend Billy Graham.

William Franklin Graham, Jr., was born in 1919 in Charlotte, North Carolina, where he grew up the son of a farmer. In 1939, he was ordained as a minister; thus, beginning what would be his life's calling.

It was in 1949 that Reverend Graham gained the international prominence he is known for today. It was that year that he hosted his Los Angeles Crusade. Originally scheduled to last only 3 weeks, it ended up continuing for over 2 months. Throughout that time, huge crowds came to hear Reverend Graham spread the gospel of Christ.

In the years following the Los Angeles Crusade, Reverend Graham's stature only grew. He traveled across the United States and around the world to spread the good word and encourage his fellow men and women to find salvation with Christ and in Christ. He would fill everything from small churches to massive football stadiums.

According to the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, Reverend Graham preached to over 215 million people in over 185 countries and territories around the world during his life. But his influence did not stop there.

Throughout his ministry, Reverend Graham became known as America's Pastor, serving as a moral compass for our Nation. He served as a spiritual adviser to countless American and international political leaders and civic leaders, including every American President since Harry Truman.

In the 1950s and 1960s, he joined with Martin Luther King, Jr., for integrated crusades, a powerful statement from a White southerner at that time. He delivered invocations at the inaugurations of four American Presidents. In 1983, he was awarded our Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, by President Ronald Reagan.

Following the horrific attacks on our Nation on September 11, 2001, it was Reverend Graham who comforted our Nation from the pulpit of Washington's National Cathedral.

While best known for his work as America's Pastor, there is much more to Reverend Graham. Foremost among those was his marriage to his beloved wife, Ruth. Reverend Graham and Ruth met at Illinois' Wheaton College, but it was Ruth's hometown of Montreat, a small town in western North Carolina's Swannanoa Valley, which I am honored to represent in North Carolina, that they chose to call home. It is a small town, a humble town.

It was at the Gaither Chapel on the campus of Montreat College where Reverend Graham and Ruth were married in 1943. From there, the Grahams

built a home on Montreat's Little Piney Ridge. It was at that home that the Grahams raised their five children: Virginia, Anne, Ruth, Franklin, and Nelson. Certainly, Reverend Graham's public works were extraordinary, but what he and Ruth built as a family is enduring, indeed.

While an international icon for his work spreading the gospel of Christ, Reverend Graham and his family were simply great neighbors to the American people of Montreat and the nearby town of Black Mountain. According to a story in the Black Mountain News, Reverend Graham was known to occasionally attend services at Swannanoa's First Baptist Church, play golf at the Black Mountain Golf Course, and grab lunch at the Coach House restaurant in town.

One of the finest moments of my career was having the opportunity to serve as Reverend Graham's Representative in Washington when his home in Montreat was placed in the 10th District. It was then that I had the honor of traveling up Little Piney Ridge to visit Reverend Graham in his home. The personal kindness and hospitality he showed in inviting me into his home is something that I will never forget.

I extend my deepest condolences to each of Reverend Graham's five children, to all their grandchildren and great-grandchildren who have lost a mentor and a friend. As a nation, we are forever indebted to Reverend Graham for his years of service to our State, our Nation, and to this world. It is only befitting that tomorrow Reverend Graham will return here to Washington one final time to lie in honor in the rotunda of this great building.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by noting that Reverend Graham has passed on from this world, but he has moved into the kingdom he preached about for so many years. He has rejoined his beloved wife, Ruth, and has finally been called home to our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ following a life well lived.

#### VOTING ON IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, when we left Washington before the Presidents Day recess, we watched our colleagues in the Senate vote on a series of bills to address immigration. Only one bill received 60 votes, but it was 60 votes against the bill offered by Senator GRASSLEY, the bill that most closely matches the President's hatred for immigrants.

So a supermajority in the Senate opposes the President's plan for massive cuts to legal immigration and massive deportations.

□ 1015

Then, yesterday, President Trump's campaign against immigrants received another blow. The Supreme Court declined to take a case from California

and declined to lift an injunction requiring the Department of Homeland Security to continue to process renewals for the DACA program, which means that those who signed up for DACA over the past 5 years can renew their DACA now, and the arbitrary deadline the President set for kicking 1,000 people per day out of the program beginning next Monday has, like so much of what Trump does, been stopped for now.

Just take a moment to appreciate what happened. The Attorney General and the President, without offering any evidence, told the American people that they had to end the DACA program because it was illegal and the courts would strike it down, they said.

As it turns out, the truth is almost the exact opposite of what the President and the Attorney General have told the country. No court has ever found DACA illegal or even legally suspect. Their actions to kill the DACA program have been found highly questionable by the courts.

But let me be clear, Mr. Speaker, just because the courts have taken no action and the Senate failed to take action does not mean that the House and Republicans are off the hook for DACA. The President still plans to kill DACA and make hundreds of thousands of immigrants, who are currently documented and known to our government, into undocumented immigrants forced underground—vulnerable, exploitable, and deportable.

The House has an opportunity—indeed, a responsibility—to step up to the occasion and craft a permanent solution. The good news is that the solution is supported by 8 out of 10 voters in the United States: a pathway to citizenship.

Can we, as a body, rise to the occasion to do something Americans want us to do? Can we set aside questions of who wins and who loses politically long enough to do what is right? We won't know unless we try.

Many on the other side say there should be only one option: leave or be deported, but that is not what we do to American children. And let's be clear, these are American children. We do not force American children to live in exile for 10, 20, 30 years. We do not educate and acculturate our youth and then force them out of the country.

If you are an American patriot, the last thing you want is for the world to see us deporting our own Americans. Just ask your donors, the Koch brothers, who know that saving the Dreamers is what they call something demanded as patriots.

So, Mr. Speaker, the ball is in our court. We need to take action now. If we can draft a compromise to protect Dreamers and allow them to live in their home country, America, if both sides concede something to the other, we may get to a solution. That is what leaders must do. A compromise will likely be painful for all. We need to show the country that we are willing to

take the heat and that we are ready to legislate.

The President set us on this course. He pulled the legal rug from underneath the Dreamers and then cloaked his position on immigration in an ethnocentric, pro-European, pro-White agenda that will hurt America.

But the racists—and we must call them out for what they are—the racists who are driving immigration policy in the White House are defining the agenda for every House Republican and are shaping the brand of the Republican Party not just as the party opposed to illegal immigration, but, now, as the party opposed to legal immigration; not just as the party who doesn't want poor or Latin American immigrants, but doesn't want Brown or Black or anyone who isn't White in this country. If that is how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle define themselves and want to be remembered, then they should do nothing.

But I have a greater faith in this institution and in the ability of this Congress to rise above racism and to do something the American people want us to do without regard to race, religion, or national origin. I am a Democrat who will work with Republicans if Republicans are serious about reaching a solution, but it must start with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying: "Yes, we want to solve the problem, and we want to rise above the racism emanating from the White House today."

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

#### ATTACK AT MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on Valentine's Day was an incomprehensible act of violence.

I visited the school on Friday, an experience that was both moving and sobering. I walked through the horrifying events that took place there, and I witnessed the outpouring of love and support from so many who have deposited flowers, candles, and left beautiful messages in memory of the victims.

Upon reflecting on that visit and after meeting with the brave student and teacher survivors Sunday in south Florida and yesterday here in Washington, I believe the best way for elected officials to honor the fallen and their families is by taking meaningful action to prevent these tragedies in the future.

That means working to make sure law enforcement agencies have the resources to assess threats and intervene before it is too late. It means investing in mental health, reevaluating school security with measures like the bipolar

tisan STOP School Violence Act, and securing stronger regulations on guns.

Mr. Speaker, the voices and engagement of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas survivors calling for change to our gun safety laws will be decisive. We, as a society, must work together to address loopholes and vulnerabilities in existing law while still protecting Americans' Second Amendment rights.

From strengthening the NICS system to banning bump stocks and preventing those with links to terrorist organizations from acquiring firearms, to raising the age for the purchase of long guns to 21, with exceptions for those in our military and law enforcement, there are commonsense solutions that will not prevent every tragedy but can certainly prevent some and mitigate others.

It won't be easy, but we must make progress on all these fronts. As a father and a husband, I will not accept that, in the greatest country in the world, the loss of innocent life becomes commonplace.

I am calling on congressional leaders in both Chambers and in both parties to work together and allow Congress to craft, consider, and debate legislation that protects the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens while making all Americans safer. We have to do better, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to working with all my colleagues to honor the 17 innocent lives lost in Parkland.

#### HONORING MY GOOD FRIEND, DEPUTY CHIEF REPORTER ED JOHNSON, FOR HIS SERVICE TO THIS INSTITUTION

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and to give thanks to a very good friend of mine, our Deputy Chief Reporter of the House of Representatives, Ed Johnson, whose last day for us is this Friday before he returns to our home State of Wisconsin.

Ed began his official court reporting career back in Wisconsin in 1980, hooking up with a judge. He eventually made his way here to the House of Representatives in 2007 and, ultimately, became Deputy Chief Reporter in 2015.

Ed took his role as our guardian of the public record very seriously: with great integrity, with great professionalism, and with great respect from everyone who had a chance to work with him.

And what do these Official Reporters do for us? Like today, this young lady here to my left brings her stenograph machine down to the well of the House or to a committee that they might be assigned, and they record everything that is said. With a single stroke of the key, they are able to record whole words, phrases, sometimes whole sentences if they know what is being said, sometimes when Members are speaking over each other. It is an incredibly difficult talent that they have to learn,

and they all do it so very, very well for us.

Now, some of Ed's highlights during his career here: He was able to report President Obama's State of the Union Address in 2015 by sitting here at the dais.

And listen to this: He served as "Mr. February" in the "2013 Men of Court Reporting" calendar, which is probably appropriate, given Ed's legendary sense of humor. He has also been known to do some standup comedy.

Having spent time with my good friend, Ed, here in Washington, I have a feeling that he is going to miss a lot of the aspects that he has been privy to Capitol Hill, given his appreciation for our history, politics, policy, the personalities of this place, and we will certainly be missing him.

So I want to wish him and his wife, Liz, and their two dogs, Bucky and Angus—I mean, what could be more Wisconsin than that—as they return home to our home State of Wisconsin where they will be a little bit closer to their families.

I want to thank Ed for his service to this institution, but also to our country and the distinguished career that he had here in Washington.

I wish him and Liz all the best as they return home to Wisconsin where Tawni and I look forward to continuing our friendship.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF AUDREY TUCKER

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Audrey Tucker of Upper Makefield in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. A committed public servant, Audrey, the CEO of the Family Service Association of Bucks County, passed away at 73 last week.

Joining Family Service as a social worker in 1978 and rising to become the organization's CEO in 1987, Audrey served as the face of Family Service for four decades. Audrey was a visionary leader credited with growing the organization into an entity that offered mental health services, helped the homeless, offered drug and alcohol treatment, and helped local families.

Her friends and colleagues of Family Service said it best: "Family Service has suffered a huge loss. Audrey was the heart and face of Family Service for four decades. But she built a strong team that will continue to carry out her vision of a community where anyone can achieve his or her full potential."

Our community will feel Audrey's loss tremendously, but it is clear to all that we are a better community for having had her in our community, and her important work will continue.

#### RECOGNIZING BUCKS COUNTY GIRLSTEM CONFERENCE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Bucks County GirlSTEM Conference.

The 2017 conference was attended by over 800 girls in grades 6 through 10 and focused on inspiring young women in our region to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and math.

The 2018 conference, scheduled for this May, is expected to be even larger. Attendees learn from professional women working in STEM fields, including agriculture, banking, physics, nursing, marine biology, real estate, engineering, app design, and more.

And the impact of this program is already clear in our community. As a result of attending GirlSTEM 2017, 95 percent of girls said they felt more motivated to do well in school; 96 percent felt more engaged in their own learning; and 93 percent said GirlSTEM helped them plan ahead, make career choices, and feel optimistic about their future.

As our economy continues to evolve, I commend projects like Bucks County GirlSTEM Conference for the important work they play in educating and exciting the next generation of female leaders. These young women are the future leaders of our Nation.

#### REPUBLICAN TAX SCAM CUTS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, Republican tax scam tax cuts really are only going to benefit giant corporations and the wealthy few, and what working people will ever glean from this is minimal in scope and really is just sort of a pittance in order to allow people who have more wealth than they can possibly even count to just get more.

This tax cut, this massive tax cut, would wipe away healthcare coverage for millions of workers, give multinational corporations and foreign investors a giant payday, and it paves the way for more cruel cuts, cutting programs that will benefit Americans.

It is a moral abomination. It is wrong. It is giving more to those who already have too much and taking from those who already are struggling to make ends meet. But, sadly, it is just another example of how Republicans and their billionaire buddies are in it for themselves and not the American people.

I would like to talk about another important example, because you have to look at what is going on in our Supreme Court together with these tax cuts and other programs to understand how much damage Republican leadership means to the American people.

Yesterday, the Supreme Court heard a case. It was Janus v. AFSCME. Janus, as the case is called, is yet another attack on the right to organize your workplace and negotiate for better wages and benefits and safer workplaces.

Over the last several decades, big companies and their conservative allies in Congress have attacked the right to collectively bargain.

□ 1030

The attacks on workers have led to stagnating wages for workers and greater income inequality. This case is no different. It is being bankrolled by the usual suspects: the Koch brothers and their billionaire allies.

Janus will determine whether public sector unions that represent teachers, firefighters, police officers, and nurses in States and cities across this country can collect fees from all of the employees in the workplaces that they represent.

This case is about whether millions of hardworking public sector workers will have the freedom and the resources to stand together and fight for a better future for themselves and their families. But it is also about the corrosive power of money in politics. It is about the millions of dollars wealthy donors spent to hold a Supreme Court seat open for over a year; the millions more that were spent to elect President Trump so that he could fill that seat with Neil Gorsuch; and the millions of dollars that the Koch brothers and the Bradley Foundation, two organizations devoted to cutting government services for Americans and weakening unions, spent to fund the Janus case.

And today, now that the bought-and-paid-for court has heard the case that will deliver a blow—we hope it doesn't, but likely it will—to the public service workers and the unions that represent them, their investment appears to be paying off.

Here is the thing: millionaires and billionaires who fund these antiworker and antiunion attacks are petrified about the labor movement. They are absolutely afraid of it. That is why they have been working to attack it.

That is because the labor movement is premised on the simple idea that, when workers come together, they can fight for their fair share of the wealth that they helped to create and because the labor movement is about equality and a fair economy that works for everyone, not just a few.

That is why wealthy donors have worked to eliminate and cut union representation; that is why they engage in union busting; that is why they funded the Janus case; and that is why they continue to keep kicking working people in the teeth over and over again.

This Republican tax scam is only part of the restructuring of American democracy where we take from working Americans, give to the wealthiest, and then try to deprive through the courts people's right to organize collectively on their job.

But hardworking Americans are standing up, hardworking Americans are banning together, and hardworking Americans are not going to allow a prosperous life for themselves and their families to be taken away so easily.

This Janus case is something that I urge everybody to look into. It represents another attack on the American working class, but the American

working people are standing up stronger than ever and will come back stronger than ever.

#### PORT WIDENING AND DEEPENING

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Trump on including \$13 million for widening and deepening the project at the Port of Corpus Christi in its fiscal year 2019 budget. Widening and deepening the port is critical not only to the local economy in Corpus Christi, but to the entire Nation.

While getting the funding in the President's budget is a huge victory, it is still just an early step in a lengthy process. Congress still needs to approve and appropriate the funds for this project over multiple years.

I encourage my colleagues in the House and Senate to support this appropriation and grow the Port of Corpus Christi and our Nation's energy sector.

Corpus Christi is the Nation's largest port for energy exports, shipping out crude oil, petroleum products, and LNG. Widening the ship channel will allow for two-way barge traffic, and deepening it to 54 feet will allow for larger ships to enter and exit the port, creating more economic growth and good jobs for American workers.

This project has been one of my top priorities since coming to Congress in 2010 and will continue to be a priority as long as I am here.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in supporting this widening and deepening project.

#### CELEBRATING 100TH BIRTHDAY OF JOHN MCCAIN

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I suspect we all know Senator JOHN MCCAIN, but we should also know World War II veteran John McCain from Wharton, Texas, who just turned 100 years old.

Mr. McCain was born in Texas on February 15, 1918. When he was just 7 years old, he joined the workforce going door to door with his Shetland pony circulating fliers for local businesses. In the years leading up to World War II, he traveled to Los Angeles to learn to be a diesel mechanic and then promptly enlisted in the Texas National Guard, 36th Tank Company, as a diesel mechanic. On January 16, 1941, he was deployed to Fort Benning.

Following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, McCain was deployed to Hawaii. After we defeated the Japanese Navy at the Battle of Midway, McCain's unit was moved to Fort Chaffee before being deployed to Europe, where he and his unit swept through southern Germany and eventually met the Russian Army in Czechoslovakia in 1945.

After the war, McCain worked for a natural gas pipeline company in Liberty, Texas, for 35 years. After retiring, he moved back to his hometown of

Wharton. During his retirement, he has traveled by RV to all 48 continental States and nine provinces in Canada. He has also traveled the world, visiting 42 countries. He often says: When you are 100 years old, you just go wherever the wind blows you.

Mr. McCain, thank you for your service to our country and to your community. I hope you had a great 100th birthday.

#### REMEMBERING JOE FULTON

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to remember the life of a great constituent and family friend, Joe Fulton, who passed away recently at the age of 83.

Joe not only lived in Corpus Christi, but he helped shape the city's skylines. His projects, as a general contractor, include the Art Museum of South Texas; Texas State Aquarium; the Bayfront Omni Hotel; Frost Bank Tower; the Nueces County Courthouse; the Hayden Head Terminal at the Corpus Christi International Airport; and Whataburger Field, home of the Corpus Christi Hooks, just to name a few. Fulton's work received national attention, when, in 1993, the Engineering News-Record named his company, Fulton Construction, one of the top contractors in the United States.

In addition to his work as a contractor, Joe was a member of the Port of Corpus Christi Commission from 1985 to 1998 and fought for the widening and deepening of the port. He served as chairman of the Port of Corpus Christi Commission from 1991 to 1996. He was also a board member of the Cullen/Frost Bank, trustee and chairman of the Driscoll Foundation, director of the Texas State Historical Association, chairman of the Greater Corpus Christi Business Alliance, and president of the Corpus Christi Tourist Bureau.

Joe's impact on our community will live on for a long time. We will miss you, Joe.

#### JANUS V. AFSCME AND THE IMPORTANCE OF UNIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I live in Broward County, Florida, where the Marjory Stoneman Douglas mass shooting tragedy took place nearly 2 weeks ago.

I am here to talk about our teachers and other public sector employees, but I want to take a moment to make sure that people within the sound of my voice understand what is at stake here. To hear the messages of these valiant students, in the memories of their friends whose lives were lost, their teachers whose lives were lost, and also on their own behalf as survivors. Their message is clear that we need to make sure that we are preventing weapons of war from being in the hands of civilians by banning assault-style rifles; by banning high-capacity magazines; and

by closing gun show loopholes, and every other loophole, that exist today on background checks so that we can make sure that we take concrete steps to prevent mass shootings from happening in this country, anywhere.

If anything else, their message is a diversion tactic, whether it is more investment in mental health or arming teachers. In particular, the idea that we should put more guns into a school environment is ludicrous to them. Their teachers already did everything they could to protect these children, and some of them lost their lives. That is unacceptable and something that we need to come together to prevent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, Congressman MAST, for taking a stand that was extremely difficult on banning assault weapons. I know that is not politically popular for me to do, but he deserves that credit, so I thank him.

The Janus v. AFSCME case is a case related to public sector unions. Simply put, teachers and other employees would be dealt a serious blow in terms of their ability to organize, organize on things like the conditions in a school and how we can keep them safe, all the way to wages and benefits.

Today, despite being more productive than ever, we have Americans who work longer hours for less money and fewer benefits. While working people continue to struggle, we have corporate CEOs, whether they are the CEOs of gun manufacturers or any other corporation, who continue to use their wealth to influence politicians and rig the economic rules to benefit the wealthy and the powerful at the expense of everyone else.

A major part of this effort is a decades-long attack on unions. Unions increase the bargaining power of workers by allowing them to negotiate collectively, together, rather than individually with employers. Imagine how a single or handful of employees would do if they were trying to negotiate with a major corporation for better benefits and wages on their own. When workers bargain collectively, employers have no choice but to work with them to pay them higher wages and offer more generous benefits and better working conditions, like school safety.

Big corporations and their overpaid CEOs don't like paying higher wages and offering generous benefits; so, as a result, they don't like unions. The latest battle in the corporate war on unions happened yesterday at the Supreme Court where the Justices heard the Janus v. AFSCME case.

This goes after public sector unions to continue the assault on all working people. It is a blatantly political and well-funded plot to use the highest court in the land to further turn the economic rules against the middle class.

When teachers, nurses, police officers, firefighters, and other public service workers are free to build strong unions, they win benefits like better

working conditions, wages, healthcare, and retirement security and safety that are given not just to union members, but to everyone in the workplace covered by the contract.

I saw this firsthand, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Graduate Assistants United union when I was in graduate school and I attended the University of Florida. Graduate assistants are the lowest rung on the ladder at colleges and universities, but are a linchpin to the success of educating college students. Having a union to fight for our wages was a key to being treated fairly by our university.

Public sector unions have also played a vital role in providing economic opportunity for women and people of color. Given that all workers covered by a contract gain the benefits of union negotiations, it has been standard practice that all workers governed by the contract contribute their fair share to the cost of organizing, through union dues paid by union members and fair share fees by workers who choose not to join the union. Fair share fees don't pay for any political activities, just the collective bargaining activities that directly benefit everyone.

We need to make sure that we continue to stand up for workers and for the middle class. I am hopeful that the Supreme Court will not side with the plaintiffs in this case.

#### RECOGNIZING THE WEISS SCHOOL

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Weiss School, a K-8th grade school in Florida, whose students designed the WeissSat-1 satellite selected by NASA to be launched into space.

I have had the opportunity to meet a number of these incredible students. They devote themselves fully to the pursuit of knowledge. Some of them remarked to me that the worst part about school was that they had to leave at the end of the day and they wished that there were apartments there. I think that speaks to the incredible high quality of their teachers and the faculty in that institution of learning.

The WeissSat-1 was selected for its outstanding design and scientific importance, as part of NASA's CubeSat Launch Initiative, an excellent program that, unfortunately, has a very uncertain future. The CubeSat Launch Initiative was established in 2008 as a mutually beneficial program to spur innovation in the STEM community and simultaneously advance NASA missions.

Since its inception, NASA has selected 149 CubeSats, built by 85 organizations across 38 States, and they have launched 58 of these CubeSats to date, all of them at a fraction of the cost of developing satellites in-house.

NASA's Office of Education is currently being restructured and the fu-

ture of the CubeSat program is in jeopardy.

□ 1045

Students and teachers from the Weiss School are in the House gallery today to witness the introduction of a resolution that they themselves helped to write.

The WeissSat-I resolution that I will introduce today with bipartisan support from my Florida colleagues will raise awareness of the CubeSat Launch Initiative and encourage continuance of the program as NASA reorganizes their Office of Education.

I would like to thank the students of the Weiss School for their dedication, their faculty, their teachers for their work in helping their students to reach the highest and fullest potential that any students could reach.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that it is not in order to refer to or introduce occupants in the gallery.

#### KEEP YOUR WORD, MR. PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 1 minute.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a liberated Democrat with one request: I ask that the most powerful man in the world, the President of the United States of America, keep his word.

Keep your word, Mr. President. You have indicated that no one under the age of 21 should be able to buy an assault-type weapon.

Keep your word, Mr. President. Don't allow the NRA to veto your word. You are the most powerful man in the world.

Keep your word, Mr. President. Stay with those young people who have issued a clarion call to this country to do something about the killing that is taking place on our school campuses. These are children who are dying.

Keep your word, Mr. President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### PROVIDING SAFE AND NUTRITIOUS FOOD TO THOSE IN NEED

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of addressing more than 1,200 advocates who were in Washington this week for the National Anti-Hunger Policy Conference.

As chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition, I am grateful for the work these groups do to alleviate hunger and ensure that people have access to nutritious food.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and other Federal nutri-

tion programs are vital to ensuring that all Americans have healthy foods within reach, whether low-income populations, the elderly, or those living in areas with strained access to nutritious food.

SNAP, as well as the USDA's commodity distribution programs, support agriculture and lessen the effects of poverty on our most vulnerable citizens.

In advance of the next farm bill, we will continue to identify ways to work alongside State and local organizations to help provide safe and nutritious food for those who need it most.

Mr. Speaker, a healthy diet for many Americans may have nothing to do with commitment, but rather accessibility. Limited access to supermarkets and grocery stores with fresh, nutritious food can be a challenge in both rural and urban communities. These are called "food deserts."

This is a particular concern for SNAP, which intends to provide nutrition to millions of Americans.

According to the USDA, to qualify as a low-access community, at least 500 people, or at least 33 percent of the population, must reside more than 1 mile from a supermarket or a large grocery store. For rural areas, the distance is more than 10 miles.

It is difficult to eat healthy when the easiest store to get to primarily provides packaged and processed food. SNAP recipients may find a local market convenient, but it offers high-calorie foods with minimal nutrition value. These foods can often be a staple for families with limited resources.

It is my hope that we can redouble our efforts to increase access to fresh foods for communities throughout the country.

No one in America, Mr. Speaker, should go hungry, and everyone deserves a full shot at living a full, healthy, and productive life.

Through strong policy and the advocacy of our Nation's antihunger and antipoverty groups, we truly can work to end hunger once and for all.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1100

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 a.m.

#### PRAYER

Chaplain Robert Vick, American Legion National Chaplain, New Port Richey, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, we humbly ask Your blessings on our government and all our representatives gathered here today. We humbly ask Your blessing, Your wisdom, and protection for our country and for our flag, the symbol of our freedom and our home. Keep us always aware of the heritage which is ours and the freedom and opportunities we enjoy as Americans.

As we bow before You, may we pledge anew in our hearts and on our lips to preserve this country, its citizens, and our way of life. May we continue our commitment to You and to our fellow man. May we not take that small step from tolerance to tyranny in our deliberations.

May we keep foremost in our thoughts the welfare and the success of our great Nation and work together to solve our differences. May we emulate the great men and women of the past, who, through sacrifice, purchased our freedoms. Aid us to commit ourselves to preserving them.

I pray this prayer in the name of God, before whom every knee shall ultimately bow and every tongue confess that You are Lord and God.

Amen. And amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GIANFORTE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### WELCOMING CHAPLAIN ROBERT VICK

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a constituent, a true American hero. What an honor it is to introduce Chaplain Robert Vick, who currently serves as the American Legion National Chaplain.

Chaplain Vick lives in New Port Richey, Florida, with his wife of 62 years. She is present today as well. Together they have 4 sons, 10 grandchildren, and 16 great-grandchildren.

In addition to his commitment to his family, the chaplain has a great love for our country and a passion for service. A Korean war-era veteran of the U.S. Navy, Chaplain Vick has a distinguished record of service. He also has

been a proud Legionnaire since 1983. I am also proud to say that he is a family friend.

Saying that he feels called to use his ministerial training to serve the spiritual needs of other veterans and their families, Chaplain Vick was appointed National Chaplain of the 2 million-member American Legion last year.

Even as the U.S. Capitol prepares in honoring another humble servant of God tomorrow, the Reverend Billy Graham, I am proud that Chaplain Vick offered this morning's prayer in the U.S. House.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

#### CUTTING TAPE FOR RECREATIONAL RODEO COMPETITORS

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight another example of Federal overreach that threatens our Montana and Western way of life. Unclear Federal regulations could force millions of Americans who recreationally compete in rodeos or participate in other equestrian events to get a commercial driver's license. But these are not folks competing for their livelihoods. In a recent story in the Billings Gazette, Andy Bolich, the head coach for the Montana State University rodeo team, said: "For the most part, around Montana, I would say rodeo is a hobby for most people."

Yet Federal regulations could force these rodeo participants to wade through unnecessary, costly red tape for their hobby. That is why I recently led a letter which a bipartisan group of 26 colleagues signed, to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. We urged the Department of Transportation to clarify how the CDL regulations treat those who participate recreationally in rodeo events.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue reforming, rolling back, and repealing unnecessary regulations to protect our Montana and Western way of life.

#### SUPPORTING SNAP

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today is the Anti-Hunger Day of Action, and I rise to support the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, which helps feed 40 million Americans.

We live in the richest country in the world, yet many Americans struggle to

get nutritious food to feed their families, including 1 out of 5 American children. President Trump's budget would worsen the problem by cutting SNAP by \$213 billion over 10 years. The President's proposal would also replace families' flexible monthly SNAP benefits with food boxes that contain no fresh produce. It basically puts people on rations.

So I ask my Republican colleagues: Did you really come to Congress to take food out of the mouths of hungry people, hungry children? Who are you?

Ending hunger in America is not a matter of resources; it is a matter of political will. We must invest in our nutrition programs to make sure that no one's plate goes empty in America.

#### AMERICAN LEGION STORMS THE HILL

(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, the American Legion convenes in Washington this week for its annual policy conference to meet with Federal lawmakers.

The American Legion was chartered and incorporated by Congress in 1919 as a patriotic veterans organization devoted to mutual helpfulness. It is the Nation's largest wartime veterans service organization, committed to mentoring youth and sponsorship of wholesome programs in our communities, advocating patriotism and honor, promoting strong national security, and continued devotion to servicemembers and veterans.

Hundreds of local American Legion programs and activities strengthen the Nation one community at a time. Whether it is connecting veterans through sporting programs, honoring fallen heroes through Legion Riders or advocating for homeless veterans, the American Legion plays a priceless role in creating a sense of community among veterans of all ages and service periods.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the American Legion. The Legionnaires have a tremendous sense of obligation to their community, their State, and their Nation. They advocate honestly for veterans in Washington, and I look forward to meeting with my local Legionnaires later today.

#### INTRODUCING THE GATEWAY AT BUFFALO

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we unveiled plans for a new, state-of-the-art land port of entry at the Peace Bridge in Buffalo, New York.

Deploying the most advanced detection technology, the Gateway at Buffalo will improve national security and



public safety. It will cut wait times for both passenger and commercial vehicles in half. It will greatly improve air quality in the neighboring community. It will improve aesthetics with new L.E.D. lighting, landscaping, and public art.

This plan will improve our region's growing economic relationship with Canada, leveraging \$30 billion in commerce and over \$200 billion in economic activity, supporting over 1 million jobs. This plan is long overdue. It is a plan that our community deserves and a gateway that is worthy of the promise and potential of our future in Buffalo and western New York and our relationship economically and otherwise with the great country of Canada.

#### GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the wake of yet another mass shooting in this country to ask the House of Representatives to summon the courage to actually do something to prevent the next terrible tragedy.

Last evening we held a moment of silence on this floor, and what I fear is that, again, that moment of silence will be followed by days of silence by this House, by weeks of silence by this House, by months of silence by this House on the very question of gun violence in this country.

There are things we can do to move past the typical partisan response: the legislation that I and three others crafted, bipartisan legislation, to regulate these terrible bump stocks that could have prevented the tragedy in Las Vegas from being as bad as it was.

Other things we can do that we agree on: closing the background check loophole, making sure that if you are too dangerous to fly on an airplane, you can't buy a weapon.

These are the things that Congress ought to take up and that the American people have every right to expect us to act upon.

Let's do something.

#### REPEAL THE 2001 AUMF

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask Speaker RYAN for a debate and a vote on our endless wars. It has been 16 years since Congress first passed the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force. At that time, of course, I knew then it was going to be a blank check to encompass conflicts all around the globe, and I couldn't vote for it.

It has been used for operations in Niger, Syria, Libya, Somalia, and many other countries. It has been used to justify the war against ISIS, which did not exist, of course, when this AUMF was first written.

Simply put, the 2001 AUMF has become a blank check for any President to wage war, anytime, anywhere, anyplace, without the consent of Congress. In 2016, the Congressional Research Service documented 37 times it had been used in an unclassified report. Now, in 2018, it has increased to 41 times.

The Constitution is clear: Congress, not the White House, is tasked with the solemn responsibility to declare war.

We have turned a blind eye to these conflicts. They have spiraled out of control. Today a bipartisan group of Members, the Progressive Caucus and the House Freedom Caucus, will be hosting an ad hoc hearing to demand a debate and vote on these ongoing wars.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. We need to repeal the 2001 AUMF and, yes, give at least 8 months while the current one is in place to debate and vote on a new AUMF.

#### GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, how many people must die for Congress to act and address the severe epidemic of gun violence in America?

We were devastated by the massacres in Newtown; Las Vegas; Orlando; and most recently in Parkland, Florida. On the Hill today are the courageous students from the Parkland high school, Marjory Stoneman Douglas. They came to Washington with one message: for Congress to take action now on gun violence.

Action doesn't mean holding moments of silence. Action doesn't mean tweeting thoughts and prayers. Action means passing meaningful legislation, like the overwhelming majority of Americans are pleading with us to do.

We should start by banning weapons of war, like the AR-15 and high-capacity magazines. We should allow the CDC to once again research the causes of gun violence that can better protect our communities. And we should also act to pass legislation to require universal background checks.

Yesterday, Democrats filed a motion to force a vote on universal background checks. Not a single Republican has signed on to the motion. I implore my Republican colleagues to sign up to call for action because inaction means that more people will die and more families will grieve and our students will continue to feel unsafe.

#### HONORING BILLY GRAHAM

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to rise to honor the life of America's pastor. Last week we

mourned the loss of Reverend Billy Graham, who passed away at the age of 99 in his beloved home of North Carolina.

As one of the most influential pastors of the 20th century, Reverend Graham traveled the world to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ to millions of people. In fact, he preached to more people than anyone who has ever lived.

As a young man, I have very fond memories of my family all coming together to sit in front of the television to watch Reverend Graham's crusades. His message of God's love, mercy, forgiveness, and justice deeply influenced not only me but also many in our Nation's history. In today's day and age, we desperately need another Billy Graham to give hope to a deceived, confused, and hopeless populace.

Reverend Graham preached the truth. He lived it. And we know that the truth will set us free. But more importantly, Billy Graham has heard the words from the Savior of the world: Well done, my good and faithful servant.

Billy Graham will be sorely missed, but his memory will live on in the hearts and minds of those millions of people he helped. And as Billy Graham would say, all glory be to God.

□ 1115

#### NATIONAL ANTI-HUNGER WEEK

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this is National Anti-Hunger Week. The United States is the richest nation on Earth. We are a land of abundance. And yet millions of people in our country go to bed hungry every single night.

They are called food insecure, but what it is is that they are hungry, and programs like the food stamp program, the SNAP program, have enjoyed bipartisan support for decades because great leaders, people like George McGovern, Bob Dole, Ted Kennedy, Jack Kennedy, and people like Jake Javits, said that we have a moral obligation to combat hunger in the United States.

What we need to do is to strengthen the SNAP program, not sabotage it. This administration's new proposals to implement strict work requirements are a thinly veiled attempt to throw people off of the program.

The vast majority of SNAP recipients already work if they can. USDA's most recent data shows that work rates have been increasing year after year.

The food box proposal is an attack on the dignity of the families that have fallen on hard times. Undermining SNAP will not eradicate hunger. It throws many Americans into deep poverty and desperation at times when they need support the most.

Food insecurity affects veterans, working families, children, workers,



the unemployed, and seniors. It is about lifting people out of poverty. It is about supporting our economy. It works for households with children.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY TO  
THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 1, 2018.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY,  
MARCH 1, 2018, TO MONDAY,  
MARCH 5, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, March 1, 2018, it adjourn to meet on Monday, March 5, 2018, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 1865, ALLOW STATES  
AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE  
SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 748 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 748

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those

printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 748, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit.

In addition to an amendment offered by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the rule makes in order amendments offered by Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee received testimony from numerous Members, including Mr. MARINO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and the legislation's sponsor, Mrs. WAGNER.

In addition to consideration at the Rules Committee, the legislation was marked up at the House Judiciary Committee last year.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of any crime more debased than when one person forces a fellow human being into sexual slavery.

Through many pieces of legislation that the House considered this year, we have been fighting to rid our communities of sex traffickers and the anguish they leave in their wake. Today, we have the opportunity to pass an important piece of legislation that will further this fight by ensuring that we hold websites that turn a profit by aiding sex traffickers accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the committee for its hard work on this legislation, but also, more, importantly, I would like to thank the legislation's author, Mrs. WAGNER, for her tireless efforts in championing this bill, which extends both compassion and justice to trafficking victims. As a result of her efforts, the legislation we consider today will empower law enforcement, State attorneys general, and, most importantly, victims to fight against the sex trade and its predators.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would give Federal, State, and local prosecutors the tools they need to hold websites and their operators accountable for supporting the sale of sex trafficking victims. Specifically, it would create a new Federal statute with increased penalties for promoting sex trafficking online and would amend section 230 of the Communications Decency Act to permit State authorities to prosecute operators of trafficking websites for criminal acts.

In consideration of this legislation, we must also reflect on why this legislation is necessary.

Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act was created to ensure that websites would not be considered the publishers of, and thereby held responsible for, the content that actually originated with a third party. The statute was never intended to shield websites that profit by creating a marketplace for sexual slavery, like Backpage.com, from facing the legal consequences of their criminal enterprises.

Nevertheless, some websites have successfully invoked the section 230 immunity provision despite engaging in actions that venture far outside the scope of those envisioned by the statute. The authors of the Communications Decency Act did not imagine that wicked men and women would turn vulnerable young people into sexual commodities and then say, "Let's protect those predators."

Mr. Speaker, no law condones such sexual exploitation, and no law should be manipulated to condone such abuse. With the addition of Mrs. WALTERS' amendment, this legislation strikes the important balance of preserving section 230 of the Communications Decency Act for law-abiding websites, while ensuring that bad actors can no longer hide behind a misused statute.

This legislation will ensure that our society continues to protect the innocent and punish those who seek to profit from their sexual enslavement.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, too often, our laws passed with the best of intentions fail to keep pace with technology, and that is what we are seeing today with the Communications Decency Act.

The bill was passed in 1996 as Congress' first attempt to regulate inappropriate material online. This law prevented hosts and visitors of a website from being treated as a publisher for legal purposes. It is what allowed classified websites like eBay to flourish while being legally protected from third-party content posted on their sites.

But 20 years is an eternity in the digital age, and bad actor websites have created platforms designed to facilitate illegalities like child prostitution and sex trafficking, and they use provisions in this law to shield them from any liability.

One of the most notorious examples is online advertiser Backpage.com. Since 2011, more than 20 civil action lawsuits have been brought against this site for willingly facilitating sex trafficking and the prostitution of minors. However, each time a legal action was brought against Backpage, Federal law shielded them from liability.

Last year, The Washington Post reported that a contractor for this site was soliciting and creating sex-related ads, despite Backpage's repeated insistence that they had no role in the content of their ads. Backpage used longstanding Federal protections under the Communications Decency Act to shield itself from all liability.

In the *Doe v. Backpage* ruling by the first circuit, the judges held that, even if Backpage had facilitated the crime of sex trafficking, this law shielded the company from the claims that were filed by the child victims. The first circuit recently reiterated that when it threw out yet another lawsuit against Backpage. The courts weren't able to help these victims, instead, encouraging them to pursue legislative changes, and that brings us here today.

H.R. 1865 finally creates a legislative solution to hold these bad actors accountable and allow the victims to seek the damages that they deserve. It creates a new offense in the Federal code for websites that facilitate this criminal activity and gives, to prosecutors, the tools they need to hold the wrongdoers accountable.

The bill is a product of a lot of great work, and I want to thank Congresswoman WAGNER for introducing it. The Rules Committee, last night, made in order an amendment from Congresswoman WALTERS that substantially strengthens the legislation and has Congresswoman WAGNER's full support. Its inclusion attached the text of bipartisan Senate language to drastically improve its implementation. This is language that has the support of both the tech industry and the victims advocacy groups.

Mr. Speaker, it is so nice to see Members of both parties from both sides of the Capitol come together on this. Through collaboration, we have crafted a bill that does more than just update a 20-year-old law. It fulfills our moral responsibility to protect the children that we represent.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the sponsor of this legislation and a tireless advocate for this issue.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I love this opportunity to testify on the rule for H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, or FOSTA. This legislation has been born, sadly, out of necessity, but has been truly a labor of love for me since I was first elected to Congress over 5 years ago. The bill is the result of meetings with trafficking survivors across the country who have been victimized by the online sex trade and unable to access either justice or relief in our court systems.

Today's consideration of the bill is an historic achievement, a long-awaited clarification from this Congress that the businesses that sell our children online can no longer do so with impunity. It is a clear statement that there are serious legal consequences for websites that actively profit from the exploitation of our most vulnerable. It is a wake-up call to America's judicial system, making clear that section 230 of the Communications Decency Act does not provide immunity to websites that are actively engaged in modern-day slavery.

□ 1130

FOSTA is a recommitment to Americans that Congress never intended to create a system that allows businesses to commit crimes online that they could not commit offline. It is in many ways just a simple statement of the obvious: Congress does not believe—and did not ever believe—that rape was a requisite of a free and open internet.

This bill is a promise to our State and local law enforcement and prosecutors. Congress is making it clear that we believe in and support their missions to protect our communities. Combined with the Walters amendment, which reinstates victim-centered provisions from my original bill last April, this legislation is now a guarantee of the fundamental rights of the most vulnerable members of our society. It is a message to the children and victims who have been robbed of their basic dignities that Congress hears them and is responding to the injustices that they all have faced.

It has not been an easy journey to get to this point, to find middle ground with the tech industry and the victims' advocates to incorporate the concerns

of prosecutors and the law enforcement community to move this bill through committee and to get both FOSTA and the SESTA Walters amendment to the floor today. So I am very grateful for the many, many people who joined my crusade to restore justice to the brave children, women, and men across our country who have been sold online.

I am grateful to Chairman GOODLATTE and his team for going the extra mile in helping us include a strong, new crime that will enable prosecutors to better target online trafficking and prostitution. I am grateful for the Energy and Commerce Committee and House leadership and their willingness to prioritize this issue.

I must give a big thank-you to Majority Leader MCCARTHY, our Whip SCALISE, and Speaker RYAN for leading the way in doing the right thing for America's children.

I am grateful for Senators PORTMAN and BLUMENTHAL and Senators CORNYN and MCCASKILL for carrying SESTA on their shoulders and advocating for a solution that allows victims to access the civil remedies that they deserve. I am grateful to each and every one of our 176 bipartisan cosponsors, many of whom personally stopped on the House floor to hear and express their concerns about victims of online sex trafficking. I especially want to mention Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY and Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY who fought the good fight on the other side of the aisle for what is truly a landmark, for a bipartisan piece of legislation that is going to save lives.

I am also so thankful for my dedicated staff who have poured their hearts, their minds, and their lives into this fight in more ways than the public will ever know.

FOSTA, combined with the Walters amendment, which is SESTA, will provide better civil justice for victims, more prosecutions of bad actor websites, more convictions, and more predators behind bars. Because of this package, fewer businesses will ever dare to enter the sex trade and fewer victims will be sold into modern-day sex slavery.

Last, but most importantly, I am in awe of and grateful for the contributions of the survivors in this fight to turn FOSTA and SESTA into law. It is heartbreaking to watch survivors struggle to piece their lives back together alone while our justice system shields the websites that sold them. That is why I introduced this bill, and that is why it must become law.

I expect this piece of legislation to sail through the Senate and make its way to the President's desk so that we can put those bad actor websites behind bars, deter others from entering this ecosystem, and make sure that there are rights and justice for our victims.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair and our colleagues because, when we vote today for FOSTA and the Walters amendment, our survivors will know

that they are not alone and justice will indeed no longer be out of reach.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Trump tweeted over the weekend: "Dems are no longer talking DACA."

Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ. Democrats are still urging our colleagues yet again to act by helping us bring up the Dream Act for a vote on the House floor.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help hundreds of thousands of young people who are American in every way except on paper. President Trump set the official deadline for DACA to expire on March 5, so we can't afford to waste any more time, and Dreamers should not be forced to live in fear any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), to discuss our proposal.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, ending DACA would be a nightmare for Dreamers. In fact, it would be a nightmare for businesses and a nightmare for America's economy.

You would think that that statement may have been said by the advocates for immigration rights or maybe by some of the faith-based groups that support immigration. But it wasn't. It was said by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Speaker, and that is so because DACA-eligible workers contribute \$1.4 billion in Federal taxes, \$2 billion in Social Security taxes, and \$470 million in Medicare every single year.

So this statement on its face we would think was made by folks who have traditionally supported immigration rights was made by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the one entity that is really concerned about economic growth, job creation, and the well-being of our economy.

Ranking Member NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ's report on the impact of DACA on small businesses found that deporting Dreamers will cost \$60 billion and reduce economic growth by \$280 billion, including \$460 billion in economic output over a decade. So this is the dramatic impact that not resolving DACA and not bringing help to the Dreamers will have on our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, when we look into the eyes of these Dreamers, we just can't say no to them. You can't say no to a young person full of aspirations, full of dreams, and still full of so much hope

for our Nation. Even under these very critical and challenging times for our Nation and the world, these Dreamers are full of aspirations.

So the question will be: Are we a nation of aspirations or a nation of deportation?

Nearly 8 in 10 voters support allowing Dreamers to remain permanently in our country. In red States and blue States, in Republican majority districts and Democratic districts, over 80 percent of Americans feel that these young people should stay in our Nation. Even three-quarters of Trump voters and only 14 percent believe that they should be forced out. Only 14 percent of our Nation feels that these young people should be kicked out, thrown out in the cold—only 14 percent. A very small minority of Americans believe that that should be what we do.

Ninety-one percent of DACA recipients younger than 25 are employed. They are no burden on our economy. Those who are over 25 years old have been employed at a rate of 93 percent. Ninety-three percent of DACA recipients over 25 years old are working residents of our Nation with an average earning of \$36,000.

Dreamers are students, teachers, healthcare workers, devoted members of our communities, members of our Armed Forces, and first responders. That is who Dreamers are. They are not a load on our country. As we saw in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey, it was a Dreamer who made food and volunteered to set up beds for thousands of Americans who were displaced. Jesus Contreras, a Dreamer and a paramedic, worked as a first responder for 6 days straight after the hurricane.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring the Dream Act to the floor and stand with our Nation's Dreamers.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, and the rule that brings this bill to the floor. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time. I want to also commend the gentleman from Missouri for introducing this very important legislation.

According to the Department of Justice, more than half of sex trafficking victims are 17 years old or younger. According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, there was an astounding 846 percent increase from 2010 to 2015 in reports of suspected child sex trafficking. They found this to be "directly correlated to the increased use of the internet to sell children for sex."

This is something I have been concerned about for a long time. Before I came to Congress, I was a criminal court judge for 7½ years trying felony

criminal cases. Far too many of those cases involved sexual abuse of minors. I was told my first day as a judge that well over 90 percent of defendants in felony cases came from father-absent households. Certainly family breakdown has been a major factor—maybe the major factor—in almost all serious crimes we have had through the years.

But certainly another problem is that we have addicted our children to the computers. Now, almost everyone is addicted to computers, iPads, iPods, and screens of all types. While some technology has been good, it has also in some ways been very harmful to many in our society.

In an article entitled "Have Smartphones Destroyed a Generation?" psychologist Jean M. Twenge wrote in the Atlantic magazine: "If you were going to give advice for a happy adolescence based on this survey, it would be straightforward: Put down the phone, turn off the laptop, and do something—anything—that does not involve a screen."

She wrote that too much time on the internet has caused teenagers to be more subject to mental problems of all types, even depression and suicide. While this advice pertains to teens, I think it really applies to everyone. Even most adults today would be healthier, both mentally and physically, if they spent less time staring at screens.

Today, technology has made many things easier, but, unfortunately, this includes the crime of child sex trafficking. This is very important legislation, very necessary at this time, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, many of my colleagues today, as well as I, discussed the need to protect America's children. This bill is a great piece of that, and I am very grateful to have it on the floor today. But there is more that we can do. It must include acting to curb the Nation's gun violence epidemic.

Every day in America, 91 people are killed by a gun. Since Sandy Hook, there have been close to 1,000 mass shootings. A mass shooting is one where three or more people have lost their lives. Imagine that, thousands of them. Our Nation is still mourning the loss of 17 lives just last week when a gunman using an AR-15-style rifle opened fire at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. That gun is a weapon of war and should only be in the hands of the military and never on the streets of the United States.

Assault weapons were the weapon of choice not just in the Florida shooting but also in the mass shootings at the concert in Las Vegas; the movie theater in Aurora, Colorado; and the elementary school in Sandy Hook, Connecticut.

They were prohibited under the assault weapons ban that Congress let expire in 2004. I was here when we established that ban, and we saw a great decrease in gun deaths from that. So they should be prohibited today and not in the hands of people who simply want to kill the most people they can in the shortest time.

Why would we allow an insanity like that?

So I was pleased to cosponsor legislation this week to re-implement the assault weapons ban.

□ 1145

The students of Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School are inspiring the entire Nation to push Congress to do our job and to act on gun violence.

I will tell you that I understand the pain that everybody feels from all of this, but we can't maintain it. We go from one to the other, as though nothing had ever happened before.

But we have to also do what the NRA has forbidden us from doing, which is to have gun research at the Communicable Disease Center. That certainly should be lifted, as well.

We certainly should expand and strengthen the background check system. Keeping people on the terrorist watch list and the no-fly list from being able to purchase firearms and explosives seems to me to be a no-brainer, but we won't even do that. And, yes, reinstating that weapons ban again, I think, is critically important.

Perhaps the voices of those injured and grieving children can break the gun lobby's stranglehold on Congress. I hope so. The majority should heed their call because we, as Members of Congress, are in a unique position. Unlike the clergy or grief counselors or elected officials, we can actually do something to combat this violence. It certainly is, Mr. Speaker, past time that we do.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am proud to support H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017.

This legislation will prevent websites like Backpage from hiding behind section 230 of the Communications Decency Act while simultaneously empowering law enforcement, State attorneys general, and victims to fight against the sex trade and its predators. I look forward to supporting this rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 748 OFFERED BY  
Ms. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative

Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 4296, OPERATIONAL RISK  
CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR  
BANKING ORGANIZATIONS, AND  
PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 4607, COMPREHENSIVE  
REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 747 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 747

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4296) to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of

Rules Committee Print 115-60, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2.

Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4607) to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-61, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Just 3 weeks ago, we hosted a small lender in my district office who was being hindered in his efforts to serve home buyers in eastern Colorado. Why? Washington, in its unyielding effort to regulate every decision of Americans, lumped this lender into a broader regulation that came out of the housing crisis 10 years ago. This isn't some theoretical exercise. These regulations have real impact on Coloradans.

The last time I was on the floor debating these issues, I discussed the affordable housing situation in Colorado. Without completely recounting that

debate, I want to reiterate the basic facts.

From 2009 to 2016, Colorado had a net increase of 600,000 people. In that same time, housing costs skyrocketed by more than 57 percent.

Since 2016, our growth has begun to fall off considerably. When The Denver Post researched why a State with a high quality of life and decades more growth potential had a dramatically slowing growth rate, they found that a substantial part of it had to do with rising housing costs.

We must reconsider our Washington-knows-best regulatory approach. We here in Washington can't possibly know what is the best for a potential home buyer in Trinidad or Las Animas or Fort Morgan or Greeley or Castle Rock, Colorado.

I, for one, am tired of the arrogance of Washington telling us in eastern Colorado which banks we can and can't use to finance our mortgages. It is time that we bring financial accountability to the place that needs it most: Washington.

That is what these two financial bills do. They return power to the American people. They reduce unnecessary regulations on small community banks and credit unions, thereby freeing up capital that small businesses and employers can access to create new jobs. They make commonsense changes to Federal laws so that regulators have to routinely review their regulations to ensure that the regulations are not overly burdensome.

Eastern Coloradans are frustrated with the Washington-knows-best mindset of their government, and I am listening to them.

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

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which provides for the consideration of two bills from the House Financial Services Committee—H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, and H.R. 4296, legislation to undercut operational risk capital requirements—under a completely closed process.

These are the 66th and 67th closed rules of this Congress, Mr. Speaker. I am deeply concerned with the Republican leadership's total lack of consideration for regular order.

For all intents and purposes, regular order is dead in this Congress. We consider one closed rule after another after another after another, and Republicans routinely rush bills to the floor without even holding hearings on the underlying legislation to help Members better understand the impacts of these bills and to benefit from expert witnesses.

What is especially shameful about the process today, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that there were amendments submitted, but Republicans decided to self-execute these nongermane amendments with no debate or discussion on the House floor and to shut down the ability of Members to offer additional amendments. This is just bad legislating, plain and simple.

I hope that if November turns out the way I hope it does and we have a change in leadership in Congress, when Democrats are in charge, we run this place like professionals, like adults, where we respect all points of view, where we go back to regular order, when we say we are going to go back to regular order, we mean it.

Why are we doing all of this, Mr. Speaker? What is possibly so urgent that we have to throw regular order out the window?

Today, we are considering another two pieces of deregulatory legislation that will benefit big banks at the expense of financial stability to our economy and consumer protections that help everyday families.

H.R. 4607 would create a lopsided approach to implementing regulations that force agencies to consider the cost of regulations on bankers without considering the benefit to consumers. H.R. 4296 would undermine the ability of regulators to establish operational risk capital requirements to protect our economy from another crisis.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. Our constituents expect Congress to put them first, not the big banks, especially the big banks that wrecked our economy and endangered the life savings of millions of families. We owe it to them to bring to the floor legislation that will help their lives and make our country better. But, sadly, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has failed to act on meaningful legislation that will do anything like that.

Mr. Speaker, today marks nearly 2 weeks since 17 people, including 14 students, were gunned down at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. This was one of the worst shootings our country has ever seen. It was the eighth school shooting this year, and it is only February.

Yet Republicans in Congress have not lifted a finger to take up bipartisan gun reform legislation that would help to prevent shootings like these and protect our kids. Instead, we are here considering a bill that will only help the already rich and powerful.

This is shameful. It is absolutely shameful, Mr. Speaker.

According to the Gun Violence Archive, a nonprofit that monitors gun violence, since 2014, there have been over 1,360 mass shootings in America. In 2018 alone, less than 2 months, there have been over 400 teens aged 12 through 17 and 90 children under the age of 11 killed or injured by guns.

Yet the majority in this House even refuses to bring to the floor legislation banning bump stocks, a reform agreed

upon by both sides of the aisle, I thought. The NRA has even said that “devices designed to allow semiautomatic rifles to function like fully automatic rifles should be subject to additional regulations.” I don’t know if they meant it, but they said it.

President Trump: “I will be strongly pushing comprehensive background checks with an emphasis on mental health. Raise age to 21 and end sale of bump stocks. Congress is in a mood to finally do something on this issue—I hope.”

Now, it is true that we have a President who is so erratic that he changes his mind from one hour to the next, but so far, I haven’t seen a retraction tweet. So I have every reason to believe he is still standing by his commitment to supporting these modest gun safety reforms.

Yet here we are, just days after this horrific mass shooting, and not one single gun reform or gun safety bill is being voted on or even scheduled for a vote. I am furious that, in the face of such tragedy and such senseless violence, this Congress continues to do nothing—not a thing—to protect our kids and our families and our communities.

Students from Amherst Regional Middle School in my district in Massachusetts sent me a letter last week that every Republican in Congress should read.

They write: “Seventeen innocent people lost their lives. . . . That scares us. It scares us that kids have to go to school wondering if they are next. That we even have to think that the next time we see some of our classmates or teachers may be in their open caskets. And what scares us most of all, is that our government fails to do anything to change this.”

They continue: “They are gone because our country doesn’t care enough to have better gun control, and we will not stop fighting until they get their justice. . . . We’re writing this letter because we want to personally ask each and every one of our politicians: How many more killings must we bear before the laws are changed. . . . Our country is no longer safe. Not in school, church, concerts, parties, or even public meeting areas. Please choose to do something. All of our lives depend on your actions.”

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter written by these students.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN: Seventeen innocent people lost their lives on February 14th, 2018. That scares us. It scares us that kids have to go to school wondering if they are next. That we even have to think that the next time we see some of our classmates or teachers may be in their open caskets. And what scares us most of all, is that our government fails to do anything to change this. Please don’t forget. About the pain and suffering of all the families and the victims. About the children fearing that their school is next. About all of the lives that will never be lived. They are gone because our country doesn’t care enough to have better gun control, and we will not stop fighting until they get their justice. And that’s why we wrote

this letter. We’re not writing it to get some extra credit points or fame. We’re writing this letter because we want to personally ask each and every one of our politicians; how many more killings must we bear before the laws are changed and regulations are tightened. Before the government cares for our safety. Before the lives that were lost are never forgotten or regarded as yesterday’s news. The time to talk about gun-control is now. It is not next decade or next year or even next week. It is now. Now is the time to strengthen the process involved in conducting a complete background check and lengthen the waiting period required in order to receive a firearm. Please stand with us and all of the of the students and children in our nation. Stand with all of the families of the victims. Stand with the tremendously brave people who lived through these terrifying events. Stand with the heroes who saved countless lives, and ended up losing their own. Our country is no longer safe. Not in school, church, concerts, parties, or even public meeting areas. Please choose to do something. All of our lives depend on your actions and support.

Sincerely,  
STUDENTS AT AMHERST REGIONAL  
MIDDLE SCHOOL.

□ 1200

Mr. MCGOVERN. I cannot say it better than these students, Mr. Speaker. These are young people writing to Congress begging us to do something to end the violence. They are young people who want a better future.

I would just ask my Republican friends: Are you so beholden to the National Rifle Association that you could possibly turn your backs on our country’s young people? Can you really ignore these heartbreaking pleas for action?

You know, a recent poll showed that 80 percent of Americans support bans on assault-style weapons like the one used in the Florida school shooting and 90 percent support tougher background checks. These are commonsense reforms that have overwhelming support from the American people. This should be a bipartisan issue that we could come together on.

But I would say, even if you don’t want to support what I think is commonsense legislation and commonsense reform, understand that the majority of the people in this country do support this and at least bring these bills to the floor so that we could have a debate, and then people can vote however they want to vote.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and these terrible bills that help big banks, put consumers in our country at risk, and do absolutely nothing to address the real priorities that we should be tackling. It is long past time for Congress to finally do something to stop these horrific mass shootings that are taking the lives of our kids and our families.

Mr. Speaker, we could just have easily spent this afternoon debating and approving one, or more, of any of the gun safety and gun reform measures that have bipartisan support. We could have shown high school and elementary students, our children, Mr. Speak-

er, that we heard them, that we care about them, and that we are starting to take action.

Instead, we are debating these worthless bills to help big banks and continue to ignore our children’s suffering. Shame on this Congress, Mr. Speaker, shame on all of us.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), a member of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Colorado for yielding me this time to speak on this rule.

I have to admit, I was a little confused when I walked in, based on what I was hearing on the other side, of what bill we were actually discussing. And let me just say this, Mr. Speaker, before I get into why I am rising today in support of these important bills that have bipartisan support.

Being someone who has been on the receiving end of being shot at, we have to focus on how do we make our children safe. I think everybody in this Chamber is deeply, deeply concerned on that. We have to assume the next shooter is there and he already has a weapon, and the actions that we take must be focused clearly on how do we make these children safe. I don’t think there is any person in this Chamber who would disagree with that, and especially, I know, on our side of the aisle, so we are committed to that.

But today, we are here speaking on a rule that is very important for two substantive bills that we are bringing up, and I rise in support of not only my bill, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, but also my colleague, Mr. LUETKEMEYER’s bill, which we are also discussing here.

This week, the House is continuing to take up strongly bipartisan bills from the Financial Services Committee. The committee has passed, so far, Mr. Speaker, 91 bills in this Congress, and we have taken our remarkable productivity to the floor by passing 36 bills out of this Chamber, and six of them have been signed into law.

My bill, which we are beginning to debate here today, is another strongly bipartisan bill which will provide regulatory relief for financial institutions and increase access to capital and credit for businesses and consumers.

Mr. Speaker, there is a historical trend for the government to overregulate after an economic recession. The recovery from the financial crisis of 2008 to 2009 was weak and slow for many reasons, not least of which was overregulation of the financial sector by the Dodd-Frank Act and the previous administration.

Some would argue that there is also a trend to underregulate during good economic times like we are living in now. Some say that the regulatory relief legislation that we passed out of



the Financial Services Committee will lead to abuses by big banks and other financial institutions and cause another financial crisis.

But these bills will not cause the government to underregulate banks and credit unions. They will simply implement smart regulation. In other words, these bills do not gut or eliminate regulation. They right-size regulation and make it more efficient.

Back in 1996, Congress did a good thing by passing the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, or as we call it, EGRPRA. EGRPRA requires the banking regulatory agencies to go back once every 10 years—that is, once a decade—and review their regulations to identify those that may be outdated, unnecessary, or overly burdensome, and then they are to send a report to Congress. It also requires the agencies to eliminate regulations if they determine they are inappropriate.

Make no mistake, EGRPRA was a good idea back in 1996, and it is a very valuable tool, but far too often EGRPRA regulatory reviews have been viewed as merely a check-the-box exercise by these agencies and in the financial sector. Many believe the two EGRPRA reports, which were released in 2007 and then a decade later in 2017, were lackluster and could have produced more useful recommendations to policymakers; and under the current EGRPRA law, it will be another decade before we could actually look at those regulations again.

EGRPRA could also result in more action from the regulators to clean up outdated and unnecessary rules. That is why it is important for Congress to revisit EGRPRA and to revitalize this law.

My bill contains several reforms to the EGRPRA review process that will breathe new life into the law and make sure it is not simply a check-the-box exercise for regulators. This bill will require more frequent regulatory reviews by moving the review cycle from 10 to 7 years. It will expand EGRPRA to include all regulated financial institutions instead of only the insured depository institutions. It will expand EGRPRA to include the CFPB, and the bill will also codify the National Credit Union Administration into EGRPRA, since the NCUA participated in the latest review voluntarily.

The bill will also require the CFPB to use its findings from its Dodd-Frank regulatory reviews and its EGRPRA reports so the CFPB does not waste time on rules it has already reviewed. And most importantly, this bill will require the agencies to tailor rules they find to be unnecessary, outdated, or overly burdensome based on the size and risk profile of the bank or credit union—that is, the regulators making the determination, not the banks and not the institutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I am wrapping up.

This bill passed out of the committee with a strong bipartisan vote of more than two-thirds of the committee members, including all Republicans and eight Democrats. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

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

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleagues, I mean, let's be honest, the two bills that we are debating today are "nothing burgers." I mean, you know, I just figured this out. In the Rules Committee, we have spent 43–43 percent of the bills that have come before the Rules Committee have been financial service-related bills, mostly to undercut Dodd-Frank and to reward big banks and powerful special interests.

But, you know, we could debate that, but no matter what you think about some of this legislation, most of it, I think, has been either, you know, destructive to our economy or it doesn't add up to very much of anything. But no matter what you think about it—and we could say that banking issues are important—they are not as important as protecting our kids.

I mean, 43 percent of the bills that have come before the Rules Committee have basically been attempts to reward big corporations and big financial institutions in this country. We have spent zero time, zero percent of our time, discussing legislation to ban bump stocks. We have spent zero percent of our time in the Rules Committee considering legislation to strengthen and expand universal background checks. We have spent zero percent of the time debating a bill to ban assault weapons. We have spent zero percent of our time discussing how we can restrict high-capacity magazines.

I can go on and on and on. We spent zero percent of our time on the issue of guns, notwithstanding that we are seeing massacres occur on a regular basis in this country. There is something wrong here, and, I mean, we have the time; and if this were a priority, we would be talking about some of this commonsense gun legislation today rather than, as I said, these "nothing burgers" that are now before us.

Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago, a gunman walked into a school in Parkland, Florida, and gunned down 17 students and teachers. Unfortunately, senseless acts of violence like that one are far too common. According to Everytown for Gun Safety, every day, 96 Americans are killed with guns; and every year, there are 13,000 gun homicides in the United States.

With this most recent tragedy in Parkland, Americans have stood up and said: Enough is enough. We have all been inspired by these eloquent and passionate voices of these young stu-

dents from Florida who have had the guts to stand up and speak truth to power. But you know, Mr. Speaker, according to a Quinnipiac poll from last week, over 90 percent of Americans are in favor of universal background checks for gun purchases; and according to a CNN poll from yesterday, over 70 percent are in favor of stricter gun control laws generally.

The American people are clamoring for action on this issue, and we have yet to do anything about it, not one thing. As I mentioned, all of our time has been spent mostly on legislation to help the well-off and the powerful in this country. We have not spent any time at all talking about this issue of guns, which are killing our kids. But today, my Republican colleagues have an opportunity to put the safety of our children over the power of the gun lobby.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up three commonsense gun safety bills: H.R. 4240, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act; H.R. 3464, the Background Check Completion Act; and H.R. 2598, the Gun Violence Restraining Order Act.

These bills would close the dangerous gun show and internet sale background check loopholes, prevent the sale of guns without a completed background check, and ensure that people who are a danger to themselves or others can be prevented from purchasing or possessing a gun.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I ask my good friend from Massachusetts, in the revision of his remarks, if he wouldn't just clear up one point. He had mentioned that this Congress has not done anything in regard to gun violence prevention, and while true, it is not completely accurate.

The fact of the matter is, this Congress is controlled by the Republican Party. The Republican Party determines what bills go for a hearing, what bills come up for a vote. So the fact is, this is a Republican problem. They are the ones that are stopping commonsense gun violence prevention legislation from coming up for a vote to make the American people more safe.

Mr. Speaker, there are many important bills that this House could be considering, but none more important than legislation that would save lives



and prevent gun violence. There is no single bill, nor policy, that will end gun violence in America, but we do know that background checks work. Every day, background checks stop more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun.

Unfortunately, those folks who were blocked from buying a gun from a licensed dealer can go around the block, around the corner, or down the street to a gun show or to an online site and get a gun, oftentimes the same gun, without having to go through a background check.

There is a reason that 97 percent of Americans want to expand and strengthen our background check system. Even the President has come out and said that he is in support of this. I can't think of many things that Americans agree on 90 percent of the time, but they do so on background checks.

We have a bipartisan bill ready to go. H.R. 4240, both Democrats and Republicans coauthoring that bill, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act, would help get more records into the NICS system and would expand background checks to all commercial sales.

□ 1215

We shouldn't have to wait for another mass shooting, and we shouldn't have to wait for the 44th moment of silence. Let's act now. Oppose the previous question and give us a vote on H.R. 4240.

How many more people have to die before Members of this body will muster the courage to bring background check legislation that will help to the floor of this House for a vote?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the combined rule for H.R. 4296, my bill that addresses difficulties with operational risk capital requirements imposed on financial institutions, and H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act. Both of these bills are commonsense reforms to regulation that will improve the efficiency of our financial system. My legislation, H.R. 4296, will replace misguided capital standards imposed by the international standard setters, the Basel Committee.

The Basel Committee requires U.S. institutions to hold excessive capital based on a "look back" approach of an organization's risks, previous earnings, and other provisions that provide no indication of future risks. The methodology employed by this international body has forced our banks to hold hundreds of billions of dollars in reserve rather than putting the money to work in the form of loans and investments. That is money that could be used to fund mortgage loans, car loans, and

other day-to-day financing for American consumers.

I recognize the importance of our Nation's financial institutions to hold capital in the event of a future crisis or distress, and H.R. 4296 maintains those capital requirements. As a former regulator, I can tell you that it is important to have adequate capital to regard against loss. But there is a sweet spot that needs to be attained, and regulators can do that if you have proper regulation in place.

What this bill does is amend the method by which the reserve capital is calculated by focusing standards based on an organization's current business activities. This approach offers a better assessment of the amount of capital that should be held to withstand any future crisis.

The methods-based approach proposed in H.R. 4296 properly calibrates operational capital requirements. It maintains strong and healthy financial institutions, while unshackling billions of dollars for lending purposes.

The second bill we are discussing here today provides another opportunity to advance a more practical approach to regulation. H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, sponsored by Mr. LOUDERMILK from Georgia, offers a holistic approach to U.S. prudential financial regulation.

This bill requires all Federal financial agencies, including the CFPB and National Credit Union Association, to participate in the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act's, or EGRPRA, comprehensive review of rules and regulations. The purpose of the review is to ensure that regulation is not overly burdensome, duplicative, or outdated, while maintaining standards to promote safety and soundness.

Additionally, H.R. 4607 requires the agencies to meet every 7 years for a comprehensive regulatory evaluation, as opposed to the current 10-year cycle in statute.

I am hard pressed to think of a less controversial bill than this one. Requiring regulators to review the impact of their actions on a more frequent basis is a simple and straightforward way to improve efficiency.

H.R. 4296 and H.R. 4607 have garnered bipartisan support, Mr. Speaker, because they are practical solutions that will properly guide supervisors to enforce more effective regulation. The result of these modest bills will be the promotion of a vibrant and open economy that works for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat what I said at the outset. The rule we are considering would make in order two Financial Services bills that I think amount to "nothing burgers," especially when compared to what we

should be doing in terms of protecting our communities and protecting our kids from gun violence. That should take priority over this.

We have young people from Florida here, going door to door, talking to Members of Congress and Members of the Senate, begging us to do something. And what are we going to consider is the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, and then we are going to consider the operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations.

I did a couple of townhall meetings over the weekend, and I can tell my colleagues truthfully that nobody in the audience asked a question about the operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations. Nor did they bring up the need for us to rush ahead and pass the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, but they did ask what we are doing to protect their kids and to protect our schools.

We are living in a time when parents have to wonder when they send their kids to school in the morning whether they will come back alive. We are living in a time when going to the movie theater is a risk, when going to a concert is a risk, or when going to church is a risk. This is unacceptable, and people have had it.

I would say to my colleagues who are beholden to the National Rifle Association: I get it. If you don't want to stand up to them, that is fine, but don't stand in the way of this House having a debate on these issues and having a vote. Let the American people see where everybody stands, Democrats and Republicans alike.

It is unbelievable to me, in the aftermath of this tragedy, that we are here talking about the operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations, when we should be talking about strengthening our background checks and expanding our background checks; when we should be talking about banning bump stocks; when we should be talking about dealing with high-capacity magazines; and when we should be talking about banning assault weapons.

People don't have to vote for those things if they don't want to, but I think that is what the American people want. You see it in the polling data. I am hearing it when I go home and I talk in townhalls.

People are just frustrated that we are doing nothing. We hold moments of silence, and that is about it. I think some in the NRA are hoping that this is kind of business as usual. That we will have this terrible tragedy, then, as time goes on, people will focus less and less on it, the media will focus less and less on it, and then we will just kind of move on.

I remember, in the aftermath of the Las Vegas shooting, there was talk about banning bump stocks. The President said he thought that was a good idea. Even the NRA did. Time went on, the focus went off of what happened in

Las Vegas, and we did nothing. Maybe that is what some of my colleagues are hoping for, is that time will pass and we will do nothing. But it is such an abrogation of our duty and our responsibility, and I just don't get it. I don't get it.

This is another closed rule that makes a mockery of regular order. But what is even more disturbing to me is that we are prioritizing banking issues over protecting our kids and our families, and I just find that unconscionable.

I think the anger in this country is just growing more and more and more. I have great hope that these young voices, not just those from Parkland, Florida, but high school students all across this country, who want a future where they don't have to worry about going to school, their voices are getting louder and louder and louder, and they are not going to cave and they are going to demand change. It is their future, and they want us to give them a future where they feel safer and more protected.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can bring up some commonsense gun safety legislation. Again, if you don't want to vote for it, you can vote "no," but we have to have the debate.

I think that is what is particularly insulting to so many people across this country who are frustrated with this House when it comes to gun safety legislation, is that we don't even have the guts to have a debate. We don't even bring it up. It is not a priority. I think we have an opportunity now, if we defeat the previous question, to make it a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to close debate by reviewing a few basic truths.

In the aftermath of the financial meltdown last decade, Washington embarked on a campaign to reduce the power of Wall Street over Americans. In typical Washington fashion, we, instead, got a monstrosity of a new regulatory infrastructure that has all but snuffed out Main Street lenders. The plan to reduce Wall Street's influence actually increased it.

This House—not the Senate, because the Senate has refused to act—listened to the American people and passed the Financial CHOICE Act. Instead of embarking on a campaign that hurt American people and propped up Wall Street, we set out with one goal: increase the financial freedom of Americans.

And we did that. We passed a bill that would make substantive changes to our financial regulations to the betterment of Americans.

These bills before us today continue on that path. They recognize that this government should work for all Ameri-

cans, not just those who can afford political connections.

Eastern Coloradans should know that I serve them and them alone. As long as I have this responsibility to represent them, I will work to reduce Washington's role in their life.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership on the Financial CHOICE Act and these bills. I hope that he will remain engaged in this effort as he commences the next chapter in his life at the end of this Congress.

I thank Chairman SESSIONS for his leadership in bringing this debate to the floor today.

We must never yield in putting Americans first in our public policy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 747 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 3. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4240) to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 4240 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3464) to prohibit firearms dealers from selling a firearm prior to the completion of a background check. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Com-

mittee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 3464 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2598) to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others new tools to prevent gun violence. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4240, H.R. 3464, or H.R. 2598.

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 27, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 27, 2018, at 9:24 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without an amendment H. Con. Res. 103.

That the Senate agreed to without an amendment H. Con. Res. 107.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1307

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 1 o’clock and 7 minutes p.m.

#### RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution at the desk, which I have previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas, gun violence affects every community in our Nation;

Whereas, 30 people are killed every day by someone using a gun;

Whereas, more than 2,200 people have been killed this year by someone using a gun;

Whereas, there have been at least 34 mass shootings this year;

Whereas, while mass shootings often receive media attention, gun violence is present every day in every community;

Whereas, since the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School, the House of Representatives has held 43 moments of silence to honor the memory of people killed by someone using guns;

Whereas, most gun owners are responsible and law-abiding;

Whereas, the Supreme Court, in its District of Columbia v. Heller decision, recognized the right to keep and to bear arms;

Whereas, the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act was enacted on November 30, 1993;

Whereas, background checks have been successful and every day stop more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun;

Whereas, over 2,000,000 gun sales were blocked since enactment of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act;

Whereas, 90 percent of all background checks are done instantly;

Whereas, the States that require background checks, 47 percent fewer women are murdered by intimate partners;

Whereas, in States that require background checks, there are 47 percent firearm suicides;

Whereas, in States that require background checks, 53 percent fewer law enforcement officers are killed by someone using a gun;

Whereas, 97 percent of Americans polled support background checks for all gun sales;

Whereas, in many States, no background check is required to buy a gun online or at a gun show; and

Whereas, the President has said, “Whether we are Republican or Democrats must now focus on strengthening Background Checks!” Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved That the House of Representatives should immediately consider H.R. 4240, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2017, and H.R. 3464, the Background Check Completion Act of 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California wish to present argument on the parliamentary question whether the resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, yes, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the question of order.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is our duty as lawmakers and Representatives to pass laws that will make our communities safer. So far, Mr. Speaker, Congress has done nothing in regard to gun violence prevention, and that is shameful.

Every Member here knows that something must be done about gun violence. We may not all agree on what that is, but everyone, from the President of the United States of America to the inspiring young leaders who are leading a movement today out of Florida, agrees we must expand background checks. That is why we need this resolution and why we must take up the bipartisan background bill immediately. You cannot table the 30 people a day who are killed by someone using a gun.

Let us have this vote, Mr. Speaker. We have had too many moments of silence. We have got a bill that is ready to come to the floor. It is bipartisan, Democrats and Republicans supporting the bill, coauthoring the bill.

Ninety-seven percent of the American people believe that we should take up and vote for a measure regarding background checks. This is a good bill. It should be brought to the floor.

The Republicans should not be silencing the wishes of the American people. The Republican majority should not disallow hearings and votes on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The remarks of the gentleman must be confined to the question of order.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from California seeks to offer a resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX. The resolution offered by the gentleman from California provides that the House should vote on two specified measures.

One of the fundamental tenets of rule IX, as the Chair recently ruled on December 10, 2015, is that a resolution expressing a sentiment that the House should consider a particular bill does not qualify as a question of the privileges of the House. Similarly, on February 6, 2018, the Chair ruled that a resolution providing that the House should act on a specified item of business does not constitute a question of the privileges of the House.

By calling for a vote on two particular measures, the resolution expresses a legislative sentiment in violation of the principles documented in sections 702 and 706 of the House Rules and Manual. Accordingly, the resolution does not constitute a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:  
Mr. Burgess moves to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 748;

Adoption of House Resolution 748, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 747; and

Adoption of House Resolution 747, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 184, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—228

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

Johnson, Sam	Moolenaar	Sensenbrenner	Shea-Porter	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Jones	Mooney (WV)	Sessions	Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Jordan	Mullin	Shimkus	Sinema	Titus	Waters, Maxine
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Shuster	Sires	Tonko	Watson Coleman
Katko	Noem	Simpson	Slaughter	Tsongas	Welch
Kelly (MS)	Norman	Smith (MO)	Soto	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Kelly (PA)	Nunes	Smith (NE)	Suozi	Veasey	Yarmuth
King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NJ)	Swalwell (CA)	Vela	
King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (TX)	Takano	Visclosky	
Kinzinger	Palmer	Smucker			
Knight	Paulsen	Stefanik			
Kustoff (TN)	Perry	Stewart	Bergman	Engel	Smith (WA)
Labrador	Pittenger	Stivers	Black	Graves (MO)	Speier
LaHood	Poe (TX)	Taylor	Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Torres
LaMalfa	Poliquin	Tenney	Cleaver	Long	Trott
Lamborn	Posey	Thompson (PA)	Cramer	Payne	Velázquez
Lance	Ratcliffe	Thornberry	Cummings	Pearce	Walz
Latta	Reed	Tipton			
Lewis (MN)	Reichert	Turner			
LoBiondo	Renacci	Upton			
Loudermilk	Rice (SC)	Valadao			
Love	Roby	Wagner			
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Walberg			
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Walden			
MacArthur	Rogers (KY)	Walker			
Marchant	Rohrabacher	Walorski			
Marino	Rokita	Walters, Mimi			
Marshall	Rooney, Francis	Weber (TX)			
Massie	Rooney, Thomas	Webster (FL)			
Mast	J.	Wenstrup			
McCarthy	Ros-Lehtinen	Westerman			
McCaul	Roskam	Williams			
McClintock	Ross	Wilson (SC)			
McHenry	Rothfus	Wittman			
McKinley	Rouzer	Womack			
McMorris	Royce (CA)	Woodall			
Rodgers	Russell	Yoder			
McSally	Rutherford	Yoho			
Meadows	Sanford	Young (AK)			
Meehan	Scalise	Young (IA)			
Messer	Schweikert	Zeldin			
Mitchell	Scott, Austin				

NAYS—184

Adams	Eshoo	Lujan Grisham,
Agullar	Españat	M.
Barragán	Esty (CT)	Luján, Ben Ray
Bass	Evans	Lynch
Beatty	Foster	Maloney,
Bera	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn B.
Beyer	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	Matsui
Blumenauer	Gallo	McCollum
Blunt Rochester	Garamendi	McEachin
Bonamici	Gomez	McGovern
Boyle, Brendan	Gonzalez (TX)	McNerney
F.	Gottheimer	Meeks
Brady (PA)	Green, Al	Meng
Brown (MD)	Green, Gene	Moore
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Moulton
Bustos	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Butterfield	Hanabusa	Nadler
Capuano	Hastings	Napolitano
Carbajal	Heck	Neal
Cárdenas	Higgins (NY)	Nolan
Carson (IN)	Himes	Norcross
Cartwright	Hoyer	O'Halleran
Castor (FL)	Huffman	O'Rourke
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Chu, Judy	Jayapal	Panetta
Cicilline	Jeffries	Pascrell
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Clay	Kaptur	Peters
Clyburn	Keating	Peterson
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Connolly	Kennedy	Pocan
Cooper	Khanna	Polis
Correa	Kihuen	Price (NC)
Costa	Kildee	Quigley
Courtney	Kilmer	Raskin
Crist	Kind	Rice (NY)
Crowley	Krishnamoorthi	Richmond
Cuellar	Kuster (NH)	Rosen
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Lawrence	Rush
Delaney	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Lee	Sánchez
DelBene	Levin	Sarbanes
Demings	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
Deutch	Lipinski	Schneider
Dingell	Loeb	Schrader
Doggett	Loeb	Scott (VA)
Doyle, Michael	F.	Scott, David
Ellison	Lowey	Serrano
		Sewell (AL)

NOT VOTING—18

Bergman	Engel	Smith (WA)
Black	Graves (MO)	Speier
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Torres
Cleaver	Long	Trott
Cramer	Payne	Velázquez
Cummings	Pearce	Walz

□ 1337

Messrs. TED LIEU of California, NEAL, PANETTA, RUSH, THOMPSON of Mississippi, MCEACHIN, and JOHN-SON of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1865, ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 748) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.  
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 184, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—228

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

Gohmert Lucas  
 Goodlatte Luetkemeyer  
 Gosar MacArthur  
 Gowdy Marchant  
 Granger Marino  
 Graves (GA) Marshall  
 Graves (LA) Massie  
 Griffith Mast  
 Grothman McCarthy  
 Guthrie McCaul  
 Handel McClintock  
 Harper McHenry  
 Harris McKinley  
 Hartzler McMorris  
 Hensarling Rodgers  
 Herrera Beutler McSally  
 Hice, Jody B. Meadows  
 Higgins (LA) Meehan  
 Hill Messer  
 Holding Mitchell  
 Hollingsworth Moolenaar  
 Hudson Mooney (WV)  
 Hultgren Mullin  
 Hunter Newhouse  
 Hurd Noem  
 Issa Norman  
 Jenkins (KS) Nunes  
 Jenkins (WV) Olson  
 Johnson (LA) Palazzo  
 Johnson (OH) Palmer  
 Johnson, Sam Paulsen  
 Jones Perry  
 Jordan Pittenger  
 Joyce (OH) Poe (TX)  
 Katko Poliquin  
 Kelly (MS) Posey  
 Kelly (PA) Ratcliffe  
 King (IA) Reed  
 King (NY) Reichert  
 Kinzinger Renacci  
 Knight Rice (SC)  
 Kustoff (TN) Roby  
 Labrador Roe (TN)  
 LaHood Rogers (AL)  
 LaMalfa Rogers (KY)  
 Lamborn Rohrabacher  
 Lance Rokita  
 Latta Rooney, Francis  
 Lewis (MN) Rooney, Thomas  
 LoBiondo J.  
 Loudermilk Ros-Lehtinen  
 Love Roskam

**NAYS—184**

Adams DelBene  
 Aguilar Demings  
 Barragán DeSaulnier  
 Bass Deutch  
 Beatty Dingell  
 Bera Doggett  
 Beyer Doyle, Michael  
 Bishop (GA) F.  
 Blumenauer Ellison  
 Blunt Rochester Eshoo  
 Bonamici Espallat  
 Boyle, Brendan Esty (CT)  
 F. Evans  
 Brady (PA) Foster  
 Brown (MD) Frankel (FL)  
 Brownley (CA) Fudge  
 Bustos Gabbard  
 Butterfield Gallego  
 Capuano Garamendi  
 Carbajal Gomez  
 Cárdenas Gonzalez (TX)  
 Carson (IN) Gottheimer  
 Cartwright Green, Al  
 Castor (FL) Green, Gene  
 Castro (TX) Grijalva  
 Chu, Judy Gutiérrez  
 Cicilline Hanabusa  
 Clark (MA) Hastings  
 Clarke (NY) Heck  
 Clay Higgins (NY)  
 Clyburn Himes  
 Cohen Hoyer  
 Connolly Huffman  
 Cooper Jackson Lee  
 Correa Jayapal  
 Costa Jeffries  
 Courtney Johnson (GA)  
 Crist Johnson, E. B.  
 Crowley Kaptur  
 Cuellar Keating  
 Davis, Danny Kelly (IL)  
 DeFazio Kennedy  
 DeGette Khanna  
 Delaney Kihuen  
 DeLauro Kildee

Pelosi Sánchez  
 Perlmutter Sarbanes  
 Peters Schakowsky  
 Peterson Schiff  
 Pingree Schneider  
 Pocan Schrader  
 Polis Scott (VA)  
 Price (NC) Scott, David  
 Quigley Serrano  
 Raskin Sewell (AL)  
 Rice (NY) Shea-Porter  
 Richmond Sherman  
 Rosen Sinema  
 Roybal-Allard Sires  
 Ruiz Slaughter  
 Ruppertsberger Soto  
 Russo Suozzi  
 Ryan (OH) Swalwell (CA)

Bergman Davis (CA)  
 Black Engel  
 Carter (TX) Graves (MO)  
 Cleaver Huizenga  
 Cramer Long  
 Cummings Payne

**NOT VOTING—18**

□ 1345

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

Stated against: Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 84.

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

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

**RECORDED VOTE**

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 235, noes 175, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

**AYES—235**

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

Labrador Thompson (CA)  
 LaHood Thompson (MS)  
 LaMalfa Titus  
 Lamborn Tonko  
 Lance Tsongas  
 Latta Vargas  
 Lawson (FL) Veasey  
 Lewis (MN) Vela  
 LoBiondo Velázquez  
 Loudermilk Visclosky  
 Love Wasserman  
 Lucas Schultz  
 Luetkemeyer Waters, Maxine  
 MacArthur Watson Coleman  
 Marchant Welch  
 Marino Wilson (FL)  
 Marshall Yarmuth  
 Massie  
 Mast  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Norman  
 Nunes  
 O'Halleran

**NOES—175**

Adams Meng  
 Aguilar Gallego  
 Barragán Garamendi  
 Bass Gomez  
 Beatty Gonzalez (TX)  
 Bera Green, Al  
 Beyer Green, Gene  
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva  
 Blumenauer Gutiérrez  
 Blunt Rochester Hanabusa  
 Bonamici Hastings  
 Boyle, Brendan Heck  
 F. Higgins (NY)  
 Brady (PA) Himes  
 Brown (MD) Hoyer  
 Brownley (CA) Huffman  
 Bustos Jackson Lee  
 Butterfield Jayapal  
 Capuano Pingree  
 Carbajal Johnson (GA)  
 Cárdenas Johnson, E. B.  
 Carson (IN) Kaptur  
 Cartwright Keating  
 Castor (FL) Kelly (IL)  
 Castro (TX) Kennedy  
 Cicilline Khanna  
 Clark (MA) Kihuen  
 Clarke (NY) Kildee  
 Clay Kilmer  
 Clyburn Kind  
 Cohen Krishnamoorthi  
 Cooper Kuster (NH)  
 Correa Langevin  
 Courtney Larsen (WA)  
 Crowley Larson (CT)  
 Cuellar Lawrence  
 Davis (CA) Lee  
 Davis, Danny Levin  
 DeFazio Lewis (GA)  
 DeGette Lieu, Ted  
 Delaney Lipinski  
 DeLauro Loeb sack  
 Demings Lofgren  
 DeSaulnier Lowey  
 Deutch Lujan Grisham,  
 Dingell M.  
 Doggett Luján, Ben Ray  
 Doyle, Michael Lynch  
 F. Maloney,  
 Ellison Carolyn B.  
 Eshoo Maloney, Sean  
 Espallat Matsui  
 Esty (CT) McCollum  
 Evans McEachin  
 Foster McGovern  
 Frankel (FL) McNerney  
 Fudge Meeks

Simpson  
 Sinema  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smucker  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Taylor  
 Tenney  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Zeldin



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

NOT VOTING—20

Bergman Engel Roskam  
Black Graves (MO) Smith (WA)  
Carter (TX) Huizenga Speier  
Chu, Judy Johnson (LA) Torres  
Cleaver Long Trott  
Cramer Payne Walz  
Cummings Pearce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1352

Mr. GOTTHEIMER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4296, OPERATIONAL RISK CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BANKING ORGANIZATIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4607, COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 747) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4296) to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4607) to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 185, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—227

Abraham Brat Comstock  
Aderholt Bridenstine Conaway  
Amash Brooks (AL) Cook  
Amodei Brooks (IN) Costello (PA)  
Arrington Buchanan Crawford  
Babin Buck Culberson  
Bacon Bucshon Curbelo (FL)  
Banks (IN) Budd Curtis  
Barletta Burgess Davidson  
Barr Byrne Davis, Rodney  
Barton Calvert Denham  
Biggs Carter (GA) Dent  
Bilirakis Chabot DeSantis  
Bishop (MI) Cheney DesJarlais  
Bishop (UT) Coffman Diaz-Balart  
Blackburn Cole Donovan  
Blum Collins (GA) Duffy  
Bost Collins (NY) Duncan (SC)  
Brady (TX) Comer Duncan (TN)

Dunn Kustoff (TN)  
Emmer Labrador  
Estes (KS) LaHood  
Farenthold LaMalfa  
Faso Lamborn  
Ferguson Lance  
Fitzpatrick Latta  
Fleischmann Lewis (MN)  
Flores LoBiondo  
Fortenberry Loudermilk  
Foxy Love  
Frelinghuysen Lucas  
Gaetz Luetkemeyer  
Gallagher MacArthur  
Garrett Marchant  
Gianforte Marino  
Gibbs Marshall  
Gohmert Massie  
Goodlatte Mast  
Gosar McCarthy  
Gowdy McCaul  
Granger McClintock  
Graves (GA) McHenry  
Graves (LA) McKinley  
Griffith McMorris  
Grothman Rodgers  
Guthrie McSally  
Handel Meadows  
Harper Meehan  
Harris Messer  
Hartzler Mitchell  
Hensarling Moolenaar  
Herrera Beutler Mooney (WV)  
Hice, Jody B. Mullin  
Higgins (LA) Newhouse  
Hill Noem  
Holding Norman  
Hollingsworth Nunes  
Hudson Olson  
Hultgren Palazzo  
Hunter Palmer  
Hurd Paulsen  
Issa Perry  
Jenkins (KS) Pittenger  
Jenkins (WV) Poe (TX)  
Johnson (LA) Poliquin  
Johnson (OH) Posey  
Johnson, Sam Ratcliffe  
Jones Reed  
Jordan Reichert  
Joyce (OH) Renacci  
Katko Rice (SC)  
Kelly (MS) Roby  
Kelly (PA) Roe (TN)  
King (IA) Rogers (AL)  
King (NY) Rogers (KY)  
Kinzinger Rohrabacher  
Knight Rokita

NAYS—185

Adams Cuellar  
Aguilar Davis (CA)  
Barragán Davis, Danny  
Bass DeFazio  
Beatty DeGette  
Bera Delaney  
Beyer DeLauro  
Bishop (GA) DelBene  
Blumenauer Demings  
Blunt Rochester DeSaunier  
Bonamici Deutch  
Boyle, Brendan Dingell  
F. Doggett  
Brady (PA) Doyle, Michael  
Brown (MD) F.  
Brownley (CA) Ellison  
Bustos Eshoo  
Butterfield Espallat  
Capuano Esty (CT)  
Carbajal Evans  
Cárdenas Foster  
Carson (IN) Frankel (FL)  
Cartwright Fudge  
Castor (FL) Gabbard  
Castro (TX) Gallego  
Chu, Judy Garamendi  
Cielline Gomez  
Clark (MA) Gonzalez (TX)  
Clarke (NY) Gottheimer  
Clay Green, Al  
Clyburn Green, Gene  
Cohen Grijalva  
Connolly Gutiérrez  
Cooper Hanabusa  
Correa Hastings  
Costa Heck  
Courtney Higgins (NY)  
Crist Himes  
Crowley Hoyer

Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan

Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema

NOT VOTING—18

Allen Cummings Pearce  
Bergman Engel Smith (WA)  
Black Graves (MO) Speier  
Carter (TX) Huizenga Torres  
Cleaver Long Trott  
Cramer Payne Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1359

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

Stated for:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 86.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. 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 230, noes 177, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—230

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

Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant

Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaull  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messner  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratchliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer

Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schneider  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Westrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff

## NOT VOTING—23

Bergman  
Black  
Blumenauer  
Carter (TX)  
Cleaver  
Cramer  
Cummings  
Engel

Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Soto  
Suzoi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)

Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1865.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 748 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1865.

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

□ 1409

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, with Mr. DENHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) and the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

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

Mr. Chairman, today, this body will make tremendous progress towards ending online sex exploitation. This is a big deal.

I am proud to stand here as an original cosponsor of the important legislation we are considering today, H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act.

I have been so pleased to work closely with my colleague, Congresswoman ANN WAGNER, on this issue, and I know that I am not the only person here who greatly appreciates her leadership on this. It has been sobering, to say the least, to hear some of the personal accounts of sex trafficking victims, and several from my home State of Alabama.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1405

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was thus unable to cast my vote on rollcall votes 83, 84, 85, 86, and 87. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 83, "nay" on rollcall No. 84, "nay" on rollcall No. 85, "nay" on rollcall No. 86, and "nay" on rollcall No. 87.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL COLLECTIVELY TO THE MEMBERS OF THE OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 106, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 106

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on March 21, 2018, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the members of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), in recognition of their superior service and major contributions during World War II.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the ceremony described in subsection (a)

## NOES—177

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

DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)

Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pocan



It is our responsibility to provide justice for these victims and to do everything we can to protect the most vulnerable members of our society from trafficking. This is modern-day slavery.

As it stands now, the sad truth is that criminals can easily and anonymously purchase women and children on the internet using various websites.

Thanks to broad interpretation of existing law, specifically section 230 in America's courts, these websites are, essentially, immune from State and local prosecutions. These websites make millions by enabling sex trafficking while facing very little risk of being punished for these crimes.

The bill we are considering today would change that by amending this law to ensure that websites that unlawfully contribute to the exploitation of sex trafficking victims are no longer immune to punishment.

H.R. 1865 will finally hold bad actor websites accountable for these unspeakable wrongdoings. The bill also provides increased criminal liability and, thus, deters websites and individuals from selling human beings online. Websites will no longer be able to turn a blind eye or actively conceal this horrific practice without facing very real consequences.

This legislation has been a work in progress for some time now, and I am excited today to have the opportunity to cast my vote in favor of it here today. I urge my colleagues to join me.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for managing this legislation. I thank Congresswoman WAGNER for her leadership and, as someone said, continued determination, joined by my friend and colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman BEATTY and Congresswoman MALONEY. We have all worked together over the years for the victims of human trafficking and sex trafficking.

In the last couple of hours, we heard in the Judiciary Committee the stories of the victims of rape, so we know that this is an important time and important legislation. Throughout this time, you will hear stories of victims who have been victimized and are in need of this legislation.

Just to recount my statement in the Rules Committee, yesterday, Monday, a week ago, in Houston, I sat down with victims who had been trafficked or who had been victimized through online sex trafficking or other aspects of sex trafficking. It was overwhelming to hear parents speak of a young girl, their daughter, who had been misled and driven away from their home or from her area and had been taken and abused for a long period of time until he had to rescue her himself, spending \$50,000, and then \$60,000, to be able to rehabilitate herself, which is now an

ongoing process. Though, as every family and every parent, he is grateful that she is alive.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1865, Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017, an important bill intended to address the reprehensible crime of online sex trafficking by prosecuting the violators and providing relief to the violated.

□ 1415

First and foremost, H.R. 1865 makes clear that section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, which its interpretation was expanded in the first circuit court ruling of *Doe v. Backpage*, this bill makes it clear that section 230 of the Communications Decency Act was never intended to protect the facilitation of online prostitution or sex trafficking and calls out those websites that have acted recklessly in allowing the sale of victims of sex trafficking online or stood idly by while young boys and girls, many as young as 13 years old or even younger, were coerced, threatened, tortured, bought, and sold on the whims of their exploiters.

Secondly, this legislation will provide Federal prosecutors with an additional weapon to use against the immoral individuals who participate in the forced enslavement we know as sex trafficking.

H.R. 1865 creates the new offense of intentional promotion or facilitation of prostitution while using or operating a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce, such as the internet. A general violation of this offense will be punishable by a sentence of upwards of 10 years.

Websites have operated with impunity, hidden behind section 230, allowing traffickers to advertise, promote, sell minors and other vulnerable at-risk members of our society, children, parents' precious, precious children, who are forced to perform unspeakable acts under the threat of violence, gun violence, starvation, and emotional and physical abuse.

Under this legislation, an aggravated violation of the new offense, punishable by imprisonment, occurs if a defendant, such as *Backpage*, promotes or facilitates the prostitution of five or more victims or acts with reckless disregard of the fact that the conduct in question contributed to sex trafficking as defined in the Federal criminal code at section 1591, title 18.

Not only does H.R. 1865 create criminal liability and mandatory restitution for online sex traffickers and their enablers, this legislation goes even further. Victims harmed as a result of an aggravated violation of this new offense will have the ability—very important—to seek civil damages, while judges will be required to impose restitution upon defendants convicted of committing either the general or aggravated violation.

We appreciate law enforcement, U.S. attorneys, yet we know that State law

enforcement agencies and prosecutors are vital in the fight as well, and they have called on Congress to act and to fight more effectively. There are State task forces across the country working to protect young girls and boys, and H.R. 1865 allows State legislators to enact laws prohibiting the conduct that reflects the offense created in this bill.

Soon we will be discussing the Walters amendment, which is offered because of the victims groups who want a stronger response to helping victims. We thank them for that.

The Jackson Lee amendment, which I will offer, leads to be able to help understand what the level of recovery is and the mandatory restitution. It will tell the story. It will provide the GAO study to find out how this legislation is positively impacting, who is receiving the dollars, are they receiving the dollars.

Today, this account has swelled to \$99 billion a year, with a considerable portion of that money being generated through online advertising solicitation, and that is the account of dollars that are being used through sex trafficking.

My amendment will determine and help to bring information to us as to the effectiveness of this particular legislation, and I think it will be very important.

Let me conclude by saying that a letter to Congress from the National Association of Attorneys General indicated certain Federal courts have broadly interpreted the Communications Decency Act, which has left victims and State and local law enforcement agencies and prosecutors, who regularly confront the cruel realities of sex trafficking, feeling powerless against online ad services and websites that facilitate or allow sex trafficking.

My heart goes out, and I am grateful that we have moved. As we move forward, we will be able to build with more legislation that might include my second amendment that would have allowed victims of sex trafficking to file civil actions in State courts.

Mr. Chair, let me express my gratitude to the victims who have been courageous enough to tell their story.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1865, the "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017," an important bill, intended to address the reprehensible crime of online sex trafficking by prosecuting the violators and providing relief to the violated.

First and foremost, H.R. 1865:

(1) Makes clear that Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act was never intended to protect the facilitation of online prostitution or sex trafficking; and

(2) Calls out those websites that have acted recklessly in allowing the sale of victims of sex trafficking online, or stood idly by while young boys and girls—many as young as thirteen years old or even younger—were coerced, threatened, tortured, bought, and sold on the whims of their exploiters.

Secondly, this legislation will provide federal prosecutors with an additional weapon to use against the immoral individuals who participate

in the forced enslavement we know as sex trafficking.

H.R. 1865 creates the new offense of intentional promotion or facilitation of prostitution while using or operating a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce, such as the Internet.

A general violation of this offense will be punishable by a sentence of imprisonment of up to ten years.

Websites have operated with impunity and hidden behind Section 230—allowing traffickers to advertise, promote, and sell minors and other vulnerable, at risk members of our society, who are forced to perform unspeakable acts under the threat of violence, starvation, and emotional and physical abuse.

Under this legislation, an aggravated violation of the new offense, punishable by a maximum of twenty-five years imprisonment, occurs if a defendant, such as Backpage.com:

(1) Promotes or facilitates the prostitution of five or more victims; or

(2) Acts with reckless disregard of the fact that the conduct in question contributed to sex trafficking, as defined in the federal criminal code at section 1591 of title 18.

Not only does H.R. 1865 create criminal liability and mandatory restitution for online sex traffickers and their enablers, this legislation goes even further.

Victims harmed as a result of an aggravated violation of this new offense will have the ability to seek civil damages, while judges will be required to impose restitution upon defendants convicted of committing either the general or aggravated violation.

We appreciate the efforts of federal law enforcement and assistant U.S. attorneys who endeavor to rid the streets and virtual highways of sex trafficking.

Yet we know that state law enforcement agencies and prosecutors are vital to this fight as well, and they have called on Congress to help them fight more effectively.

There are state task forces across the country working on the frontlines to locate young girls and young boys—children—and return them to the arms of distraught mothers and fathers.

H.R. 1865 allows state legislatures to enact laws prohibiting conduct that reflects the offenses created in this bill and the existing sex trafficking statute that I previously mentioned.

Congresswoman WALTERS has offered an amendment, which is supported by many victims' advocacy groups, to further strengthen the legislation before us today.

Taking two key provisions from the Senate bill, known as SESTA, the Walters amendment makes clear that the Communications Decency Act does not impair or limit federal causes of action filed by victims of sex trafficking and creates a right of action for state attorneys general to file federal causes of action for sex trafficking on behalf of their citizens.

This leads me to my own amendment, which is intended to measure the effectiveness of the civil recovery and mandatory restitution provisions of H.R. 1865.

In every community across the country, soulless individuals bend, break, and use the minds and bodies of young girls, young boys, men, and women—for a profit—over and over again.

Despite the reprehensible nature of this crime, sex trafficking is a widespread problem

that is now the fastest growing criminal industry.

Today, it has swelled to \$99 billion a year—with a considerable portion of that money being generated through online advertising and solicitation.

Sex traffickers have harnessed the wide-reaching expanse of the Internet together with the ability to conduct their so-called business anonymously.

They are no longer restricted to dark, unsafe street corners, filthy truck stops, or seedy hotels and strip clubs.

Instead, websites have made sex trafficking easy, convenient, and less risky for traffickers and their cowardly customers.

Today, visitors to websites can scroll through virtual Yellow Pages of listings, on their cell phones or tablets, according to their location, tastes, and preferences, without leaving the privacy and safety of their homes.

According to the Polaris Project, U.S. law enforcement has identified online advertisements as the primary platform for buying and selling sex with minors. Over the past several years, more than 80 percent of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's reports regarding child sex trafficking relate to the sex trafficking of a child online.

When notified of the criminal activity occurring on their websites and platforms, many companies, have worked to remove the content and even collaborated with law enforcement to find the perpetrators and rescue victims.

On the other hand, there are companies that have made every effort to obfuscate the criminal nature of the activity that is allowed to continue unabated, while the companies continue to turn a profit, and traffickers continue to force their captives to perform sex acts, under the threat of violence and actual physical and emotional abuse.

Girls and boys, men and women, are brazenly advertised and sold for sex on roughly a dozen major websites—the most notorious of these is, of course, Backpage.com.

However, local law enforcement officials in Seattle, Washington have identified more than 130 websites where mostly women and children are bought and sold for sex.

Many attempts have been made to hold these websites, including Backpage.com, accountable for allowing sex traffickers to operate on their platforms and profiting from their conduct.

However, as was pointed out in a letter to Congress from The National Association of Attorneys General: "certain federal courts have broadly interpreted the Communications Decency Act," which has left victims and state and local law enforcement agencies and prosecutors, who regularly confront the cruel realities of sex trafficking, feeling powerless against online ad services and websites that facilitate or allow sex trafficking.

My heart aches for those who are taken advantage of, abused, robbed of their innocence, and then robbed again of the justice they seek.

As I said earlier, the legislation before us will allow victims to file civil actions in federal courts under certain conditions and my amendment will determine if the civil actions are delivering relief and restoration.

I offered a second amendment that would have allowed victims of sex trafficking to file civil actions in state courts under the same

conditions set forth in the underlying bill for federal civil actions.

Although I am disappointed that this amendment was not accepted, I look forward to building upon the work that has been done to address the needs of victims and survivors of sex trafficking, and introducing additional legislation to continue along the pathway towards a comprehensive solution.

I am inspired and energized by the countless survivors who, despite their suffering, are willing to stand against those who have exploited them. These brave individuals want justice and I want them to have it.

As a leader in the fight against Human and Sex Trafficking and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I am painfully familiar with the pervasiveness of sex trafficking in my own state of Texas—which has become a hot bed of human trafficking.

Among law enforcement and human trafficking authorities, Houston is known as the hub of human trafficking.

The highest number of calls to the National Human Trafficking Hotline in Texas comes from Houston, and a study conducted by the University of Texas stated that there are more than 300,000 victims of human trafficking in Texas, including almost 79,000 minors.

In the few minutes I have left, I would like to share the story of a young woman named Kathy, who moved to Houston in 1994 with her family.

Kathy was raised to be strong and independent; she was very involved in her church, community, and ROTC.

She graduated from high school, with hopes of pursuing a career in journalism.

Yet, Kathy became a victim of sex trafficking.

Like most girls, she wanted to be loved.

She met a charming young man who treated her like she had never been treated before.

After a fairytale year, her Prince Charming proposed something Kathy felt she could not refuse—a promising job with his company, an administrative position that would triple her income and provide financial security for her future, which seemed like a dream come true.

The job was in Dallas and, despite her initial hesitation, she saw the offer as an opportunity to provide for her family.

But, shortly after she arrived in Dallas, Kathy found herself in the dark world of sex trafficking and prostitution—a life she never imagined.

Graphic images were taken of her and placed on the Internet against her will.

She was forced to perform sexual favors multiple times, every day, throughout Dallas and surrounding areas.

Escape was not easy.

She was cut off from her family.

Her boyfriend, turned pimp, limited her phone calls to johns, and did not allow her to have money.

But, somehow she found an opportunity to get away and she never looked back.

After many years of living in silence, Kathy decided to journal her experience.

That journal became a book, which became a stage play.

Kathy found her voice and is now an inspirational speaker who hopes to use her story to encourage others to join the fight against sex trafficking.

Images of Kathy's horrific past linger on the Internet.

She says: "Sites like Backpage have chosen to revictimize survivors and keeps us in bondage by refusing to remove images taken against our will."

Kathy hopes that one day the voices of survivors will be heard.

Well, Kathy—know that I hear you.

Congress hears you.

We hear the voices of the victims, who remain in physical and mental bondage.

We hear the voices of the survivors, who are struggling to rid themselves of reminders of their torment—survivors like Liliana who was lured away from her home by a man she met on the internet, held captive, repeatedly raped by at least five different men, and suffers from PTSD.

H.R. 1865, the "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017," together with Representative WALTERS's amendment, provides law enforcement, prosecutors, and courts at every level with the tools they need to hold responsible each and every bad actor who participates in, facilitates, contributes to, or profits from this modern-day form of slavery.

The proposed legislative combination will help defend and protect communities across the country, guard against the further spread of sex trafficking, and provide survivors with a path to justice of their own.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for the time and the work on this bill.

Mr. Chair, I also want to thank Mrs. WAGNER from Missouri for sponsoring this bill, along with the help of our friends on the other side.

You notice, Mr. Chair, that everybody who is in line, mostly, who are here to speak are women, and I want to congratulate the women in Congress, because they have taken the lead for making sure that we stop this scourge of human sex trafficking.

Mr. Chair, I also want to thank the different groups, victims groups, throughout the country who have continued to give us input on what we can do to make laws better. I call those groups the victims posse, because they are here all the time rounding us up, talking to us about what they want and think is necessary to make life better for victims.

Mr. Chair, according to most, Alexa was a normal and well-adjusted 15-year-old girl, teenager, but like many young people, she struggled with insecurity and loneliness. So when a handsome and sympathetic man reached out to her on social media, she was immediately taken in by his kind and comforting words.

Most Americans don't realize that the evils of human trafficking are all around us. Traffickers lurk on the phones, on computers, and on the internet, constantly searching for vulnerable victims to lure into their traps.

After months of manipulation, Alexa agreed to meet her new online friend. As soon as she got into his car, she re-

alized that this person was a different person than she believed him to be. He chained her and forced her to have sex for money, and he committed this evil numerous times.

Technology has changed our world in countless positive ways, but it has also given human sex traffickers a direct avenue to our children and their lives. We, as a society, must work harder to capture these criminals and shut down their online schemes. Only then can we protect others from Alexa's fate.

This is our job. This is our duty. We must stop the trafficking network. Not in our town, not in our city, and not in our State.

And that is just the way it is.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for her leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chair, as the co-chair of the Victims' Rights Caucus with my colleague Congressman TED POE, I am a proud co-sponsor of this important legislation for victims in America who have suffered from these crimes.

A free and open internet, we all believe, is essential to economic growth, entrepreneurship, and enterprise in the 21st century, and America leads the way. This new technology age has reshaped our lives and allowed for greater access to learning, greater ability to shape our own futures as Americans, and with economic benefits we could not have imagined 15 years ago.

Sadly, there are some people who look at these freedoms and the openness of the internet and see ways to exploit, abuse, and prey on innocent children and teenagers in the name of profit. It is outrageous, and it is a crime. I am speaking of the scourge of sex trafficking, which has impacted the lives of too many young people in the San Joaquin Valley that I represent and throughout America.

Today, here in Congress, we look squarely at traffickers, pimps, and victimizers and say we must do a better job in protecting our citizens. As a result of this legislation, our laws will no longer be manipulated and used as a cover for their abuse. No longer will these people be able to hide behind the shield that the internet provides you when knowingly contributing to this horrible crime.

The Fresno Bee, a local daily newspaper in the San Joaquin Valley, recently ran a 6-week-long series about human trafficking in the Valley. The paper reported that nearly every 16-year-old girl in Fresno has been approached at one time or another by sex traffickers. Imagine that: nearly every 16-year-old girl in our county.

Police have seen sex trafficking victims from every high school in Fresno County and most of the junior high schools. It is horrible. This is a tragedy, and it cannot and should not be allowed to continue.

Today, we say it is time to make important changes. This legislation does that. It will help protect our children and provide them the ability to confront their abusers.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ADERHOLT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, as I had said, it is time to make these important changes, and this bipartisan legislation does that. It protects our children, providing them the ability to confront their abusers, including those who knowingly promote and advertise these crimes.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman, and I am thankful for the bipartisan leadership in this effort.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. Chair, let me just say thank you to her for her tireless work on this effort.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, my friend, Mrs. ROBY, for her fearless leadership and support on this issue.

Today we bring, Mr. Chair, H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, or FOSTA, to the floor, finally.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank my partners on the other side of the aisle, my dear friends, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY and Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, for their tireless support on this effort.

The sad truth is that sex trafficking is a crime as old as the Nation itself. Over the past few years, Congress has routinely taken bipartisan action to fight it, yet sex trafficking seems to continue unabated. This is largely because the methods of recruitment and sale of sex trafficking victims have evolved with technology, and U.S. laws have remained stagnant.

Today, when the House votes on FOSTA, we will be sending a clear message: businesses that sell human beings online can no longer do so with impunity. Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act explicitly allows enforcement of Federal criminal law, but courts have mistakenly found that it does not allow robust enforcement of State criminal law.

Last summer, 50 State attorneys general called on Congress to untie their hands to allow them to bring justice to the websites that sell our children and the victims. Empowering our State and local prosecutors is in the best interests of the American people. Federal prosecution is discretionary, and the vast majority of crimes are prosecuted at the State and local level.

Most websites engaging in the online sex trade are first identified at the local level and should be quickly addressed before they ever reach the size of Backpage.com. Without proper State and local enforcement, there is no real

criminal deterrent against businesses looking to enter the sex trade. Today, we will change that.

FOSTA will allow prosecutors across the country to protect their communities without fear of section 230 preemption. FOSTA will produce more prosecutions of bad actor websites, more convictions, and put more predators behind bars. It will provide a meaningful criminal deterrent so that fewer businesses will ever enter the sex trade and fewer victims will ever be sold and raped.

Clarification of section 230 is desperately needed. In August 2017, the Sacramento Superior Court dismissed charges brought against Backpage by the California attorney general, saying: "If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of section 230 of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitation of others by human trafficking."

Today, Mr. Chair, Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law to hold accountable websites that support exploitation. FOSTA also creates a new crime targeting websites that are intentionally promoting prostitution, and it encourages States to use or adopt similar laws.

Unfortunately, sex trafficking ads are written to evade law enforcement. Looking at these ads, you usually can't tell that force, fraud, and coercion were used against the victim or that the person depicted in the ad is a minor.

□ 1430

Because indications of knowledge of sex trafficking are typically hidden, it is nearly impossible for prosecutors to demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that the website operators knew that the ads involved sex trafficking. This is why prosecutors tell me that they would oftentimes prefer to use prostitution laws instead of sex trafficking laws when charging these websites.

Sex trafficking laws are written to target pimps, johns, and businesses, but are not always the best tool against the online sex trade. FOSTA gives prosecutors the freedom to use both State sex trafficking laws and the State prostitution laws, and lets prosecutors decide how best to do their jobs.

Importantly, prosecutors will be able to seek a higher penalty for websites that promote prostitution and recklessly contribute to sex trafficking. Online sex trafficking is flourishing in America because there are no serious legal consequences for the websites that profit from the exploitation of our most vulnerable.

FOSTA, combined with the SESTA Walters amendment that adds back in victim-centered provisions from my original language, will finally create these serious legal consequences.

Today we are voting to keep our commitment to trafficking survivors, both by empowering them to hold ac-

countable the websites that stole them and by arming prosecutors with the tools they need to ensure that the most vulnerable members of our society are never sold online in the first place.

I trust that my colleagues will join me in this vote to fundamentally transform the fight against online sex trafficking in America.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), a Democratic cosponsor of this legislation. I thank her very much for her perseverance and determination.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE not only for yielding me time, but for all her scholarship and all of her commitment to making a difference against sex trafficking.

Mr. Chair, today is a proud day for me. I am proud to stand here on this House floor to urge the support and passage of the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, known as FOSTA, as well as the Walters amendment.

Human trafficking and sex trafficking is happening in all areas: big cities, little cities, rural and suburban areas, Democratic districts, Republican districts. It happens in every congressional district in America, regardless of whether that district is red or blue.

Trafficking, Mr. Chair, is a non-partisan issue, and that requires bipartisan solutions. And if Congressman POE were still here, I would add, "And that is just the way it is."

I am so honored to be joined today with so many colleagues. I also want to thank Congresswoman ROBY for her leadership in managing the time. What an honor it is for me to join the leadership of Congresswoman ANN WAGNER, not only the sponsor of this bill, but a friend, a colleague, someone who is my classmate. And early on, she started talking about human trafficking, and we shared our mutual interest; and we have been, so to say, joined at the hip ever since. And I could not thank her enough for all of her leadership.

Mr. Chair, it tells you that we must work together. Congresswoman WAGNER has done that with this legislation and more. So I am very honored to be the lead Democrat. You have heard what the Fighting Online Sex Trafficking Act will do, so I won't go in great details with that again. But I will tell you, it will address a critical problem.

Our laws have not kept pace with how technology has been used to exploit the innocent. The internet has changed how humans are trafficked. It has taken something that was once done in the streets and made it easier and more anonymous. Trafficking online is a well-documented problem, yet we have seen a few websites turn a blind eye, even as they profit on the buying and the selling of children, women, and men.

FOSTA will help solve this in many ways, as you have heard. On this last

point, I would like to say FOSTA is targeted in a way that will not only affect websites engaged in the online trafficking trade; it will recognize some of the concerns that some of the tech communities initially raised. But I think that the process that FOSTA has gone through in the Judiciary Committee and now with the Walters amendment shows how the legislative process can be used.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BEATTY. It shows how the legislative process can be used to result in a better product. The bill now has the support not only of the trafficking victims' advocates, but also of law enforcement and many of the internet and tech companies.

So, again, I thank the hard work of Congresswoman WAGNER. I want to say that we won't solve the problem of human trafficking overnight, but if we get this bill signed into law, we will make it harder for traffickers to exploit the innocent and we will keep countless children, women, and men out of the cycle of abuse.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, the internet was never meant to be a zone of impunity for traffickers and their accomplices, including classified ad websites, that turn a blind eye to or actively facilitate to profit from the sex trafficking of children. Yet we are seeing the internet used as a virtual slave market.

Today, because of ANN WAGNER's tenacity, her courage, her legislative skill and compassion, and this bipartisan effort that, again, comes to the floor to make a major change in law, we begin taking back the internet from traffickers by passing H.R. 1865. This legislation will also allow those who have been hurt to sue. It empowers women, especially women, to take their cases into court and to get remedies there as well.

Today we say no to the status quo that allows our children to be bought, abused, and sold again with impunity online. Today we say no to courts slamming the door on trafficking victims who want to sue website owners complicit in sexual abuse and cruelty.

Mr. Chair, the statistics of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children show that backpage.com is the subject of the majority of the child trafficking tips that are received in the United States. In documents obtained by subpoena that backpage.com originally refused to share—and I see that Mrs. MALONEY will be speaking in a moment; she and I worked very hard on that as well—Congress has found that backpage.com was removing telltale words and signs of likely human trafficking from advertisements on its

website but still posting the advertisements and making money. They made it harder to detect.

Backpage.com actively prevented U.S. law enforcement from detecting children being trafficked. Backpage wasn't prosecuted. Judges across the country wouldn't even allow civil suits by trafficking victims who were sold through backpage.com, as was pointed out by ANN WAGNER just a moment ago, all because of a law that was written before the internet or human trafficking was really understood: Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act.

Today, Congress will change that law. God willing it passes in the Senate and it will be signed by the President.

Today we can protect our children and free speech, too. H.R. 1865, as amended, will allow State prosecutors to prosecute, and it empowers trafficked women, victims, to sue the middleman who facilitated and profited from their slavery.

The status quo of rampant child online sex trafficking is more than unacceptable; it is absolutely abhorrent to anyone who believes in human dignity and human rights. This is a tremendous bill. Mr. Chair, again, I thank ANN WAGNER for her leadership.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who joined with Representative JOYCE BEATTY from Ohio and the lead sponsor, Congresswoman WAGNER, to be strong supporters of this legislation. She is an original cosponsor of the bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I thank Congresswoman LEE for yielding and for her extraordinary leadership on this issue and in so many other areas.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong, strong support of H.R. 1865. It is transformative legislation. It is important and it will save lives. It is a historic legislative achievement. I thank my colleague ANN WAGNER for her selfless, dedicated, effective leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. I thank my colleagues, JOYCE BEATTY and SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Congresswomen ROBY and WALTERS, really everyone, and the leadership of this body for bringing this bill to the floor. I hope we should all pass it. It is important.

This bill clarifies that internet companies that actively advertise the sale of trafficking victims, many of whom are children and minors, are not protected by the Communications Decency Act, Section 230. When Congress enacted it 22 years ago, it never, never intended to make the internet into a red-light zone and a protected area to shield sex traffickers and corporations from selling our young people, many of whom are stolen, doped, forced into sex trafficking, and then protect them from the appeals of their parents for some type of justification, some type of recognition of the harm that they have caused.

Now, this bill, like every other sex trafficking bill, has been a bipartisan effort between Democrats and Republicans. It is landmark. It is important. And we must continue to fight this modern-day form of slavery wherever it exists, and this crime has absolutely exploded online because it is so profitable.

You can sell a gun once. You can sell illegal dope once. But they sell the human body over and over again until they die.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, this is an important issue. I must tell you that we have a choice.

This has gone to the courts, and the courts have said Congress must decide whether Congress wants to shield corporations, profit-makers, exploiters—I would say—murderers of young children online, selling them for sex trafficking. So if you vote against this bill, you are shielding them. If you vote for it, you are protecting our children.

This bill removes obstacles for attorneys general throughout the country to enact State antitrafficking laws. That is why 50 attorneys general have supported it.

Victims and families will be given a pathway to justice through private civil action that they have been denied too long. Over 50 organizations have come out in support of H.R. 1865, and I include in the RECORD a list of those organizations.

Shared Hope International, Arlington, VA; Rights4Girls, Washington, DC; Covenant House International, New York, NY; ECPAT USA, Washington, DC; World Without Exploitation, New York, NY; Mary Mazzio & I AM JANE DOE Community, Boston, MA; Courtney's House, Washington, DC; Legal Momentum, New York, NY; Equality Now, New York, NY; National Center on Sexual Exploitation (NCOSE), Washington, DC; My Life My Choice, Boston, MA; Truckers Against Trafficking, Englewood, CO; Sanctuary For Families, New York, NY; Trafficking in America Task Force, Gainesville, FL; CSA San Diego County, El Cajon, CA; Villanova Law School Institute on Commercial Sexual Exploitation, Villanova, PA; National Council of Jewish Women New York, New York, NY; Dawn's Place, Philadelphia, PA; Child's World America, Villanova, PA; Freedom From Exploitation, Inc., San Diego, CA.

Women's Justice NOW, New York, NY; Children's Law Center of California, Sacramento, CA; Carole Landis Foundation For Social Action, Haverford, PA; The Voices and Faces Project, Chicago, IL; NH Traffick Free Coalition, Milford, NH; The Samaritan Women, Baltimore, MD; Free to Thrive, San Diego, CA; Enough Is Enough, Great Falls, VA; The Lynch Foundation for Children, Rancho Santa Fe, CA; Bags of Hope Ministries, Boston, MA; Hope Ranch For Women, Wichita, KS; Wings of Refuge, Iowa Falls, IA; North Star Initiative, Lititz, PA; Zoë Ministries, Greenwood, DE; Abolition Ohio, Dayton, OH; Arrow Child & Family Ministries, Baltimore, MD; Consumer Watchdog, Wash-

ington, DC; Airline Ambassadors International, Arlington, VA; Journey Out, Los Angeles, CA; The Ricky Martin Foundation, San Juan, PR; Praesidium Partners, Richmond, VA; Worthwhile Wear, Silverdale, PA; Amirah, Woburn, MA; Saved in America, Oceanside, CA; Awaken, Reno, NV; Ala Kuola, Honolulu, HI; Glory House of Miami, Miami, FL; Generate Hope, San Diego, CA; Refuge for Women Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV.

#### INDIVIDUAL SIGNATURES

J.S., Child sex trafficking survivor, Chattanooga, TN.

Tom and Nacole S., Parents of a child sex trafficking survivor, Chattanooga, TN.

Kubiiki Pride, Mother of a child sex trafficking survivor, Boston, MA.

Ambassador Swanee Hunt.

Marian Hatcher, Senior Project Manager/Human Trafficking Coordinator, Cook County Sheriff's Office, Chicago, IL.

Penny M. Venetis, Clinical Prof. of Law/Director, International Human Rights Clinic, Rutgers Law School, Newark, NJ.

Michelle Madden Dempsey, Professor of Law, Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law, Villanova, PA.

Donna M. Hughes, Professor, Eleanor M and Oscar M Carlson Endowed Chair, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI.

Jody Raphael, Senior Research Fellow, DePaul University College of Law, Chicago, IL.

Audrey Rogers, Professor of Law, Elisabeth Haub School of Law, New York, NY.

Katha Pollitt, Columnist, The Nation, New York, NY.

Sarah Robinson, Public Defender, Defender Association of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA.

Dayle Ann Hunt, Playwright, The Trauma Brain Project, Chicago, IL.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Some corporations, like Facebook, Sheryl Sandberg, and others have stood up and said: Enough is enough; protect our children.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the following statement from Sheryl Sandberg of Facebook.

Sex trafficking—particularly of young girls and boys—is one of the most heinous acts that takes place anywhere in the world. Those of us in the United States must recognize that these deplorable acts of buying and selling children for sex don't just happen in other countries. They happen here all as well—right under our noses, on our streets, and on the Internet. We all have a responsibility to do our part to fight this. That's why we at Facebook support efforts to pass amended legislation in the House that would allow responsible companies to continue fighting sex trafficking while giving victims the chance to seek justice against companies that knowingly facilitate such abhorrent acts.

I care deeply about this issue and I'm so thankful to all the advocates who are fighting tirelessly to make sure we put a stop to trafficking while helping victims get the support they need. Facebook is committed to working with them and with legislators in the House and Senate as the process moves forward to make sure we pass meaningful and strong legislation to stop sex trafficking.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, today, 22 years after

Congress passed the CDA, we have the opportunity to declare that the intention of the law was never to protect traffickers and companies that actively sell and enable them to continue this incredible, horrible, life-taking crime of promoting sex trafficking and selling our young people.

I urge a strong “no” vote. Let’s make it unanimous. Let’s show the world, the courts, the families, the victims where we stand.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), our fearless leader, the chairman of our conference.

□ 1445

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, for her tremendous leadership; the leadership of the gentlewoman from Missouri; and so many more.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017.

There is no question that human sex trafficking is one of the most significant epidemics that we face today. It often takes place in our own backyards, like in my district in eastern Washington. It targets our children, families, friends, and neighbors.

Fortunately, there are so many organizations, and I am grateful for those in eastern Washington who have stepped up—the Coalition to Abolish Human Trafficking—working to stop these horrific and heartbreaking crimes.

This bill will help fight online human trafficking through websites like Backpage, that serve as an illicit forum for traffickers.

I also rise in support of the amendment by my friend MIMI WALTERS from California, which I believe is crucial to the success of this bill.

By strengthening section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, we can restore victims’ access to justice and hold accountable tech companies and online websites that make human trafficking easier and knowingly turn a blind eye.

We know these websites have the ability to sensor content, and we see it in the political world every day. So why can’t they work harder to sensor and remove posts related to sex trafficking and enslavement of other human beings?

This isn’t hard. It is common sense to hold websites accountable for the crimes committed on their sites.

We all must work together to put an end to human sex trafficking, which is why I urge my colleagues to support the Walters amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a member of the Judiciary Committee, a distinguished Member, who is the ranking

member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security and knows about violations of human beings.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, section 230 of the Communications Decency Act has been an important element of the law. It has allowed the internet to flourish. We support that.

But we never intended section 230 to protect people who are trafficking in human beings, who are abusing children, who are prostituting children. Really, modern slavery. It is an outrage.

And when we saw the court cases about Backpage where they basically used the CDA as a shield for action that was absolutely criminal, in my judgment, those guys belong in prison, as far as I am concerned. The good news is that the bill drafted by Representative WAGNER actually fixes this problem.

We just got a letter from the U.S. Department of Justice. I just received it. This is what they say: “Every day, trafficking victims in America appear in online advertisements that are used to sell them for sex. The Department works diligently to hold traffickers accountable for their crimes but faces serious challenges.”

It goes on to say that the “high evidentiary standard needed” is a problem; but it also says that that bill, as drafted and reported from the Judiciary Committee, addresses the issues that are preventing prosecution, and it “would take meaningful steps to end the industry of advertising trafficking victims for commercial sex.”

I would just like to say thanks to the authors of the bill, as well as the Judiciary Committee, on which I serve. We worked together on a bipartisan basis to make adjustments. We had hearings so that we could have this bill that the Department of Justice says will allow them to successfully go after these guys who are trafficking these children and other victims.

A word of caution, however, and I will talk about this later when the amendment comes up, on the Walters amendment.

The Justice Department says in this letter that they believe “any revision . . . to define ‘participation in a venture’ is unnecessary,” and, in fact, that the “new language would impact prosecutions by effectively creating additional elements.” In fact, they say the amendment will make it harder to prosecute.

We get told in law school that bad cases make bad law. One of the ways to avoid that is to have the committee process work through it. That did not happen in the case of the amendment that will be offered later.

So based on the Justice Department’s admonition, I am grateful to their celebration of the underlying bill, and I am mindful of their warning that the amendment could undo all of the good work that we have done on a bipartisan basis.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

This legislation will finally make a meaningful difference in combating online sex trafficking. For too long, bad actor websites have operated with impunity in selling young women and girls forced into the commercial sale of sex. They have, beyond any shadow of a doubt, profited off the misery of others. They have convinced courts to misapply the Communications Decency Act, a Federal law that was originally intended to encourage websites to police content and rid platforms of illegal content. They have misused the Communications Decency Act as a shield to avoid criminal liability in State courts.

Given the number of local websites that are deliberately selling women and children for sex, we must now take steps to allow Federal, State, and local prosecutors to hold these websites accountable and dismantle these illicit, heinous online markets.

H.R. 1865 will ensure vigorous criminal enforcement against bad actor websites by creating a new Federal law to prosecute these sites and explicitly permitting States the ability to enforce comparable laws.

While the Federal code does not criminalize the knowing advertisement of sex trafficking, this statute is, unfortunately, of limited utility. Nearly all websites responsible for rampant sex trafficking advertisements host ads that rarely, if ever, state that the victim being sold is either underage or subject to force, fraud, or coercion.

Therefore, this bill takes measures to target websites that are deliberately promoting and facilitating prostitution.

Additionally, H.R. 1865 provides for an aggravated violation that applies to websites that promote prostitution in reckless disregard of the fact that sex trafficking is occurring on their platform.

I want to highlight, Mr. Chairman, an amendment that will be offered to this legislation. Though I applaud my colleague’s dedication to this issue and fully appreciate the suffering of victims, I have concerns about this amendment which states that the provisions of the bill apply regardless of whether the conduct alleged occurred or is alleged to have occurred before, on, or after such date of enactment.

Had regular order been followed, Mr. Chairman, the Judiciary Committee would certainly have fixed this issue, which I believe could subject this legislation to a constitutional challenge under the ex post facto clause, a concern shared by the Justice Department.

I hope we have an opportunity to fix this problem as we move forward with the bill, and I include in the RECORD a



letter from the Department of Justice highlighting these constitutional concerns.

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, DC, February 27, 2018.

Hon. ROBERT W. GOODLATTE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter presents the views of the Department of Justice (Department) on H.R. 1865, the "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017." The Department supports H.R. 1865. We applaud House and Senate legislative efforts to address the use of websites to facilitate sex trafficking and to protect and restore victims who were sold for sex online. The Department appreciates this opportunity to provide technical assistance to ensure that these goals are fully met through narrowly tailored legislation. The Department also notes that a provision in the bill raises a serious constitutional concern.

Every day, trafficking victims in America appear in online advertisements that are used to sell them for sex. The Department works diligently to hold the traffickers accountable for their crimes but faces serious challenges. This is due in part to the high evidentiary standard needed to bring federal criminal charges for advertising sex trafficking, but also because the Communications Decency Act (CDA), codified at 47 U.S.C. § 230, bars our state and local partners from bringing any criminal action that is inconsistent with that section. H.R. 1865 addresses both issues and would take meaningful steps to end the industry of advertising trafficking victims for commercial sex.

#### TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Section 3(a) of the bill creates 18 U.S.C. § 2421A, a new federal offense that prohibits the use or operation of websites (and other means or facilities of interstate commerce) with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution. The bill also provides for an aggravated felony if the defendant recklessly disregards that the crime contributed to sex trafficking as prohibited by 18 U.S.C. § 1591(a). Section 2421A would stand as a strong complement to existing federal laws.

However, the Department notes that Section 2421A as originally drafted is broader than necessary because it would extend to situations where there is a minimal federal interest, such as to instances in which an individual person uses a cell phone to manage local commercial sex transactions involving consenting adults. Therefore, the Department would support amending the language of Section 2421A so that Congress can clarify its intent to target traffickers using or operating interactive computer services, as follows (with a corresponding change to 2421A(b)): "Whoever, using a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, owns, manages, or operates an interactive computer service, as defined in Section 230(f) of Title 47, United States Code, or conspires or attempts to do so, with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both."

The Department believes that any revision to 18 U.S.C. § 1591 to define "participation in a venture" is unnecessary. Section 1591 already sets an appropriately high burden of proof, particularly in cases involving advertising. Under current law, prosecutors must prove that the defendant knowingly benefitted from participation in a sex trafficking venture, knew that the advertisement related to commercial sex, and knew that the advertisement involved a minor or the use of force, fraud, or coercion. See *Backpage.com*,

*LLC v. Lynch*, D.D.C., Civil Action No. 15-2155, Docket 16 (Oct. 24, 2016). While well intentioned, this new language would impact prosecutions by effectively creating additional elements that prosecutors must prove at trial. In the context of the bill, which also permits States to bring actions for conduct equivalent to Section 1591, we are also mindful that this language could have unintended consequences as applied by the States.

Section 4 of H.R. 1865 also sets forth critical revisions to the CDA to permit state prosecutors to bring criminal actions related to sex trafficking and the use of the internet with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution. The Department believes that the existence of this exception to the CDA will alter the landscape of the industry involved in advertising prostitution.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL CONCERN

We note that Section 4 of H.R. 1865 states that the changes to the CDA "shall apply regardless of whether the conduct alleged occurred [sic], or is alleged to have occurred, before, on, or after such date of enactment." This raises a serious constitutional concern. Insofar as this bill would "impose[] a punishment for an act which was not punishable at the time it was committed" or "impose[] additional punishment to that then prescribed" it would violate the Constitution's Ex Post Facto Clause. *Cummings v. Missouri*, 4 Wall. 277, 325-326 (1867); see *Beazell v. Ohio*, 269 U.S. 167, 169-170 (1925); U.S. Const. art I, § 9, cl. 3. The Department objects to this provision because it is unconstitutional. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Congress to address this serious constitutional concern.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views in support of this legislation. We hope this information is helpful, and we look forward to continuing to work with Congress on this important legislation. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may provide additional assistance regarding this or any other matter. The Office of Management and Budget has advised us that from the perspective of the Administration's program, there is no objection to submission of this letter.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN E. BOYD,  
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I will support this bill since its strong reforms will allow State and local prosecutors to vigorously enforce the law against some of the worst criminals in society today.

This bill will allow law enforcement to effectively dismantle this lucrative, expansive, immoral, reprehensible market. Our children and vulnerable women are not commodities to be sold. This legislation emphatically affirms that fact. It will truly make a difference.

I would like to commend my colleague Mrs. WAGNER from Missouri and her dedicated staff for their work on this legislation and for their continued dedication to combatting sex trafficking and supporting victims.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is one of several we passed in the House that aims to combat the horrific and disgusting act of sex trafficking of minors on our borders.

Today, I want to share two stories of Ashton Talley and Arissa Farmer, both from my district, the First District of Arkansas, who were taken for the purpose of being trafficked, but, thankfully, were rescued before being lost in this abominable trade.

These young women were sought online by men preying on thousands of underage minors. Their stories, sadly, mirror one another and those of countless other minors across America.

Both were courted online by older men and believed they were engaging in harmless friendships. In both instances, these men traveled to my district from other States to take Ashton and Arissa to Washington State and Nebraska, respectively, for their horrific purposes.

It is believed that, for one of the victims, her eventual destination was to be the Super Bowl in Minneapolis, which reportedly draws an increase in trafficking activity for big events like that. In the other case, the victim was one of over 8,000 minors sought online by her predator.

Mr. Chairman, these girls are not unlike our own children. They are kids that we all see in our schools, our churches, and our neighborhoods. We must take the necessary steps like H.R. 1865 to protect America's children from these repugnant individuals.

This bill will not be the end-all for stamping out this unfortunate segment of society. We must all recognize this despicable act for what it is and work together to protect our youth by enacting responsible policy and becoming educated in the tactics used by predators to groom and lure our children.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I remain committed to fighting the ongoing practice of sex trafficking.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time and offer a closing to this important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as indicated, I had offered an amendment that would have allowed victims of sex trafficking to file civil action in State courts under the same conditions set forth in the underlying bill for Federal/civil actions.

I believe, however, that we have laid a stupendous foundation for innocent victims and that we will have an opportunity to work with all of our friends who fought so hard for this legislation.

So again, I want to take the opportunity to thank Congresswoman WAGNER and her cosponsors, and as well Congresswoman MALONEY and Congresswoman BEATTY, and the work that we have done in the Judiciary Committee through a period of coming together, I believe, is extremely constructive.

It is so constructive that we have any number of support letters. I include in



the RECORD a statement by John F. Clark, President and CEO of the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children.

STATEMENT BY JOHN F. CLARK, PRESIDENT & AND CEO, NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN

REGARDING HOUSE ACTION ON LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE JUSTICE TO CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS—FEBRUARY 23, 2018

The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children is pleased that the House of Representatives is scheduled to consider Representative Ann Wagner's Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act (H.R. 1865) next week. We strongly urge all Members to support the crucial amendment offered by Representative Mimi Walters, which makes long needed updates to the Communications Decency Act (CDA) to ensure that children trafficked for sex online can have their day in court against online traffickers and to clarify that there is no legal protection for anyone who participates in the sex trafficking of children.

We especially thank Senators Rob Portman and Richard Blumenthal for their powerful leadership in authoring the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act (S. 1693), which is the basis for Representative Walters' amendment, and for their ongoing support of the child survivors, their families, and the coalition of advocacy organizations who serve these survivors.

We look forward to continuing to work with Members of Congress to bring this legislation to a vote on the House Floor and through the Senate so that it can get to the President's desk to be signed into law.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from Enough is Enough.

For Immediate Release: February 26, 2018

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH CALLS ON THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO PASS CRITICAL LEGISLATION TO HOLD WEBSITES ACCOUNTABLE FOR KNOWINGLY FACILITATING SEX TRAFFICKING

STATEMENT BY DONNA RICE HUGHES, PRESIDENT & CEO, ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

GREAT FALLS, VA.—H.R. 1865, the Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017 (FOSTA), originally introduced by Representative Ann Wagner, is scheduled for an historic floor vote on Tuesday. The need for legislation to clarify Section 230 of the Communication's Decency Act (CDA) is necessary given the 1st Circuit ruling in *Doe v Backpage* which held that even if Backpage had participated in the crime of sex trafficking, Section 230 shielded the company from the claims filed by child victims.

"The urgency to amend Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act is long overdue," said EIE President Donna Rice Hughes. "Section 230, originally known as the Good Samaritan Defense, was intended to protect children from the online exploitation. Unfortunately, it has been anything but a Good Samaritan immunity for responsible Internet service and content providers, and instead has been misused by third party websites like backpage.com as a Trojan horse to knowingly facilitate sex and trafficking with women in children," said Ms. Hughes. "There must be accountability in the form of state and local criminal and civil liability for such sites which have been referred to by prosecutors as an 'online brothel.' Its time to put the dignity of women and children over corporate profit," said Hughes.

For years, EIE has encouraged Congress to amend Section 230 due to a series of devastating rulings in multiple court cases over the years which have misinterpreted Section

230 of the Communications Decency Act by granting anything goes immunity to websites whose advertising business model knowingly facilitates sex trafficking and exploitation.

"By passing FOSTA along with the crucial amendment offered by Representative Mimi Walters which mirrors S. 1693 "Stop Enabling Sex Trafficking Act 2017" (SESTA), each member of the House has the opportunity to send an 'enough is enough' clarion message to sites who exploit and traffic vulnerable children and women and to the federal courts who have failed to properly interpret Congress's original intent for #230. An overwhelming 'yes' vote by the House will say to child victims, 'we hear you, we see you and we are standing with you by providing the necessary legislative remedy to seek justice,'" continued Hughes, who applauded the resolution last week set forth unanimously by the Kentucky House of Representatives, which requested and petitioned the U.S. Congress to amend sections of the Community Decency Act (CDA 230) to "permit the prosecution of interactive computer service providers."

In 2016, during his candidacy, Donald Trump signed EIE's Children's Internet Safety Presidential Pledge in which he promised to "aggressively enforce existing federal laws to prevent the sexual exploitation of children online, including the obscenity, child pornography, sexual predation & sex trafficking laws." Ms. Hughes added, "We strongly urge the House to pass the FOSTA-SESTA compromise package and move it to the Senate, offering hope to and justice for those who have suffered from this unconscionable act of human exploitation." SESTA, originally introduced by Senators Portman and Blumenthal currently has 67 bipartisan Senate co-sponsors and is endorsed by the Internet Association (IA), as is H.R. 1865.

In 2013, Enough Is Enough voiced strong support of the effort of The National Association of Attorneys General (49 Attorneys General) calling on Congress to support a simple two word amendment that would enable state prosecutors to help fight prostitution and child sex trafficking. Unfortunately, Congress failed to act, resulting in more years of untold trauma and exploitation for trafficking victims and huge profits for websites and interactive service providers.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I also include in the RECORD a letter from World Without Exploitation with many, many signatures.

For Immediate Release

NATIONAL ANTI-TRAFFICKING COALITION URGES CONGRESS TO PASS FOSTA WITH SECTION 230 PROVISION TO CURB ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING—AS INTERNET DEMAND EXPLODES, WORLD WITHOUT EXPLOITATION CALLS ON NATIONAL LAWMAKERS TO SUPPORT SURVIVORS AND STEM THE TIDE OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING BY HOLDING WEBSITES ACCOUNTABLE

NEW YORK, NY—FEBRUARY 26, 2018—World Without Exploitation (WorldWE), the national coalition to end human trafficking and exploitation, today urges members of Congress to pass legislation that would clarify Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act and allow state law enforcement and survivors to seek justice against websites that knowingly engage in facilitating human trafficking. The bill will help disrupt sex trafficking in the United States, much of which has shifted from the streets to the Internet.

The Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017 (FOSTA), H.R. 1865, was introduced by

Rep. Ann Wagner (R-MO) and now includes a crucial amendment by Rep. Mimi Walters (R-CA) that seeks to close a legal loophole in Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act that allows websites that host online sex ads to operate with impunity. The Walters amendment echoes language from the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act of 2017 (SESTA), S. 1693 sponsored in the Senate by Rob Portman (R-OH) and Richard Blumenthal (D-CT).

"Every day, thousands of children and adults are being illegally bought and sold online, and the websites that facilitate these transactions have been able to hide behind legislation that was never designed to shelter this kind of activity," said Lauren Hersh, national director of WorldWE. "WorldWE and our members are incredibly grateful to Reps. Wagner and Walters and Sens. Portman and Blumenthal, among many others, for listening to the voices of survivors and driving meaningful change with so much bipartisan support. The urgency we are seeing to stop human trafficking at the highest levels of our government is truly inspiring."

With the growth of the Internet, human trafficking that once happened mainly on street corners has largely shifted online. According to the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, 73 percent of the 10,000 child sex trafficking reports it receives from the public each year involve ads on the website Backpage.com. The anonymity and ease with which victims can be bought and sold on the Internet has created a multibillion-dollar industry, and a tremendous surge in exploitation across the United States.

"The illegal sex trade is no less odious simply because it is operating on the Web," said Anne K. Ream, founding co-chair of WorldWE. "Wherever it happens, whenever it happens, human trafficking is an industry in which profits are built on human pain. We need public policies that are responsive to the current face of trafficking, which is why passage of FOSTA with the Walters amendment is so critical."

"We urge the House to pass FOSTA with the Walters amendment and send the bill to the Senate for adoption," said Nikki Bell, founder and director of Living in Freedom Together (LIFT), a survivor-led organization. "We are hoping after today, we will be one step closer to bringing justice to survivors and disrupting the profitable model of online trafficking in our country."

To learn more about WorldWE, hear survivor stories, donate, and join our movement to create a world without exploitation, please visit <http://www.worldwithoutexploitation.org/>

ABOUT WORLD WITHOUT EXPLOITATION

World Without Exploitation (WorldWE) is a national coalition of more than 100 organizations and individuals committed to human rights, civil rights, and gender justice. WorldWE's mission is to create a world where no person is bought, sold or exploited. The coalition aims to create a culture where those who have been trafficked or sexually exploited are treated as victims of a crime, not criminals themselves, while those who purchase, sell or exploit another human being are punished.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. What was it like before this legislation? Simply, J.S., who is documented in the film "Jane Doe," will tell you. A bright young lady, 15 years old, ran on the track team here in this area and, for her own enthusiasm, went to Seattle, Washington.

When she went to Seattle, Washington, it would have been nice if a kind soul had found her, but that was not the case.

Within 15 days, she met a man twice her age, who seduced her with gifts and convinced her to stay with him. Once she trusted the 32-year-old, he quickly turned on her and raped her, and he would post explicit pictures of her in an ad on Backpage.com, and she was forced to continue to have sex for money.

□ 1500

One would think that there was relief. But when her family sought to file in court, she lost. She lost. Only through the work of Congress has her case been able to move forward on an appeal.

So the work that we have done is vital to saving lives and to restoring lives. I am inspired and energized by the countless survivors, many of whom I have seen today and many of whom I have joined with last Monday in my district.

As a leader in the fight against human and sex trafficking and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I am painfully familiar with the pervasiveness of sex trafficking in my own State of Texas, which has become a hotbed of human trafficking in the city of Houston.

Among law enforcement and human trafficking authorities, Houston is known as a hub of human trafficking, not because of the lack of concern and energy in my law enforcement and social service community. It is just an epicenter because of the ability for people to come because of the warm weather, for children who have aged out of foster care, and for others who are victims of human trafficking.

The highest number of calls to the National Human Trafficking Hotline in Texas comes from Houston, and a study conducted by the University of Texas stated that there are more than 300,000 victims of human trafficking in Texas, including almost 79,000 minors.

The story of Kathy, right here in Houston, in the few minutes I have left, I would like to share the story of a young woman named Kathy who moved to Houston in 1994 with her family. Kathy was raised to be strong and independent. She was very involved in a church community and ROTC. So in the few minutes I have remaining, I will share the story of Kathy.

She graduated from high school with hopes of pursuing a career in journalism, but she became a victim of sex trafficking. Like most girls, she wanted to be loved. She met a charming young man who treated her like she had never been treated before.

After a fairytale year, her Prince Charming proposed something Kathy felt she could not refuse: a promising job with his company, an administrative position that would triple her income and provide financial security for her future. It seemed like a dream come true.

The job was in Dallas. Despite her initial hesitation, she saw the offer as

an opportunity to provide for her family. But shortly after she arrived in Dallas, Kathy found herself in the dark world of sex trafficking and prostitution, a life she never knew she would be involved in.

Graphic images were taken of her and placed on the internet against her will. She was forced to perform sexual favors multiple times every day throughout Dallas' surrounding areas.

Escape was not easy. She was cut off from her family. Her boyfriend-turned-pimp limited her phone calls to johns and did not allow her to have money. Somehow she found an opportunity to get away, and she never looked back.

After many years of living in silence, Kathy decided to journal her experience. The journal became a book, which became a stage play. Kathy found her voice and is now an inspirational speaker who hopes to use her story to encourage others to join the fight.

Images of Kathy's horrific past linger on. She said:

Sites like Backpage have chosen to revictimize survivors and keep us in bondage by refusing to remove images taken against our will.

Kathy hopes that one day the voices of survivors will be heard. Well, we hear Kathy today. Congress hears her. We hear the voices of the victims remaining in physical and mental bondage.

So, in conclusion, let me say, as we hear the voices of the survivors, we realize the importance of our First Amendment and the ability of free expression. But we know that the torment that these victims are going through, the PTSD that they are suffering, really is a statement of importance for H.R. 1865 that allows States and victims to fight online sex trafficking and to work with all of those who have worked so hard on this bill, from our Judiciary Committee to the Senate Judiciary Committee to the sponsors, and to go forward building on this legislation with more legislation, more victims being able to work with us, and, finally, Mr. Chairman, to be able to stomp out and extinguish human trafficking, sex trafficking, and online trafficking.

This is a powerful nation. There is no reason why we cannot do this. I look forward to that effort. With that, I ask for a vote of "yes" on this bill.

I want to say that Mrs. MALONEY, who sounded as if she said vote "no," really meant to say she wants a resounding "yes" on this legislation as well.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank my colleague, ANN WAGNER, for all of her hard work on this very, very important piece of legislation.

It is our responsibility here in Congress to provide the strongest, most effective tools possible to confront, pun-

ish, and, ultimately, prevent the horrific nightmare that is human sex trafficking. For far too long, we have seen a stark rise in the use of the internet to buy and sell trafficking victims and minors for sex.

This sick industry has been allowed to prosper because, due to broad interpretation of existing law, there have been no serious legal consequences for websites that turn a profit by selling human beings. Today it is incumbent upon us to stop this horrifying injustice by passing H.R. 1865 to finally give prosecutors the tools they need to crack down on sites that promote and participate in the human sex trade.

Mr. Chairman, I call on all my colleagues to support this legislation today and to send a clear message that we will no longer tolerate this evil, atrocious behavior, and we will no longer be complicit in letting these bad actors get away with these hateful crimes against humanity.

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD these excerpts from a series of articles entitled "Slaves of the Sex Trade" by Rory Appleton from the Fresno Bee: "Don't kid yourself. Sex slaves are all around us—and you may know some of them" (November 2, 2017), "She was a hospital worker. He sold her for sex before, during and after her shifts" (November 2, 2017), "Police: 'Every 16-year-old girl in Fresno' has been targeted by sex trade recruiters" (November 9, 2017), "Once sold for sex, she now helps lead the fight against human trafficking" (November 15, 2017), "How do you rescue women forced to walk the streets at night? It's not easy" (November 16, 2017), "To break the cycle of children sold for sex, the legal system is trying something new" (November 28, 2017), "All of us must help beat the scourge of human trafficking. Here's what you can do" (December 7, 2017). The full series can be found at <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/>.

These seven articles demonstrate the impact of sex trafficking on our communities. I commend the Fresno Bee on their important reporting.

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 2, 2017]

DON'T KID YOURSELF. SEX SLAVES ARE ALL AROUND US—AND YOU MAY KNOW SOME OF THEM

(By Rory Appleton)

Rebecca Rodriguez-Brown still remembers the room where he imprisoned her—the charming man she met and fell in love with while still a teenager. She mapped it out with her hands as she sat in a central Fresno office nearly 20 years later.

"They would have a little microwave there, and they would have a little ice chest right there by the sink," she said. "I still remember the color of the ice chest."

Rodriguez-Brown isn't sure whether the room was in an apartment or hotel. But she does remember that for seven months she was kept in this room under guard and forced to perform whatever sex act the strangers entering the room asked for. The room was punishment for refusing to do the same at her trafficker's home. Her captors brought her all of her meals. If she defied them, she'd be beaten—sometimes with her hands bound.

The Bee normally does not identify the victims of sexual assault, however Rodriguez-Brown agreed to be named.

Her story is not uncommon in Fresno, or anywhere in the world. It is one of cyclical abuse, habitual arrest and unspeakable trauma. Women and children are bought and sold every day in Fresno—online, in street corners, while at school. They are raped, branded and beaten. They are taught that they are the problem, not the people who force them into this life—causing psychological scars that may never heal.

It is what many refer to as “modern-day slavery.”

Full article is available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article182090031.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 2, 2017]

**SHE WAS A HOSPITAL WORKER. HE SOLD HER FOR SEX BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER HER SHIFTS**

(By Rory Appleton)

At her lowest point, the days seemed to stretch on forever. Eight hours a day as a hospital administrator, five hours—sometimes more—as a prostitute.

He would wake her up at 4 a.m. to walk the streets. She hated it—not that the house calls were much better. But when she begged to stop, he would convince her the fault was hers. Eventually, she would apologize and allow him to drop her off before the sun was up.

“He wanted at least \$300 before I went to work at the hospital,” she said.

So she would work the streets for three hours before starting an eight-hour day scheduling appointments in the nephrology unit of a San Diego hospital—a job she had enjoyed before she met him. He eventually forced her to have sex with men during her lunch break, in addition to before and after work. On the weekends, he took her to neighboring cities—a common tactic to avoid law enforcement or reach a new clientele.

“If it were up to him, I would have never slept,” she said.

The mood-altering drug Xanax helped with the anxiety stemming from the intense guilt she felt. She was ashamed to talk to her friends and family—not that she could have if she wanted to. He had her phone now, and he made sure she never heard about her mother’s attempts to contact her.

This woman, now 34, is one of thousands who are sex-trafficked in California each year and one of hundreds of victims now living in the central San Joaquin Valley.

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article182089821.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 9, 2017]

**POLICE: ‘EVERY 16-YEAR-OLD GIRL IN FRESNO’ HAS BEEN TARGETED BY SEX TRADE RECRUITERS**

(By Rory Appleton)

It was about 2 p.m. on a Tuesday when the 15-year-old girl left her central Fresno hotel room. She climbed into a car driven by a stranger, who would take her to another stranger with whom she had agreed to have sex for money.

If it had been a few minutes later, the girl could have easily blended in with children walking home from school. She was not dressed provocatively; she wore a red Fresno State sweatshirt and jeans. She was not wearing excessive makeup. She carried a backpack.

Who knows how many times she had followed this pattern—strange men and strange cars. Online advertisements showed her in various states of undress.

That’s how the vice unit of the Fresno Police Department found her. Today, these strangers were both undercover officers. Tonight, she will be safe.

“She said she hasn’t eaten in five days,” Sgt. Curt Chastain said. “No real family—an unreported runaway. She’s in the sex trade to survive.”

“She wants help,” he continued. “She wants to be in school, but mom won’t sign her up.”

One of Chastain’s undercover detectives confirmed this is not a rare occurrence.

“I’ve had (sex trafficking) victims from every high school in Fresno County—and most junior high schools,” the detective said. The Fresno Bee is not identifying him due to the sensitivity of his work. These traffickers, he added, use a variety of tactics to lure children and young women into “the life.”

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article183592286.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 15, 2017]

**ONCE SOLD FOR SEX, SHE NOW HELPS LEAD THE FIGHT AGAINST HUMAN TRAFFICKING**

(By Rory Appleton)

Arien Pauls doesn’t look like someone who’s been through hell.

She flashes an easy smile as she speaks. Her voice is soft, but her words are deliberate and flow with eloquence. She has a distinct rockabilly style, with one arm bearing a tattoo modeled from Disney’s “The Little Mermaid” and a hair clip featuring two large pink roses.

Looking at her, it’s hard to imagine that a man she loved forced her into slavery. For four years, Pauls was sold for sex on streets and in hotel rooms across the western half of the United States. She was barred from contacting her friends or family. She was arrested multiple times and treated like a criminal—a stigma that even now, five years later, is difficult to shake.

Her worst moments seem unimaginable.

Pauls’ trafficker—a man she believed to be her boyfriend—refused to take her to a hospital when one of the men he sold her to raped her. When she became pregnant with her trafficker’s baby, he forced her into an illegal, late-term abortion. When her reeling body began to produce breast milk after the abortion, her trafficker saw it as a money-maker: Those with certain fetishes would pay extra now, he told her.

It took a daring late-night escape—her trafficker’s SUV roaring behind her getaway car on a Las Vegas street—to get out of that life. But once she returned to Fresno, her arrest record kept her from working in her chosen career, and she has struggled with the mental scars inflicted during her past life.

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article184943988.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 16, 2017]

**HOW DO YOU RESCUE WOMEN FORCED TO WALK THE STREETS AT NIGHT? IT’S NOT EASY**

(By Rory Appleton)

For decades, the women rescued from the hotel rooms and apartments in Fresno where they had been raped, beaten and forced to have sex with strangers for money had few alternatives.

The first—and it was seldom optional—was jail. They could also go to rehab, provided they had a drug problem. But more often than not, they returned to the sex trade.

That is no longer the case.

In 2012, human trafficking became a crime in California, carrying with it new language

for dealing with the crime and harsher penalties for traffickers. Local law enforcement found success against traffickers by treating girls and women in the sex trade as victims, not complicit criminals.

Over the past few years, a growing network of advocates has added new avenues of help for the hundreds of women who are trafficked. These groups have provided victims with shelter, counseling and the tools to rebuild their lives.

Many who work with human trafficking victims consider the practice to be modern-day slavery. If that’s true, this advocacy coalition is the underground railroad.

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article184943793.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 28, 2017]

**TO BREAK THE CYCLE OF CHILDREN SOLD FOR SEX, THE LEGAL SYSTEM IS TRYING SOMETHING NEW**

(By Rory Appleton)

Defense attorney Kristin Maxwell remembers when a client came to her Fresno office shortly after being discharged from a hospital.

The teenage girl had been beaten, raped and dumped in a neighboring county. Police found her unconscious, lying naked in an alley.

“There are some parts of the body that bruise easily, and some that don’t,” said Maxwell, who’s worked in the Fresno County Public Defender’s office for 11 years. “Looking at her, you knew she had been through it. She had been beaten really badly.”

This case stands out for its brutality, Maxwell said. But it was the sheer number of human trafficking cases crossing her desk when she took control of the Public Defender’s juvenile office in 2015 that shocked her into action.

The legal community has partnered with advocacy groups, law enforcement and the Fresno County Probation Department to improve the criminal justice system in an effort to get children out of the sex trade permanently. Their work will soon bear fruit: On Jan. 19, Fresno County’s juvenile court will establish a courtroom dedicated solely to human trafficking cases.

This new court—patterned after similar courts in Sacramento, Los Angeles and other California counties—will allow a judge with specialized training to work with the various partner agencies to ensure children caught up in the sex trade receive help that’s customized for their needs.

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article186937063.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Dec. 7, 2017]

**ALL OF US MUST HELP BEAT THE SCOURGE OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING. HERE’S WHAT YOU CAN DO**

(By Rory Appleton)

Pimps have ensnared Fresno middle-school students who were selling their bodies for extra spending money. Young women have been tricked, blackmailed and forced into having sex with strangers to support men they believed were their boyfriends. People—especially children—with low self-esteem, mental illness, unstable home lives or living in poverty are the preferred targets of an industry operating in the shadows.

Human trafficking is a complex issue. Police, advocacy groups and the Fresno legal community have formed a unique partnership to tackle the growing problem in new ways. But what can the rest of Fresno do to fight human trafficking?

Talking to your children or younger family members about the issue can educate them

and help keep them out of harm's way. Non-profits that help trafficking victims would welcome financial donations. Residents can urge governments to allocate more resources to those policing and prosecuting traffickers. And far larger strides can be made to address a major underlying issue in the sex trade: the people, mostly men, who buy sex.

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article188526804.html>

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DONOVAN). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 1865

*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 "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017".*

#### SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

*It is the sense of Congress that—*

*(1) section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230; commonly known as the "Communications Decency Act of 1996") was never intended to provide legal protection to websites that unlawfully promote and facilitate prostitution and contribute to sex trafficking;*

*(2) websites that promote and facilitate prostitution have been reckless in allowing the sale of sex trafficking victims and have done nothing to prevent the trafficking of children and victims of force, fraud, and coercion; and*

*(3) clarification of such section is warranted to ensure that such section does not provide such protection to such websites.*

#### SEC. 3. PROMOTION OF PROSTITUTION AND RECKLESS DISREGARD OF SEX TRAFFICKING.

*(a) PROMOTION OF PROSTITUTION.—Chapter 117 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2421 the following:*

**"§2421A. Promotion or facilitation of prostitution and reckless disregard of sex trafficking**

*"(a) IN GENERAL.—Whoever uses or operates a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or attempts to do so with the intent to promote or facilitate the prostitution of another person shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.*

*"(b) AGGRAVATED VIOLATION.—Whoever uses or operates a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to promote or facilitate the prostitution of another person and—*

*"(1) promotes or facilitates the prostitution of 5 or more persons; or*

*"(2) acts in reckless disregard of the fact that such conduct contributed to sex trafficking, in violation of 1591(a),*

*shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 25 years, or both.*

*"(c) CIVIL RECOVERY.—Any person injured by reason of a violation of section 2421A(b) may recover damages and reasonable attorneys' fees in an action before any appropriate United States district court. Consistent with section 230 of the*

*Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230), a defendant may be held liable, under this subsection, where promotion or facilitation of prostitution activity includes responsibility for the creation or development of all or part of the information or content provided through any interactive computer service.*

*"(d) MANDATORY RESTITUTION.—Notwithstanding sections 3663 or 3663A and in addition to any other civil or criminal penalties authorized by law, the court shall order restitution for any offense under this section.*

*"(e) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—It shall be an affirmative defense to a charge of violating subsection (a) where the defendant proves, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the promotion or facilitation of prostitution is legal in the jurisdiction where the promotion or facilitation was targeted."*

*(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2421 the following:*

*"2421A. Promotion or facilitation of prostitution and reckless disregard of sex trafficking."*

#### SEC. 4. COMMUNICATIONS DECENCY ACT.

*Section 230(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*"(5) NO EFFECT ON STATE LAWS CONFORMING TO 18 U.S.C. 1591(A) OR 2421A.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to impair or limit any charge in a criminal prosecution brought under State law—*

*"(A) if the conduct underlying the charge constitutes a violation of section 2421A of title 18, United States Code, and promotion or facilitation of prostitution is illegal in the jurisdiction where the defendant's promotion or facilitation of prostitution was targeted; or*

*"(B) if the conduct underlying the charge constitutes a violation of section 1591(a) of title 18, United States Code."*

#### SEC. 5. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

*Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to limit or preempt any civil action or criminal prosecution under Federal law or State law (including State statutory law and State common law) filed before or after the day before the date of enactment of this Act that was not limited or preempted by section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230), as such section was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.*

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-583. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-583.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, beginning on line 12, strike "contribute to sex trafficking" and insert

"websites that facilitate traffickers in advertising the sale of unlawful sex acts with sex trafficking victims".

Page 6, beginning on line 8, strike "Whoever uses or operates a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or attempts to do so" and insert "Whoever, using a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, owns, manages, or operates an interactive computer service (as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f))), or conspires or attempts to do so,".

Page 6, beginning on line 13, strike "Whoever uses or operates a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce" and insert "Whoever, using a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, owns, manages, or operates an interactive computer service (as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f))), or conspires or attempts to do so,".

Page 7, line 1, strike "Consistent" and all that follows through line 7.

Page 7, line 11, strike "offense under this section." and insert the following: "violation of subsection (b)(2). The scope and nature of such restitution shall be consistent with section 2327(b)."

Page 7, line 13, insert after "subsection (a)" the following: ", or subsection (b)(1)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

This amendment makes small but important changes to the bill.

Most significantly, the bill narrows the class of defendants covered in the new section 2421A, which criminalizes the deliberate promotion or facilitation of prostitution. As the creation of this law is designed to target bad actor websites, this amendment narrows defendants covered to those who own, manage, or operate an interactive computer service with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution. This amendment avoids creating a broad Federal law that covers conduct that is not necessarily Federal in nature.

Second, the manager's amendment strikes language from the underlying bill's civil recovery provision that was intended to encourage victims to successfully plead their cases. However, the language could have created a risk of confusion by the courts, and so it has been removed.

Further, the manager's amendment clarifies that mandatory restitution provision is only applicable to victims of sex trafficking, not to those who voluntarily have engaged in prostitution.

Finally, the manager's amendment adds language inadvertently omitted from the original bill, which permits defendants who face an aggravated charge for promoting or facilitating more than five people to assert the statute's affirmative defense if a defendant can prove that advertisements were targeted to a locality where promotion or facilitation is legal.

Mr. Chairman, this manager's amendment is the product of the Judiciary Committee's repeated and thoughtful effort to produce a workable and technically sound piece of legislation. This bill will do a great deal to protect victims of sex trafficking. I am proud of the hard work by my colleagues and staff to ensure that the criminal law is appropriately tailored to achieve that goal.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Goodlatte amendment, and I thank the chairman along with our ranking member, Mr. NADLER, for their hard work in working together.

I think this amendment is particularly important because it clarifies that the restitution provision applies to victims of sex trafficking and ensures that the affirmative defense applies to both of the criminal offenses created in the underlying bill. These changes are simple and reasonable.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Goodlatte Manager's Amendment, which makes technical changes to H.R. 1865.

The amendment adds "attempt" language that was inadvertently omitted from the bill and is consistent with, and tracks the typical language used in the federal criminal code to define criminal offenses.

The amendment also clarifies that the restitution provision applies to victims of sex trafficking and ensures that the affirmative defense applies to both of the criminal offenses created in the underlying bill.

These changes are simple and reasonable and maintain the overall spirit of the bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. MIMI WALTERS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-583.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 21, strike "COMMUNICATIONS DEPENDENCY ACT" and insert "ENSURING ABILITY TO

ENFORCE FEDERAL AND STATE CRIMINAL AND CIVIL LAW RELATING TO SEX TRAFFICKING".

Page 7, line 22, strike "Section 230" and insert "(a) IN GENERAL—Section 230".

Page 8, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 13, and insert the following:

"(5) NO EFFECT ON SEX TRAFFICKING LAW.—Nothing in this section (other than subsection (c)(2)(A)) shall be construed to impair or limit—

"(A) any claim in a civil action brought under section 1595 of title 18, United States Code, if the conduct underlying the claim constitutes a violation of section 1591 of that title;

"(B) any charge in a criminal prosecution brought under State law if the conduct underlying the charge would constitute a violation of section 1591 of title 18, United States Code; or

"(C) any charge in a criminal prosecution brought under State law if the conduct underlying the charge would constitute a violation of section 2421A of title 18, United States Code, and promotion or facilitation of prostitution is illegal in the jurisdiction where the defendant's promotion or facilitation of prostitution was targeted."

Page 8, after line 13, insert the following:

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply regardless of whether the conduct alleged occurred, or is alleged to have occurred, before, on, or after such date of enactment.

**SEC. 5. ENSURING FEDERAL LIABILITY FOR PUBLISHING INFORMATION DESIGNED TO FACILITATE SEX TRAFFICKING OR OTHERWISE FACILITATING SEX TRAFFICKING.**

Section 1591(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

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

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

"(4) The term 'participation in a venture' means knowingly assisting, supporting, or facilitating a violation of subsection (a)(1)."

**SEC. 6. ACTIONS BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1595 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) In any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of that State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by any person who violates section 1591, the attorney general of the State, as *parens patriae*, may bring a civil action against such person on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate relief."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1595 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "this section" and inserting "subsection (a)"; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "this section" and inserting "subsection (a)".

Page 8, line 14, strike "5" and insert "7".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act.

I also want to thank my colleague, ANN WAGNER, for her dedication to this issue and her efforts to bring this bill to the floor.

The underlying bill will help crack down on online facilitators of human sex trafficking to end this modern-day slavery. My amendment will allow enforcement of criminal and civil sex trafficking laws against websites that knowingly facilitate online sex trafficking activities.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is of significant local concern in the heart of my district in Orange County. Last year, a major international sex trafficking ring was uncovered in a quiet Irvine, California, neighborhood. Young women from overseas were sold repeatedly through the website Backpage.com.

Websites like Backpage, which are essentially storefronts for the facilitation of sex trafficking, have been able to operate with impunity. My amendment, in conjunction with the underlying bill, will help prosecutors crack down on websites that knowingly facilitate or promote sex trafficking, while keeping in place safeguards for those who responsibly publish third-party content. This legislation will empower sex trafficking survivors to come forward and seek justice.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and putting an end to the human sex trafficking industry in America, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, section 230 of the Communications Decency Act stands for a very simple, powerful idea: a website should not be liable for the actions of its users.

Because of section 230, we have the internet as we know it today. Also, because of section 230, the vast majority of websites can safely and effectively report and coordinate with law enforcement on various crimes, including sex trafficking, child pornography, and the like.

Unfortunately, section 230 has been utilized by bad actors, including a notorious one, Backpage, to traffic in children and to exploit victims. Really, they are slavery victims. The underlying bill, H.R. 1865, puts a stop to that. As the Department of Justice has noted, it will allow for the prosecution of people who are trafficking in victims online.

The Walters amendment, however, for the first time, would carve a hole in section 230 and make it actually more difficult than the underlying bill to prosecute traffickers online. By creating potential liability for "knowing" that a user is using their website for facilitating sex trafficking, the Walters amendment would create what legal experts call the moderator's dilemma.

There is no obligation under law to moderate your website. In fact, if you

have 2 million users or 10 million users, you really don't know what is being posted by your users. But under this amendment, if you made any effort to try and find out what was happening among your users—as many websites do today, especially for child pornography, but also for trafficking—you would incur liability because you would then have a reason to know.

□ 1515

Other laws that deal with intermediary liability, such as a requirement to report child pornography or copyright safe harbors of the DMCA, have very clear and specific provisions on when a website has sufficient knowledge and what express actions it should take. The Walters amendment has none of these. There is no case law on it either.

So the amendment really would put web owners in a very weird place. If you do anything to moderate, you are risking liability. The safe incentive would be to not monitor at all. That would be tragic and it would be a gain for child predators, although I know that that is not the intention. You can't stop moderating just for trafficking. You either moderate or you don't moderate.

We do know that there have been tremendous advances for machine-operated filters to find child pornography. Actually, that is one of the easiest things to find, using filters, and it is very important that websites cooperate with law enforcement to catch those bad guys.

Under the Walters amendment, the disincentive would be huge not to do that. I think that is why the Department of Justice does not support the Walters amendment.

As I said earlier—and the chairman put the letter into the Record—the Department believes that any revision to define participation in a venture is unnecessary. They say that, while well-intentioned, this new language would impact prosecutions by effectively creating additional elements that prosecutors would have to prove at trial.

That is why it is a bad idea to adopt this amendment. As the chairman of the committee has said, section 4 of the amendment also violates the *ex post facto* clause of the Constitution by attaching criminal liability to actions that preceded the enactment of the bill. This is clearly unconstitutional.

Although I don't have any doubt as to the good intentions behind the offering of this amendment, it would actually impair the ability to protect victims. It would make it more difficult to prosecute, as the Department of Justice has pointed out.

It didn't go through the Judiciary Committee. I think that is a major fault. One of the things we were able to do in the committee—and we did this together, on a bipartisan basis—was to sort through the unintended consequences of seemingly simple language.

Nothing in writing law is simple. Certainly, nobody wants a provision that is going to negatively impact prosecutions; have unintended consequences for State actions, as the Department of Justice has pointed out; and would provide a disincentive for people to moderate activities to try and catch bad guys and to work with law enforcement.

So, although the intentions are good, the amendment is flawed. I hope we vote “no” on it, and then I hope we give a resounding unanimous vote “yes” for the underlying bill.

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

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the time I yielded back.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for bringing up the Walters amendment to H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, called FOSTA.

The Walters amendment reinstates critical pro-victim provisions from my original bill. It also reflects the work that has been done in the Senate on these provisions, which are the meat of S. 1693, the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA.

FOSTA has over 175 House cosponsors and SESTA has over 67 Senate cosponsors. These two bills depend on each other to address the problem of online sex trafficking.

Mr. Chair, we should not allow Big Tech money and special interests to try and overdefine this conversation and override our criminal justice system.

FOSTA amends section 230 to allow for stronger criminal enforcement against websites that profit from human trafficking, and SESTA amends section 230 to allow for stronger civil enforcement against websites that profit from human trafficking.

They are two sides of the same coin and they must pass together. We need both criminal and civil tools to properly combat the highly “lucrative” industry of online sex trafficking.

Moreover, it is imperative that we clarify that section 230 does not impair or limit the ability of trafficking victims to use the Federal private right of action that Congress clearly provided in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act.

Two years ago, the First Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that there is a fundamental tension between these private right of action and section 230. Today, by voting “yes” on the Walters amendment, the House will dispel this tension. No website is immune from civil liability for knowingly facilitating the sale of trafficking victims.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, a 16-year-old was found beaten and stabbed to death after being advertised as a prostitute on Backpage.

I might suggest that we follow one great philosopher in California who asked: Can we all get along?

This amendment is needed in order to give enhanced powers to State attorneys general that they can provide the extra litigation leverage for individuals who are impacted in a devastating manner.

As I said, we have to be concerned about the First Amendment, but we have got to protect our children. Every time I think of this precious young lady, Desiree, and the tears of her mother who testified before the other body in the Senate hearing, I think it is important that we move forward. If we move forward, we can build on this legislation.

I intend to offer additional legislation that we will need so that we can put a stop sign in front of the dastardly behavior of online sex trafficking.

So I ask my colleagues to support the Walters amendment in order to ensure that we can move forward and, as we move forward, make a difference in the lives of these children.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Walters Amendment, which addresses problems states and local law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and advocates have faced in their attempts to hold online sex traffickers responsible for their despicable behavior.

Congress decided more than 150 years ago that no person—no woman, no child, no boy or girl—deserves to be bought, sold, or owned by another person.

And, as I have said many times before, trafficking in human beings has no place in a civilized society.

Our country is facing a crisis that touches urban cities, rural areas, and suburbs, and violates the fundamental American ideal of liberty—which sets this country apart from so many others.

Traffickers hold their victims captive both physically and mentally, employing extreme forms of psychological abuse and coercion to maintain control over them and prevent them from escaping, while stripping them of their humanity.

This is an ongoing battle with very high stakes. Several years ago, I, along with Chairman MCCAUL, held the first field hearing on human trafficking in Texas before the Committee on Homeland Security. At the time of the hearing, a stash house was raided and 115 people were rescued. I visited that location and saw first-hand, the atrocious conditions in which those people were forced to exist.

Without the hard work of those Texas officers, I cannot fathom the torment that might have befallen those poor souls.

As Ranking Member of the Judiciary Crime Subcommittee, I support the eradication of Human and Sex Trafficking. This vile cruelty must end.

Anyone who aids, assists, facilitates or promotes such behavior must be held accountable.



Just last week, I sat down with a room filled with anti-human trafficking advocates and representatives of anti-human trafficking advocacy groups, including Real Beauty Real Women and Break the Cycle. I heard stories of suffering and stories of frustrations.

Victims and survivors are crying out for a change in the law and they are crying out for justice. They have tried to bring cases against the people, websites, and online service providers, who contributed to their suffering and profited from their victimization—to no avail.

Prosecutors have tried to bring online sex traffickers and the companies who provide them safe harbor—and, unfortunately failed.

It is imperative that we do all that we can to provide for victims of this disgusting crime, protect vulnerable members of society from becoming victims as well, and tell websites like Backpage.com.

Sex trafficking is a callous and brutal crime that unquestionably deserves the nation's utmost attention. It is particularly difficult to see the victimization of the very young who are sold into the sex trafficking market.

The SESTA amendment provides law enforcement, prosecutors, and courts at every level with the tools they need to hold responsible, both civilly and criminally, each and every bad actor who participates in, facilitates, contributes to, or profits from sex trafficking.

Many of the groups that work with victims and survivors of sex trafficking support passage of H.R. 1865 only if Ms. WALTERS's amendment passes as well.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-583.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

**SEC. 6. GAO STUDY.**

On the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a report which includes the following:

(1) Information on each civil action brought pursuant to section 2421A(c) of title 18, United States Code, that resulted in an

award of damages, including the amount claimed, the nature or description of the losses claimed to support the amount claimed, the losses proven, and the nature or description of the losses proven to support the amount awarded.

(2) Information on each civil action brought pursuant to section 2421A(c) of title 18, United States Code, that did not result in an award of damages, including—

(A) the amount claimed and the nature or description of the losses claimed to support the amount claimed; and

(B) whether the case was dismissed, and if the case was dismissed, information describing the reason for the dismissal.

(3) Information on each order of restitution entered pursuant to section 2421A(d) of title 18, United States Code, including—

(A) whether the defendant was a corporation or an individual;

(B) the amount requested by the Government and the justification for, and calculation of, the amount requested, if restitution was requested; and

(C) the amount ordered by the court and the justification for, and calculation of, the amount ordered.

(4) For each defendant convicted of violating section 2421A(b) of title 18, United States Code, that was not ordered to pay restitution—

(A) whether the defendant was a corporation or an individual;

(B) the amount requested by the Government, if restitution was requested; and

(C) information describing the reason that the court did not order restitution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have already raised the picture of Desiree, who is dead. Her death was driven by being exposed as a so-called prostitute in the sex trafficking of a little girl on Backpage.

Or J.S., who, in fact, was victimized in Seattle. She was raped. She was put on Backpage. Then she was rescued by her family. Since it was before this legislation, it failed in court.

My legislation is very simple: Does this bill work? What more can we do?

I am asking for a study where the GAO would be instructed to assess the damages awarded to victims and restitution amounts imposed against defendants as a result of this bill.

Victims of sex trafficking require a multifaceted response to rebuild their life. That includes housing; counseling; job training; and, in many cases, drug treatment and rehabilitation. We as Members of Congress need to be able to know if it works.

A citizen-led movement called Fight for Us, along with a team of influential citizens called The Houston 20, work to fill in the gaps and strengthen the services for victims and survivors in the city of Houston.

I was very proud to meet with them at the Community of Faith Church, a socially motivated church, led by Bishop James Dixon. Jackie is the lead. They were all committed, Children at Risk and many other organiza-

tions, to eliminating some of the gaps for The Houston 20, which will allow them to utilize resources for greater work.

So I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1865 which requests the Government Accountability Office to study the effectiveness of the civil and restitution provisions enacted by H.R. 1865.

In an effort to determine if we are actually providing justice to victims of sex trafficking through this legislation, GAO would be instructed to assess the damages awarded to victims and restitution amounts imposed against defendants as a result of this bill.

Victims of sex trafficking require a multi-faceted response to rebuild their lives that includes: housing, counseling, job training, and, in many cases, drug treatment and rehabilitation.

There are well-meaning, dedicated victim advocacy groups all over the country, that offer their help and services that are dependent on state and federal grants, charitable donations, and private funding.

A citizen-led movement called Fight For Us, along with a team of influential citizens called the Houston 20, work to fill in the gaps and strengthen the services for victims and survivors in my city of Houston. I commend these selfless individuals and hope that they continue their important work.

Fortunately though, H.R. 1865 creates a civil cause of action for victims of the aggravated violation, and requires judges to impose mandatory restitution orders in criminal cases involving such victims.

It is my hope that this measure will eliminate some of those gaps for the Houston 20 and allow them to utilize their resources for even greater work. Through this legislation, victims will be empowered to take control of their own recovery and restoration.

My amendment will collect data on the civil awards and restitution orders, to determine whether victims are actually receiving the relief, assistance, and justice they require and deserve.

My amendment primarily asks GAO to:

(1) report the amounts of the damages awarded and the restitution amounts ordered; but also

(2) report the amounts that are requested by victims and the government, on behalf of victims;

(3) the nature and descriptions of the losses that are claimed and proven; and

(4) the justifications for the amounts that are requested and eventually ordered to be paid.

My amendment further asks GAO to report cases that are dismissed and provide information describing the reason or reasons for the dismissals.

While it is Congress's duty to address the needs of our citizens by enacting sensible legislation, we are also responsible for monitoring the legislation we enact and determining whether we have truly responded to the needs of our citizens.

For this reason, and all reasons previously stated, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment,



although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I support Ms. JACKSON LEE's amendment requiring a GAO study. It is always helpful to require more information on the efficiency of a new law. This study will provide useful information to determine whether this legislation has proven to be the meaningful tool that we anticipate it will be. I commend Ms. JACKSON LEE for introducing this amendment and for her commitment to combating sex trafficking.

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. Chair, in recent years, sex trafficking has moved from the streets to the internet. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has witnessed an 846 percent increase in suspected child sex trafficking reports. Eighty-one percent of these reports concern online trafficking facilitated by websites that help traffickers post advertisements of child victims.

I find it hard to imagine that if a neighborhood business hosted a slave auction, the auctioneer would not be considered liable. But that is actually what is happening with websites like backpage.com and hundreds others.

I have spoken with State and local prosecutors across America who want to hold online advertisers accountable for facilitating traffic and promoting prostitution, but they cannot.

Section 230 has been interpreted so broadly that courts have ruled in favor of backpage.com in criminal and civil cases, despite the website's clear criminal conduct. These rulings defy congressional intent.

Twenty-two years ago, Senator Jim Exon from Nebraska, the sponsor of the Communications Decency Act, stated that "the information superhighway should not become a red-light district."

Section 230 was an amendment to the CDA that intended to motivate websites to screen explicit content in "good faith," and to shield websites from unfair liability for third-party content. However, section 230 was never intended to shield websites from liability for criminal conduct.

Congress did not intend to allow businesses to commit trafficking crimes online that they could never commit offline. It never meant to imply that criminal conduct can hide behind the defense of legitimate publishing or editing.

H.R. 1865 is a long-overdue clarification of section 230 explaining to America's courts that State and local prosecutors are not handcuffed from protecting their communities and that the State laws should be freely enforced

against websites that unlawfully promote prostitution and sex.

Mr. Chair, the Jackson Lee amendment will help us track the use of this new crime, and I am delighted to support it. I thank the gentlewoman for offering it.

Mr. Chair, I am horrified that children and adults are sold on the internet like a T-shirt or takeout. I am horrified that human beings are sold with impunity and have no access to justice.

Today, please vote "yes" for justice.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. More importantly, I thank her for her amendment. As the lead Democrat sponsor of this bill, I proudly join her with that amendment.

Like my colleague Congresswoman ROBY said, it is always good when you have a great bill that you can have an amendment that asks for a study to make sure that it is effective.

□ 1530

Lastly, let me just say, I thank the Congresswoman for sharing those stories, whether it is the story of Cathy, whether it is the story of Erika, or in my district, Theresa, it makes me proud to stand with her. And I thank her not only for this amendment but for her work in judiciary because what we know her amendment will do, it will protect the innocent.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, does the gentlewoman have any additional speakers?

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I have no additional speakers.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will close at this time.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewomen from Ohio and from New York. I thank Congresswoman WAGNER. I thank Congresswoman LOFGREN for her concern, as evidenced by her statement, but I want to focus on building blocks, and I want to say to fight for us in the coalition of 20 that I met with.

My promise is that we are in building blocks. We are going to build on what we are doing today, and we are going to continue to mount the assault on sex trafficking and human trafficking, and we are going to literally wipe it out.

We are going to wipe it out because of Shaundra. We are going to wipe it out because of this young, beautiful lady, 16 years old, Desiree. We are going to wipe it out because of Desiree. We are going to wipe it out because of J.S. We are going to wipe it out be-

cause Desiree was found beaten, stabbed to death, after being advertised as a prostitute on Backpage. We want her mother to know that we are outraged that children are treated in this way.

My amendment will be the guidepost: Is what we are doing working? It will provide a report on the amounts of damages awarded, the restitution awarded, report the amounts that are requested by victims and the government on their behalf, the nature and description of the losses that are claimed and proven, the justification for the amounts that are requested and eventually ordered to be paid.

My amendment asks GAO to report cases that are dismissed and provide information to describing the reason for those dismissals. We don't want anything to go under the rug. Our children are too important. I would ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

And in conclusion, I would say to those who I met with, to those groups around the Nation meeting in local communities thinking that they are alone fighting this dastardly act of sex trafficking and human trafficking, and, of course, a moneymaker like Backpage, you are not alone, we are starting today, we have done work before, and we are not going to stop. I will work with you for the ongoing blocks that are going to continue to stamp out online sex trafficking and human trafficking. With that, I ask for support of the legislation and my amendment.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I support Ms. JACKSON LEE's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PITTEMBERG). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. PITTEMBERG, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

#### TRID IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5078) to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5078

*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 “TRID Improvement Act of 2018”.

#### SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

Section 4(a) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2603(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “itemize all charges” and inserting “itemize all actual charges”;

(2) by striking “and all charges imposed upon the seller in connection with the settlement and” and inserting “and the seller in connection with the settlement. Such forms”; and

(3) by inserting after “or both.” the following new sentence: “Charges for any title insurance premium disclosed on such forms shall be equal to the amount charged for each individual title insurance policy, subject to any discounts as required by State regulation or the title company rate filings.”.

#### SEC. 3. POSITIVE CREDIT REPORTING PERMITTED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 623 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) FULL-FILE CREDIT REPORTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the limitation in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may furnish to a consumer reporting agency information relating to the performance of a consumer in making payments—

“(A) under a lease agreement with respect to a dwelling, including such a lease in which the Department of Housing and Urban Development provides subsidized payments for occupancy in a dwelling; or

“(B) pursuant to a contract for a utility or telecommunications service.

“(2) LIMITATION.—Information about a consumer’s usage of any utility services provided by a utility or telecommunication firm may be furnished to a consumer reporting agency only to the extent that such information relates to payment by the consumer for the services of such utility or telecommunication service or other terms of the provision of the services to the consumer, including any deposit, discount, or conditions for interruption or termination of the services.

“(3) PAYMENT PLAN.—An energy utility firm may not report payment information to a consumer reporting agency with respect to an outstanding balance of a consumer as late if—

“(A) the energy utility firm and the consumer have entered into a payment plan (including a deferred payment agreement, an arrearage management program, or a debt forgiveness program) with respect to such outstanding balance; and

“(B) the consumer is meeting the obligations of the payment plan, as determined by the energy utility firm.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the following definitions shall apply:

“(A) ENERGY UTILITY FIRM.—The term ‘energy utility firm’ means an entity that provides gas or electric utility services to the public.

“(B) UTILITY OR TELECOMMUNICATION FIRM.—The term ‘utility or telecommunication firm’ means an entity that provides utility services to the public through pipe, wire, landline, wireless, cable, or other connected facilities, or radio, electronic, or similar transmission (including the extension of such facilities).”.

(b) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Section 623(c) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

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

“(3) subsection (f) of this section, including any regulations issued thereunder; or”.

(c) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the impact of furnishing information pursuant to subsection (f) of section 623 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2) (as added by this Act) on consumers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of my bill, H.R. 5078, the TRID Improvement Act. This important package will cut through the red tape and level the playing field for making sure that regulations are smarter, fairer, clearer, and more efficient, while, at the same time, ensure that consumers and investors are protected.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when the CFPB, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, was first initiated as a part of the Dodd-Frank Act, one of now-Senator ELIZABETH WARREN’s goals was simpler regulation, that we would streamline regulation, that we would take bulky complex consumer forms and make them simpler. And the TILA-RESPA, truth-in-lending form and the real estate settlement form, were examples in those early days that

they were going to make these forms simpler and easier for consumers.

Well, that is what we are talking about today, Mr. Speaker, for it did not become simpler and easier. It became costly, complex, and difficult for consumers.

Today, we are back on the floor on this issue. It is not a new issue or a new concern because the confusion related to TRID has been apparent for years.

In November 2013, the CFPB finalized TRID, combining, as I said, the truth-in-lending form with the real estate settlement procedures form necessary for consumers in this country to close a home loan to have that American Dream. The effective date for this final rule was originally set for mortgage applications received on or after August 1, 2015, but due to the administrative errors of the CFPB, the agency delayed it until October 3, 2015.

In October, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3192, the Homebuyers Assistance Act, which I proudly sponsored, and it passed with a bipartisan vote in this House of 303-121. It would have provided a hold-harmless period for those trying to make a good faith effort to comply with this complex rule.

In April 2016, with complaints pouring in from both homeowners, homebuyers, consumers, bankers, title companies, the CFPB decided to reopen the rulemaking on TILA-RESPA and the TRID rule. The CFPB issued a final rule clarifying and amending certain mortgage disclosure provisions.

So as you can hear from this long story, Mr. Speaker, this rule is complex. So we are here today to try to fix a part of it, a small part of it that will make it easier, better, and more clearer for consumers.

The American Bankers Association stated that if there was one thing to fix about the current regulatory system, it would be the TILA-RESPA Integrated Disclosure rule, TRID—not qualified mortgage definitions, not the Volcker rule, the TRID rule. Mortgage lenders have seen regulatory change around every aspect of their lending for the last 8 years, and this rule is no exception.

Today, Mr. Speaker, over in the House Small Business Committee, the GAO testified. They have issued a report about the TILA-RESPA Integrated Disclosure rule. They told the committee today that this rule was one of the most expensive facing community banking across the country, the most burdensome.

So here, the TILA-RESPA rule before our House Small Business Committee says that we are burdening community banks, and they, in turn, are not able to do the kind of work that we want, that we expect for our homebuyers of homes across this country.

CFPB Associate Director David Silberman said the Bureau agreed with the GAO’s recommendation, that it assessed the effectiveness of the TRID

guidance and that it intended to ask the public for input on ways to improve regulatory guidance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this report from the GAO, but we have been calling for this for almost 2½ years that we want this rule made simpler and more direct and better for our consumers.

H.R. 5078 fixes the title insurance disclosures so that consumers actually know what their expenses are going to be for title insurance. And despite our best efforts, the CFPB has been unwilling to fix this problem on its own; so today, Congress comes to act.

The other aspect of this bill—and I want to thank my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER) for the second portion of this bill, the Credit Access and Inclusion Act of 2017.

The Credit Access and Inclusion Act amends the Fair Credit Reporting Act to allow the reporting of certain positive consumer credit information for consumer reporting agencies. Specifically, a person or the Department of Housing and Urban Development might report information related to a consumer's performance in making payments either under a lease arrangement for a dwelling or pursuant to a contract providing utility or telecommunication services. This kind of positive reporting on a consumer's ability to make their payments on time will help more families in our country build a credit record.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, allow me to just thank the gentleman from the great State of Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and also Congressman PITTENGER, as well as many other members of the Financial Services Committee on both sides of the aisle. It is always a pleasure to be able to work together on things. This is what our constituents expect, and that is what the Credit Access and Inclusion bill actually represents.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I told you that we could help millions of people get access to an apartment, lower the cost of a loan, lower the deposit they may have to put down on a phone or utility deposit, and we could do all these things without creating a new government program, we could do it without government mandate, and we could do it with virtually no new tax dollars, would you take that deal? Because I would. I would say: Wow, help millions of people be able to afford services that they need before, lower the cost of loans? Yeah, why wouldn't we do that? Well, the truth is that we can if we vote "yes" on the Credit Access and Inclusion bill.

I am proud to tell you that this particular piece of legislation, which is bipartisan, will bring about basic fairness in the credit scoring system. Credit is currency in our society. It unlocks

credit for access to goods and services. Hardworking Americans need to build some economic security for themselves and their families.

There are currently about 26 million people, or 1 in 10 Americans, who do not have a credit record; and there is another 19 million Americans who do not have enough information to even score. Low-income individuals and even racial and ethnic minorities are even in worse shape. About one in four Latinos and African Americans either don't have a credit score or don't have enough information in the file to get a score.

□ 1545

And almost half of the residents of low-income communities do not have a score of any background.

This bill allows credit rating agencies to use on-time rent, phone, and utility payments when determining credit scores.

Now, you should know, Mr. Speaker, if people are late with these lines of information, it can, and often does, show up on their credit score now. And if people take out loan products which they pay back on time, that helps those people's credit score now.

But what about the people who pay phone bills and utility bills, and they pay their bills every month on time? They are not building anything to help them get in a better credit situation. This bill allows them to do that.

As a result, more than a third of previously unscorable Americans will now have access to prime credit and the opportunities that come with it when we pass this bill.

This bill isn't just about access to credit, though. It is also about saving hardworking Americans real money, thousands of dollars, on car loans and their mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, if you are unscorable, you can often get a loan, but the interest rate is always higher when that happens. So, if people are scorable and they get a credit score, they will be able to save money for themselves and put it into their household budget.

The money that used to be going to auto lenders and mortgage brokers is now going to go into the pockets of consumers so that they can improve the lives of their family. That sounds like a pretty good day's work to me.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Minnesota for his work on this bill and providing the chance to build a credit file for those who really need it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), my friend, who, this week, I know, is having a touching time with his almost five decades of friendship with Reverend Billy Graham—we all salute their work together for the betterment of our world—and who is the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great support for Congressman HILL's bill, the TRID Improvement Act. This bill will lower consumer costs and lessen regulatory burdens for growing businesses, which will lead to healthier and well-functioning financial markets.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman HILL for his great work and leadership on this issue.

I am pleased that this legislation does include the Credit Access and Inclusion Act, H.R. 435, which I cosponsored with Congressman ELLISON, and which we introduced together.

H.R. 435 is designed to give hardworking Americans better access to affordable credit by providing more opportunities for them to build their credit on their own merit without Federal funds or new bureaucracy. At a time when access to credit is a practical necessity for economic and social mobility, tens of millions of Americans are hamstrung because they have little or no credit history.

Currently, on-time utility and rent payments are not reflected in credit scores. The Credit Access and Inclusion Act amends the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act, or FCRA, to allow for non-financial service providers, such as telephone, cable, wireless, electric, and gas companies, as well as landlords, to report their customers' on-time payments to credit reporting agencies, or CRAs.

By incorporating these on-time payments, called alternative or additional data, into credit reports, more Americans can access affordable and responsible financial products and services, buy homes and cars, and build wealth, thus strengthening or entire economy.

In total, our bill would enable nearly 100 million Americans to establish or raise their credit score, all without Federal mandates. Ultimately, this legislation will give every American the ability to build a better life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ELLISON for actively working together on this very important issue, and I thank Congressman HILL for his work on the TRID Improvement Act. Please join me in supporting this commonsense legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I urge a "yes" vote on the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I again thank Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. ELLISON for their work on this measure, and for all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have brought these bills to the floor and, particularly, for speaking out for consumers on bills that will help consumers have more access to credit, whether it is a mortgage and a speedier, easier, more transparent mortgage closing or the chance to build credit, with the work from my friend from Minnesota and my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5078, 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.

#### OPERATIONAL RISK CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BANKING ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 747, I call up the bill (H.R. 4296) to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 747, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-60, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-582, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4296

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

#### SECTION 1. OPERATIONAL RISK CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not establish an operational risk capital requirement for banking organizations, unless such requirement—

(1) is based primarily on the risks posed by a banking organization's current activities and businesses;

(2) is appropriately sensitive to the risks posed by such current activities and businesses;

(3) is determined under a forward-looking assessment of potential losses that may arise out of a banking organization's current activities, businesses, and exposures, which is not solely based on a banking organization's historical losses; and

(4) permits adjustments based on qualifying operational risk mitigants.

(b) *DEFINITIONS.*—For purposes of this section:

(1) *APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.*—The term "appropriate Federal banking agency"—

(A) has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

(B) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(2) *BANKING ORGANIZATION.*—The term "banking organization" means—

(A) an insured depository institution (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act);

(B) an insured credit union (as defined under section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act);

(C) a depository institution holding company (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act);

(D) a company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act; and

(E) a U.S. intermediate holding company established by a foreign banking organization pursuant to section 252.153 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

#### SEC. 2. REDUCTION OF SURPLUS FUNDS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking "\$7,500,000,000" and inserting "\$7,468,571,428".

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—Subsection (a) shall take effect on May 1, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise, today, in strong support of H.R. 4296, an important bill authored by Mr. LUETKEMEYER, who is a real leader on our committee. He is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit and has led many bills on this floor. This particular one addresses the burden that unnecessary operational capital requirements have imposed on our financial institutions and then, consequently, on our hardworking families and small businesses that are seeking credit.

The Basel Committee requires U.S. financial institutions to hold excessive capital based upon a look-back approach to an organization's risk, previous earnings, and other provisions that provide no indication of future risk.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is about holding operational capital for past activities.

This methodology employed by the international standard setters has forced our banks to hold hundreds of billions of dollars in reserve rather than putting that money to work in the real economy—in loans and investments—for people to buy cars, to launch small-business enterprises, or maybe to make a downpayment on that first home.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me say it so that all can hear. Hundreds of billions of dollars is currently sitting in banks across the country not being utilized to fund mortgage loans, car loans, and other day-to-day financing that American families and individuals demand.

On top of this is the increased cost of compliance that banks have had to shoulder under Dodd-Frank's onslaught of regulation. Banks like Coatesville Savings Bank, the only remaining bank in Coatesville, Pennsylvania, has told us that, now, 25 percent of their annual budget is nothing but compliance cost, Mr. Speaker. This is detrimental to the Coatesville, Pennsylvania, community. That is 25 percent. That is a huge figure, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be used to fund the American Dream in Coatesville, Pennsylvania.

So, again, Chairman LUETKEMEYER brings us a very commonsense reform and a very necessary reform.

Most agree and recognize the importance of our financial institutions to hold capital in the event of future crisis or distress. Nobody denies that, and this legislation does not remove those requirements. But, Mr. Speaker, requiring banking organizations to look back in the rearview mirror and hold operational capital against discontinued activities or products is just not nonsensical, it is crazy. It makes no sense.

H.R. 4296 simply amends the method of how reserve capital is calculated by establishing standards based on an organization's current business activities, making the requirements more accurate and tailored to a bank's current risk profile. Again, Mr. Speaker, it is just common sense. That means banks would still retain sufficient reserves to weather an economic storm, but they would be able to put the billions of dollars currently sitting on the sidelines to work to help make the economy grow, to make it healthier.

In short, this method-based approach proposed by H.R. 4296 properly calibrates operational capital while also ensuring strong, healthy financial institutions and, thus, a stronger economy for our constituents.

Again, to be very clear, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4296, does not prevent Federal financial regulators from instituting operational risk capital requirements. It does not eliminate the authority of a regulator to assess operational risk, nor does it prevent regulators from requiring that capital be held against riskier activities or businesses. The bill simply puts forth a thoughtful framework that sets parameters, while allowing regulators the flexibility needed to ensure that capital standards are appropriately tailored.

A healthy financial system, Mr. Speaker, will enhance individuals' financial freedom and will lead to a healthier and better regulatory system.

H.R. 4296 has garnered strong, bipartisan support in our committee, passing by a vote of 43-17, again, because it is practical and common sense.

I again want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who chairs our Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee, for his leadership on this bill. I urge all of

my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bipartisan measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4296. This bill is simply another rollback of rules put in place after the financial crisis. It would undermine the stability of our country's largest financial banks by restricting the way regulators set capital requirements for these institutions.

Before I get into why this bill is problematic, let me take a moment to clarify what capital is and what it is not.

Some have said that capital is money that is held on the side or in reserve and cannot be used to lend to borrowers. This couldn't be further from the truth. Capital is not a reserve. Capital refers to the terms of the financing a bank receives.

In the most simplistic example, a bank receives funds from customers making deposits, loans it receives from other institutions, and stock it has issued to investors. The bank uses all of these sources of funding to make mortgages and other loans to customers. However, there are important differences.

Bank debt has terms like regular interest payments that, if it stops paying, the bank fails.

□ 1600

However, a bank can stop paying dividends on a stock without it failing. Banks funded with lots of debt are described as being higher leveraged and risky because only a small drop in the value of their mortgages and other assets can cause them to default.

Funding a bank through higher levels of capital makes the bank stronger, because even if the loans it has made lose value, the bank can avoid default by temporarily halting payments to their investors or lowering the value of the stock.

H.R. 4296 would impact something called operational risk capital, which is the capital used to cover the possibility of losses to the largest banks caused from their operational failures, such as rogue traders, fraudulent sales practices, and cyber breaches.

H.R. 4296 would diminish this type of capital, which only about 10 megabanks are required to maintain under an enhanced framework, by restricting the information that regulators can use to determine the appropriate balance of safe funding, like bank stock versus debt, that megabanks should have to address potential operational losses that may occur.

The bill would direct regulators to primarily consider a megabank's current activities and not their past behavior when setting the capital level, thereby enabling the bank to take on more debt.

According to Americans for Financial Reform, a nonpartisan coalition of

more than 200 civil rights, consumer, labor, business, investor, faith-based, and civic and community groups:

"While current activities are obviously central to operational risk, and are already treated as such, the recent loss experience of banks is the best concrete evidence regulators usually have as to the magnitude of current and future risks. Recent past activities are also vital to understanding the future exposures of the bank, including potential legal exposures."

Thus, this change to how regulators determine the appropriate amount megabanks should maintain for operational risk is imprudent. A megabank's past actions are often the best indicators of future potential risks that it may experience.

Well, memories seem to quickly fade in Congress about the problems that led to the last financial crisis, so let me list some of the examples of past megabanks' operational failures by J.P. Morgan's "London Whale" trades and Wells Fargo's long list of violations that have ripped off millions of consumers, including those harmed by their fraudulent accounts scandal.

Given these examples of past misconduct, the megabanks have collectively paid more than \$160 billion in fines since 2010. It is absurd to suggest that their past behavior shouldn't be taken into account when determining how much capital they should hold.

Even the Basel Committee, which several of President Trump's appointees now serve on, agreed in December, when they finalized Basel III reforms from where the operational risk capital originates, writing:

"Banks which have experienced greater operational risk losses historically are assumed to be more likely to experience operational risk losses in the future."

So it makes no sense to have a forward-looking assessment that deemphasizes a megabank's past failures in setting these capital requirements. It is almost as if this bill is saying: "Don't pay any attention to that. No matter how bad they have been, don't look at their past performance. We don't want you to look at that, because we know if you do, you will make a different decision about capital requirements."

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that the bill's changes would cost the Federal Government \$22 million. This calculation was based on the fact that the capital change would not only affect the bank's probability of failure, but also the magnitude of future losses to our entire financial stability, which, in turn, affects the overall U.S. economy.

This is not a bill to help community banks. It has nothing to do with community banks. Let me repeat that. This is not a bill to help community banks, so what we wish we would not hear is someone coming up talking about how it is going to hurt community banks. That is often used as an ex-

cuse. When we are trying to rein in these megabanks, they always lop in the community banks with it. This has nothing to do with community banks. This is a bill for the 10 largest banks in this country.

So the megabanks on Wall Street are hoping Congress will let them take on riskier debt by directing the regulators to downplay, if not outright ignore, their recent and extensive operational failures.

Mr. Jamie Dimon, the CEO and chairman of JPMorgan Chase, wrote in his 2016 annual letter to shareholders that:

"Operational risk capital should be significantly modified, if not eliminated."

Let's think about it like this: most adult consumers in this country have a credit score. Banks use those credit scores to determine whether or not to lend to a consumer and, if so, under what terms.

These credit scores are based on a consumer's what?

A consumer's past payment history, because this information is considered one of the best indicators of a person's likelihood to default on future credit obligations.

Now, we all know that credit scores are problematic, but no one, including me, is proposing to get rid of them, because we can all agree that past payment information is a good indicator of how someone will handle credit in the future, but this bill takes that principle and throws it out the window when it comes to the 10 largest banks in this country.

Keep in mind, these same banks will continue to use a consumer's credit score for underwriting and rating of mortgages and other consumer loans, but the megabanks themselves are asking this Congress not to judge them on their past behavior, as they judge consumers, and to let them have a clean slate moving forward. If that isn't a double standard, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what is.

Mr. Speaker, bank profits reached an all-time record high in 2016. Compensation for Wall Street CEOs has shot back up to levels last seen in 2006, and business lending is up 75 percent since 2010. All this happened while U.S. banks added more than \$700 billion in capital to absorb potential losses. There is a simple reason for this: healthy banks lend.

U.S. banks also lent significantly more than their European counterparts, because our banks boosted their capital levels, while the European banks did not.

So despite Republicans' "Chicken Little" arguments about the dire consequences of the Dodd-Frank Act and related regulatory reforms, the data speaks for itself. Banks are making more money than ever and lending more than ever, but apparently that is not enough.

So I am here again today appealing for Congress to continue to uphold the commonsense safeguards for consumers, the broader economy, and the

megabanks. I reject this Wall Street giveaway.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this harmful legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, and the bill's sponsor.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his great leadership and for helping us with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4296, legislation that would set reasonable parameters for Federal financial regulators when establishing operational risk capital requirements so that banks can best leverage their capital to grow their local economies.

In the wake of the financial crisis, operational risk capital requirements were first agreed to at the Basel Committee. That is a foreign group of folks who get together. We have accepted some of their advice, unfortunately, and then it was implemented in the United States by the FDIC, the OCC, and the Federal Reserve.

Like many concepts fashioned at the Basel Committee, the original intent may have seemed to be a good idea, but the implementation has brought about confusion and unintended consequences.

The committee, realizing it didn't get it right, has revised its recommended operational risk standards on more than one occasion in the last few years. The first was in the fall of 2014, when the committee found that its original standards were under-calibrated. The second came in 2016, when the Basel Committee suggested a requirement that would force banks to look back and hold capital against discounted activities and products. This is not an appropriate way to determine capital requirements.

So what does this mean?

It means that today a bank that exited a particular line of business must still hold the same amount of capital as another bank that is still engaged in that business. It also means that a bank that spends money to improve risk management will be saddled with the same capital standards as a bank that has done nothing to improve its risk management.

My legislation would instill confidence by instituting clear guardrails for operational risk capital requirements. This is particularly important considering that the European regulators have moved the goalposts on U.S. regulators and financial institutions several times.

H.R. 4296 will also ensure that the imposition of forward-looking capital requirements focus on the bank's current activities and businesses.

Equally important, this bill would incentivize institutions to mitigate operational risk, creating safer banks and a safer financial system.

To be clear, this legislation does not prevent Federal financial regulators from instituting operational risk capital requirements. It does not eliminate the authority of a regulator to assess operational risk, nor does it prevent regulators from requiring that capital be held against riskier activities or businesses.

In other words, it would allow the regulators to continue their business of regulating, but putting some common sense in the regulation and allowing the flexibility to be able to use a forward-looking way of assessing risk rather than being forced to do a look-back-type of risk analysis.

This bill puts forth a thoughtful framework that sets parameters while allowing regulators the flexibility needed to ensure that capital standards are appropriately tailored.

Given my background as both a banker and a regulator, I am often one of the loudest voices in favor of strong capital standards. At the same time, those standards need to make sense, Mr. Speaker. They need to reflect the actual risk posed by the institution to the financial system.

These standards have a tremendous impact on a bank's capital levels, and it is important that the regulators get them right so that they don't hamstring the bank's ability to meet the credit needs of its local economy and community.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting in favor of this commonsense bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the chairman for his support.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank our ranking member, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, for yielding me time and also for her steadfast leadership in opposing the Financial CHOICE Act and many of the provisions included in the bill, including the one that we are considering on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, this bill flies in the face of the old maxim: Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

This bill would effectively blindfold our regulators when calculating operational risk capital at our largest institutions—it is worth repeating again: not our community banks, but our largest financial institutions—by precluding them from looking at an institution's historic losses as an indicator of possible future losses.

Now, earlier, the ranking member injected an example of asking about our credit scores. I think it is worth elaborating on this, Mr. Speaker. Imagine if I go to a bank for a mortgage loan and they ask me for my credit score, and I simply told them they couldn't look at my past financial behavior in order to decide whether or not they are going to give me the loan.

So when you talk about good or commonsense regulation, we all know the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker.

Well, this bill would effectively do just that to our regulators. Instead of a credit score, which determines creditworthiness, operational risk determines the risk of loss resulting from inadequate or failed internal processes, people, and systems.

I would tell our regulators, when determining the appropriate level of capital a financial institution needs to hold against operational risk, you cannot look at an institution's past losses, especially if they got out of that business.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is common sense. I think whether you are a banker or a regulator, you clearly understand that we need to make sure that we don't blindfold our regulators.

So I oppose this bill, which would reduce capital in our country's largest financial institutions and blindfold our regulators' ability to safeguard the stability of our economy. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no."

□ 1615

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

As I listen to my colleague from Ohio, she uses the complete wrong analogies. What happens is we don't pay our home insurance premiums on the home we sold; we pay it on the home we own.

If you lived in a swamp and then you moved to a mountaintop in Colorado, you pay different insurance premiums; and if you cease to be a skydiver and you become an accountant, maybe you pay different life insurance premiums. This has to do with your risk profile today, not yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4296, sponsored by my colleague BLAINE LUETKEMEYER. This bipartisan bill makes important corrections in the bank capital requirements for operational risk. Under the legislation, regulators would continue to be able to consider the bank's operational risk, but would do so in a forward-looking manner.

Currently, financial institutions are required to hold risk-based capital, even for discontinued activities and products. Accounting and the capital markets often use the concept of pro forma financials, which means you consider the ongoing operations, or the way that it would look if it looks like it is today, going forward. This bill would institute that same approach for regulators to use pro forma operational risk, so they wouldn't have to continue to charge a capital charge on operations that have been discontinued.

I think the chairman made a great comment about you don't buy home insurance on a home you have already sold. My colleague, Mr. LUETKEMEYER,



during the markup of this bill, talked about how the Basel Committee has revised this specific capital requirement several times, but it is still a work in progress. This legislation is just a commonsense change to make sure that banks are not charged capital charges against things that they aren't doing anymore.

This approach will free up capital that is needlessly on the sidelines and put it back in reach of America's job creators. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 4296.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY). She has raised a question about the analogies that the chairman made, and those analogies seem to escape ordinary logic.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Maybe I should try to right that wrong analogy that our chairman thought; but maybe if I take his analogy that it is not based on the house I sold but it is based on the house I am living in, well, what is the difference?

If I went to the bank and wanted to put my house up for collateral but I hadn't paid the payment on it in 4 months and it was getting ready to be foreclosed on, I think they would want to know that. And that would be maybe a better analogy on it, because what we are trying to say to the people who are out there watching and listening to this: You cannot let our larger banks put us at risk, what we know also happened in 2008.

So that was the point I was making. So let's say the analogies don't work so we don't have to go back and forth. Let me just say that I am voting "no" on this because I don't want to blindfold or tie the hands of the regulators' being able to do their jobs.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for all of his work moving this important regulatory reform through.

I speak today in support of H.R. 4296, to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency. This bill is one of many that are being reported by the Financial Services Committee with bipartisan support.

I want to commend Congressman LUETKEMEYER and Congressman MEEKS for working together to get a very strong vote from the Financial Services Committee. I hope that is something we can accomplish today on the House floor.

This legislation acknowledges that we can make improvements to the regulatory framework that has been implemented or is still pending in response to the financial crisis. My con-

stituents and I are very pleased to see the economic growth over the last year, but that does not mean we shouldn't take additional steps to ensure that we have an efficient regulatory system. For example, the Fed is likely going to continue tightening rates, and I am not sure Congress will always be able to provide the pro-growth fiscal policy that we have seen as of late.

One of our other tools for affecting the performance of the economy is a pro-growth but sensible regime that permits for investment, job creation, and financial security. H.R. 4296 will ensure our banking regulators institute operational risk capital standards that make sense for the U.S. financial system.

This legislation ensures that operational risk-based capital requirements are reflective of the banking organization's current activities and businesses. This seems logical, but the current approach is dependent on historical performance and does not provide for adjustments based on changes made by a banking organization.

So, for example, a banking organization might suffer from a cyber attack that results in losses for the organization. In fact, cyber attacks and data breaches are considered to be one of the largest categories of operational risk. In response, this banking organization could choose to overhaul its ability to detect and respond to such operational risk incidents.

Shouldn't our capital framework reflect that work, or should the banking organization continue to suffer from a punitive framework that disincentivizes proactively addressing operational risk?

I, for one, am supportive of policies that will encourage investment by banking organizations to address reputational risk, such as those that might pose a risk for a data breach. I would encourage all of my colleagues to vote in support of this bipartisan legislation. I would encourage our financial sector to proactively address operational risks, and it will also free up capital to permit for economic growth.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD), a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for her leadership in opposing this bill and standing in the protection of everyday Americans.

We can't forget that it was only 10 years ago that millions of hardworking families watched their life savings entirely wiped out. They lost their homes. They couldn't afford to send their kids to college. And all of this heartache, this pain, this suffering that they went through was the direct result of risky predatory lending practices and too-big-to-fail banks that did not have sufficient capital in place to

support and absorb their financial losses.

It was in the aftermath of this financial disaster in 2008 that Congress passed protections to prevent this from happening again, but here we are today where these big banks now believe that we should simply forget the past mistakes that they made and, instead, only evaluate their current activities to determine certain capital requirements. I guarantee you those families that have suffered have not simply forgotten about what they went through and what they are still struggling to overcome and recover from.

By ignoring critical indicators of past activities, this bill would allow big banks, like Wells Fargo, for example, who defrauded the American people just in the last several months by opening millions of fake accounts, to get away with a slap on the wrist. And the American people are set up to take the fall for their actions.

Now, supporters of this bill claim that current capital requirements stifle lending and hurt our banks and the economy, but the facts say otherwise. In 2016, bank profits reached an all-time high, and today business lending is up 75 percent since 2010. Our country's banks added more than \$700 billion in capital to absorb potential losses and protect Americans and our economy from financial disaster.

Higher capital requirements don't restrict lending. They simply ensure that big banks that are even bigger today than they were in 2008 can absorb their losses without depending on taxpayers for a bailout.

The American people deserve a financial system that works for them and their families, not one that bets against them to boost Wall Street profits. We need to pass legislation that increases these capital requirements of banks with assets greater than \$50 billion and continue to enact and strengthen reforms that will protect our economy and American families from another massive collapse. That is why I am strongly urging our colleagues to reject this dangerous bill and, instead, work together towards efforts to build a financial system that serves the American people, not special interests or Wall Street banks.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I point out to my friends on the other side of the aisle, there are over 20 different capital levels that are already applied to our banking organizations, including the Total Loss-Absorbing Capital, the TLAC.

I would also point out, if my friends are so concerned about capital levels, maybe they should have supported the Financial CHOICE Act, which is a tradeoff between greater levels of capital and Washington micromanagement of our financial institutions.

Last but not least, Chairman Powell of the Federal Reserve appeared before our committee just this morning to say safety and soundness considerations

allow the Fed to, for all intents and purposes, impose any capital level they want to on our banking institutions, thus undercutting all the arguments we have heard from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, for his active work on this important legislation.

In the aftermath of the financial crisis, the Basel Committee expanded regulations on operational risk requirements imposed on financial institutions. Unfortunately, like many of the implemented regulations, unintended consequences were brought about. The complexity and nature of the current operational risk capital requirements have greatly diminished the availability of credit for consumers, resulting in increased costs and prices for families and small businesses.

To address these concerns, H.R. 4296 limits the burden of operational risk capital requirements to a bank's current activities and businesses and permits adjustments to lessen operational risk. This will ensure that banks are holding increased capital more efficiently and will expand the credit market to better meet the needs of hardworking Americans.

Let me be clear: This bill does not eliminate operational risk capital requirements but, prudently, ensures that requirements are forward-looking and appropriately tailored to a bank's current financial risk profile. As a key provision of the CHOICE Act, which passed the House in June, I want to thank Mr. LUETKEMEYER for his persistence and continual leadership on this important issue.

I urge all of my colleagues to please join us in supporting this commonsense, bipartisan bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In addition to the concerns I have raised about this bill, I also want to mention a change to H.R. 4296 made in the Rules Committee just last night.

Because H.R. 4296 makes the 10 largest banks more likely to fail, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office determined that there was a higher likelihood that taxpayer funds would be used to wind down a megabank. To offset these costs, Republicans have taken funds from the Federal Reserve's surplus account.

So what is the Fed's capital surplus account? Effectively, it is a rainy-day fund intended to ensure adequate capital is available to absorb possible losses. Several stakeholders have raised concerns that, by reducing the Fed's surplus account, Congress could negatively affect the Federal Reserve's

independence in monetary policy decisionmaking by rendering it dependent on Treasury for recapitalization in the event that total Reserve bank capital is depleted.

Put simply, this bill not only makes the 10 largest banks more likely to fail, but it also makes it more likely that the Federal Reserve will be unable to address problems in the financial system going forward.

I would like to also mention that, in a letter opposing this bill, the Center for American Progress highlighted, again, several budgetary considerations we should keep in mind as we debate this bill. And, of course, I have either mentioned or alluded to it, but it is important that we understand that the Center for American Progress is very concerned, and the CBO also projects, that H.R. 4296 will increase the deficit due to an increase in expected losses to the Federal Government stemming from an increase in the likelihood of another financial crisis.

□ 1630

The bill would pay for these costs by lowering the Federal Reserve System's surplus funds, once again treating the Fed like a piggy bank and shifting privately generated losses to the public.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a very hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for all of his leadership and for recognizing me to be able to rise in strong support of this bipartisan legislation introduced by my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee, Congressman BLAINE LUETKEMEYER and Congressman GREGORY MEEKS.

Like so many regulations imposed by the 2010 Dodd-Frank law, the current set of operational risk capital requirements imposed on America's financial institutions place a one-size-fits-all solution on banks, regardless of their capitalization, their various lines of business, and the customers they serve.

The current standard under Dodd-Frank requires banks to look back and hold operational risk capital against discontinued business activities or products. In plain English, this means banks are being forced to hold capital to hedge against a fictitious risk of a loan or a product discontinued years ago.

This is not an effective way to determine capital requirements, nor is it in line with the real risk these standards are meant to protect consumers from.

This is hurting consumers by making credit less available in the marketplace, and this especially hurts the small- and medium-size hometown banks that our communities rely on.

To my constituents on Long Island, and to hardworking American families across our country, the consequences

of these misguided regulations are more costly loans and less available mortgages. These are the financial products that help small-business owners expand and hire or help families buy a new home.

H.R. 4296 reforms operational risk requirements so they can be focused on a bank's current activities and line of business. This legislation keeps sound standards in place so that banks must avoid risky behavior while also freeing up needed capital so that it can be lent to consumers, not be needlessly held up in a vault to meet a misguided government mandate.

By ensuring that capital standards are transparent, fair, and based on real-life economic conditions, this bipartisan solution removes a troubling roadblock to capital that would otherwise be allocated to consumers, homeowners, and businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again applaud the bipartisan teamwork of my colleagues BLAINE LUETKEMEYER and GREGORY MEEKS. I also want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for all of his leadership on this important issue and so many others, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important bipartisan bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, early in my statement, I warned that there would be someone who would come on the floor and claim that it was going to hurt community banks, small town banks; and this bill has nothing to do with community banks or small town banks.

This is about megabanks. This is about SIFIs. This is about the banks that can cause harm in the whole system. This is about those banks that we must be concerned about because of the displacement that they can cause, not only in this country, but internationally.

Mr. Speaker, I just remind you again this has nothing to do with community banks. This has nothing to do with small town banks. This is just the big banks that are significantly important banks.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), a very thoughtful member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for H.R. 4296 and for the bipartisan work of our committee, the work our chairman has helped lead; and I am encouraged that this bill will establish clear guardrails for operational risk capital requirements and improve U.S. capital framework as a whole.

This legislation is another example of ensuring regulators work in the best interest of the U.S. economy rather than abiding by international standards that hold American businesses back rather than move them forward.

In fact, the very premise of this legislation reminds me of a song. I remember when Bill Clinton was running, he

had a song about: “Don’t stop thinking about tomorrow. Yesterday is gone; yesterday is gone.” It is all about the future.

Well, this piece of legislation that is in place today, established by the Basel Committee in 2006, is thinking about tomorrow, is thinking about yesterday. What happened in the past is constraining what could happen in the future.

So banks are reserving against past losses in an era that holds them from being able to adopt the business plans that maybe even under new leadership, new board members, and a whole new set of governance requirements that will get the company moving forward at a better growth rate. This is better for not just the company, not just the executives or the board members, but the consumers that would be served by this market.

Take, for instance, historic losses being reserved against. That capital is sitting there not actively employed in the market. Even the Basel Committee saw how ridiculous this rule is; so they updated their guidance, in 2016, to include historical loss experience as a relevant indicator instead of as the sole factor.

It is time that we move forward in the best interests of our country and make rules that help American businesses instead of hold them back.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), a hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time to speak on this important bill and also for his tremendous and strong leadership on our committee.

H.R. 4296 would set reasonable standards for regulators that are based primarily on the risk posed by a banking organization’s current activities and businesses, not on past activities, as you have heard.

Operational risk standards were created and are a product of the European Basel Committee and have been amended twice, actually, since that time. But their adaptation still doesn’t hit the mark, and that is why, though the Basel Committee’s proposal is well intentioned, this bill and this proposal will amend that to tailor it to the needs and to the effectiveness and efficiency of our banks.

The current framework is based on past activity and will hold operational capital on discontinued products, products that banks don’t even have in their portfolios. This bill will correct those errors by allowing our U.S.-based financial regulators to tailor the capital requirements they need based on their unique business model.

H.R. 4296 limits the burden of operational risk capital requirements to a bank’s current activities and businesses, gives the bank the ability to de-

termine risk under forward-looking assessment, and would permit adjustment on risk-mitigating factors.

This bill, as you have heard over and over, does not eliminate the Federal Government’s ability to assess operational risk or alter the regulators’ authority to set capital requirements when doing business on high-risk customers.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER’s bipartisan legislation would create a commonsense reform to the Basel standards, and I urge all Members to support it.

I also want to thank Congressman MEEKS, a fellow New Yorker, for co-sponsoring this legislation.

Again, I want to thank Mr. Chairman for his great work on our committee and also Mr. LUETKEMEYER for his hard work, his bipartisan work on this bill, for a person who is a banker, a business person from a rural area of our country who really understands the need to protect consumers.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). The gentlewoman from California has 9½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let’s put aside the complex terminology we often use with Financial Services legislation and call this bill what it really is: a short-sighted giveaway to Wall Street megabanks.

Approximately ten banks we are talking about, the very largest banks in our Nation, have to abide by operational risk standards under an enhanced framework. They are required to maintain this additional capital so when they continue to engage in risky behavior, like opening millions of fake accounts to drive up profits, they will not immediately become insolvent, sparking a financial crisis.

And may I just stop here for a moment and say: it is odd that, given the information that we have discovered about some of our megabanks, particularly Wells Fargo, that was involved not only in creating fake accounts, false accounts in their clients’ names, but also selling them basically insurance that they did not need, I am wondering why my friends on the opposite side of the aisle are not more concerned about this operational risk that they take.

For example, when we talk about operational risk, include in that the fines, the fines that we have placed on Wells Fargo and other banks that have been caught committing fraud on its clients. It seems to me that this would be taken into consideration, and I don’t think they are going to stop.

We have gone through a crisis. In 2008, we had this meltdown. We had a recession, almost a depression. We had to bail out all of these banks, yet we have Members, particularly on the opposite side of the aisle, who are doing everything that they can to go back to

some of the practices that will cause us to be in the same situation we found ourselves in in 2008.

So I would just simply say that this attempt to basically say: don’t look at our past, no matter how bad we have been, no matter how many fines have been placed on them, forget about that. We don’t like that.

So in saying that, what they are basically saying is they are going to create more risk and they are going to put banks in the position of possibly failing.

So with that, I would just like us not to forget that our current operational risk capital standards didn’t come out of nowhere. They are still recovering from the 2007 to 2009 financial crisis, which was largely caused by unsafe practices by large internationally active megabanks and inadequate regulation that ignored past misconduct and risky activities.

The crisis stripped wealth from millions of American families and destroyed the economy. Since we passed the Dodd-Frank Act and the regulators have implemented standards from the international Basel III accord, including our operational risk capital rules, we have made tremendous progress to create a better capitalized and more stable banking system, and this is bearing results.

Megabanks have experienced record-breaking profits for the past several years. Now they expect us to believe that these commonsense rules that take into account their previous behavior was keeping them from providing more affordable credit to hardworking consumers in search of the American Dream?

As I mentioned earlier, a bank can still make loans to credit-worthy consumers while funding those loans with capital instead of debt.

□ 1645

Operational capital is not cash locked away at night, but, rather, it is the value of a bank’s assets minus its liabilities or debts. A well-capitalized bank that has adequate sources of funding can accommodate losses without reducing its lending. In fact, it would be able to lend in good times and in bad.

We should direct the regulators overseeing megabanks like Wells Fargo with its years of numerous consumer abuses and JPMorgan Chase with its London Whale trading scandal not to ignore these past failures and put our constituents at risk.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are rushing through deregulatory measures to help their friends on Wall Street. But Congress must not forget that it was hardworking consumers across the country who paid dearly for Wall Street’s faults in the last financial crisis. So I would urge Members to vote “no” on this bill.

I am very pleased that while my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle keep talking about this being a bipartisan bill and they mention Mr. MEEKS’

name from New York, et cetera, we have the support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus in opposition to this bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this legislation because I think it addresses a fundamental flaw in how we have looked at operational risk capital.

Fundamentally, we want banks to hold capital necessary for the risks they are taking today and the likely risks that they may incur losses into the future. By purely looking backwards, we are driving down the Interstate in the financial system driving by looking in the rearview mirror only. That is a terrible mistake by only looking at past risks instead of the risks they have today.

If we want to encourage institutions to become less risky, then we need to ensure that they can reduce the amount of capital buffer if they are doing less risky activities. This is basically incentivizing the right behavior. If we continue to say to institutions: You are going to be penalized for the past irrespective of what you may be doing today, irrespective of the less risk you may be taking into the future, then we are essentially providing them no incentive to become less risky.

I think the lesson after 2008 is making sure that we allow the free markets and institutions to act with the right incentives, not the wrong incentives. We want them to become less risky over time by their own decisions and by their own elections.

This doesn't change anything about the basic operational risk capital that they must maintain, except that it says it should match what they are doing today and the activities that they are going to be engaged on in the future.

So I do think this is commonsense legislation. I do think this is a thoughtful response to a genuine problem that I hear about back home in Indiana frequently. So I continue to support H.R. 4296, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, for the perhaps two dozen people who are watching us on C-SPAN at the moment, I think it is important to add a little bit of clarity to what we are debating here.

What we are debating is: What is the proper capital level for a federally insured financial institution?

We know that if that capital level is set too low, then perhaps the financial institution could fail. If it is set too high, then they will not have the capital to help fund the American Dream—car loans, home loans, and small business loans.

So we have heard a lot about a very simple bill that helps clarify one of perhaps two dozen different capital levels that are already applicable to our banking institutions, the total loss-absorbing capacity, the supplementary leverage ratio, the enhanced supplementary leverage ratio, the liquidity coverage ratio, the G-SIB surcharge, and the list goes on and on and on.

We are talking, about, Mr. Speaker, one capital level, the operational capital—operational risk capital. So, number one, there are a multitude of different capital levels and liquidity levels that are already applied to our financial institutions.

What we are saying is, if we are measuring operational risk, we should focus on current risks. Then, if in doubt, Mr. Speaker, I always recommend that Members actually read the bills that are being debated. It is an always helpful exercise. If you would actually read the bill, you would discover in section 1 of the bill, Mr. LUETKEMEYER's bill says that operational risk capital is based primarily on the risks posed by a banking organizations' current activities and business.

If you look at subparagraph (3) of paragraph (a), it says: “. . . which is not solely based on a banking organization's historic losses.”

So it is not prohibited to look at historic facts, but, primarily, we must be focused on the current operational risk.

As I used earlier in the debate the analogy of who would want their life insurance premiums based on the fact that in an earlier point in their life they were a skydiver or a scuba diver and now today they are facing life as an accountant? Those are different risk profiles.

If you build a home 4 feet below sea level, yet you sell that home, I doubt you want your flood insurance premiums based on the home that you already sold. It makes no sense.

As I also said earlier in this debate, when it comes to proper levels of capital, as Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell stated earlier today before our committee, safety and soundness considerations trump all. The regulators have the power to adjust the capital levels.

Now, this friend on the other side of the aisle talks about, oh, my God, this is a huge risk to the economy. It is \$22 million. Now, that is real money. But, Mr. Speaker, we all know that is not even a rounding error here; \$22 million over the 10-year budget window is approximately a \$2 million risk. And from the Congressional Budget Office report, they say that it is a small, small chance that the FDIC would

incur additional costs. So this is not creating more risk to the system.

What we are trying to do is calibrate the appropriate risk. If we are going to measure operational risk as opposed to the other 20-some odd capital levels, then we ought to be focused on current risk, because if we are not, Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans are losing current credit opportunities in order to pay for past operational risk. That is not right, that is not fair, and that is not smart.

We ought to ensure that we have the proper capital level not only to make sure that we have a safe and sound financial system but to make sure that we are capitalizing the American Dream for our constituents.

My constituents in the Fifth District of Texas, who live in places like Mineola and Forney, who are desperately trying to fund their American Dream and put that down payment on a first house, we have got to make sure that they are able to.

So many Americans are living paycheck to paycheck. They need these credit opportunities, Mr. Speaker. Let's calibrate one capital ratio properly. Let's add a little common sense, and let's not allow the good people in Basel, Switzerland—as good as they may be—de facto impose what is an irrational capital system on our banking system as we are trying to help our small businesses and our families.

So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 4296, a strong bipartisan bill to help credit opportunities for all families.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 747, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Maxine Waters of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4296 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 1(b)(2), redesignate subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) as clauses (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively, and adjust the margins accordingly.

Page 2, line 16, strike “means—” and insert the following: “—

(A) means—

Page 3, line 7, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 3, after line 7, insert the following:

(B) does not include a global systemically important bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof, if the global systemically important bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof has engaged in a pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other violations related to consumer harm.

(3) FEDERAL CONSUMER FINANCIAL LAW.—The term “Federal consumer financial law” has the meaning given that term under section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(4) GLOBAL SYSTEMICALLY IMPORTANT BANK HOLDING COMPANY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “global systemically important bank holding company” means—

(i) a bank holding company that has been identified by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as a global systemically important bank holding company pursuant to section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(ii) a global systemically important foreign banking organization, as defined under section 252.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(B) TREATMENT OF EXISTING GSIBS.—A company or organization described under clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A) on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed a global systemically important bank holding company for purposes of this Act.

(5) PATTERN OR PRACTICE OF UNSAFE OR UNSOUND BANKING PRACTICES AND OTHER VIOLATIONS RELATED TO CONSUMER HARM.—The term “pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other violations related to consumer harm” means engaging in all of the following activities, to the extent each activity was discovered or occurred at least once in the 10 years preceding the date of the enactment of this Act:

(A) Having unsafe or unsound practices in the institution’s risk management and oversight of the institution’s sales practices, as evidenced by—

(i) an institution lacking an enterprise-wide sales practices oversight program that enables the institution to adequately monitor sales practices to prevent and detect unsafe or unsound sales practices and mitigate risks that may result from such unsafe and unsound sales practices; and

(ii) an institution lacking a comprehensive customer complaint monitoring process that—

(I) enables the institution to assess customer complaint activity across the institution;

(II) adequately monitors, manages, and reports on customer complaints; and

(III) analyzes and understands the potential risks posed by the institution’s sales practices.

(B) Engaging in unsafe and unsound sales practices, as evidenced by the institution—

(i) opening more than one million unauthorized deposit, credit card, or other accounts;

(ii) performing unauthorized transfers of customer funds; and

(iii) performing unauthorized credit inquiries for purposes of the conduct described in clause (i) or (ii).

(C) Lacking adequate oversight of third-party vendors for purposes of risk-mitigation, to prevent abusive and deceptive practices in the vendor’s provision of consumer products or services.

(D) Having deficient policies and procedures for sharing customers’ personal identifiable information with third-party vendors for litigation purposes that led to inad-

vertent disclosure of such information to unintended parties.

(E) Violating Federal consumer financial laws with respect to mortgage loans, including charges of hidden fees and unauthorized or improper disclosures tied to home mortgage loan modifications.

(F) Engaging in unsafe or unsound banking practices related to residential mortgage loan servicing and foreclosure processing.

(G) Violating the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

We have talked at length today about how H.R. 4296 is a bill for Wall Street megabanks, and I deeply disagree with the bill’s approach. So I offer this motion to recommit not in a manner that sends the bill to the committee and kills the bill, but, rather, to attempt to improve the bill before the House votes on final passage of the measure.

Let’s discuss the elephant in the room. We all know megabanks have been given a free ride in Washington for far too long. During the savings and loan crisis, the government had no problem throwing bankers in jail for breaking the law. Over 1,000 bank executives were prosecuted. But now megabanks just get a fine, a slap on the wrist, for harming consumers.

Since 2010, megabanks have racked up over \$160 billion worth of fines, yet they keep breaking the law. We have talked about Wells Fargo’s growing list of illegal actions that have harmed millions of consumers. Sure they have been fined, but these fines are just the cost of doing business. This soft enforcement approach is just increasing their operational risk and losses, which, at the end of the day, will impact not only all of their customers, but the broader economy as well.

I hope Republicans and Democrats can all agree that any megabank that engages in a pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other egregious violations that has resulted in profound consumer harm in the last 10 years is not entitled to any benefit of regulatory relief provided under this bill.

So my amendment excludes a megabank like Wells Fargo that has fraudulently opened millions of accounts without their customers’ consent, enrolled consumers in life insurance policies without their consent, and forced nearly 1 million Americans to purchase automobile insurance that they didn’t even need.

Since 2016, I have been calling for Wells Fargo to face real penalties. Last year, I introduced H.R. 3937, the Megabank Accountability and Consequences Act, to compel the Federal bank regulators to fully utilize existing authorities to stop these megabanks from repeatedly flouting the law and harming millions of consumers.

So I was glad to see Janet Yellen on her last day at the Federal Reserve take bold action to cap the bank’s size until it cleans up its act. I am talking about Wells Fargo. This is what Janet Yellen did on her last day at the Federal Reserve.

But we must do more to send a strong message to all megabanks that there will be real consequences for their bad actions that mislead, abuse, or deceive its customers.

H.R. 4296, in its current form, would send the opposite message to recidivist megabanks. They should not reap the profit of easier operational capital requirements while their operational breakdowns are only increasing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this motion to recommit so that we do not reward a recidivist megabank like Wells Fargo for repeated operational failures that ripped off millions of consumers.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, again, there are roughly two dozen different capital and liquidity levels that are applied to our banks. We are talking about, one, operational capital, and whether or not operational risk capital ought to be based on current risk.

Now, I know my friend on the other side of the aisle always likes to wave the Wells Fargo flag. Wells Fargo needs to be held accountable. There needs to be justice for all who have been wronged. There have been roughly \$142 million now paid in restitution. There have been over \$200 million in fines paid.

□ 1700

The board of Wells Fargo has been replaced. The CEO was fired, and the Federal Reserve capped their growth, all under existing authorities.

But under this motion to recommit, potentially, other financial institutions could be included. It is not the financial institution that counts, at the end of the day. It is capital that could be used to fund car loans. It is capital that could be used to fund homes. It is capital that could be used to fund the next Apple or the next Amazon. Instead, that capital would be put onto the sidelines.

Again, we are talking about operational risk capital only and should it be calibrated for current risk or past risk. That is a completely different



issue from ensuring that customers of Wells Fargo, who clearly have been wronged, receive justice and that Wells Fargo has been held accountable.

Again, I would point out this might not have happened if the CFPB under the previous administration had been doing their business. They should have caught this. But they didn't. Instead, it was the LA Times and the Los Angeles city attorney. The CFPB was asleep at the wheel under the previous administration.

So, again, there is existing authority. But if the regulators and then-Director Cordray had been doing their job, this wouldn't have happened. The evidence was there and it was simply overlooked. We see way too many instances of that, Mr. Chair.

Again, we want to properly calibrate one capital level, operational risk capital. That is what the bill of the gentleman from Missouri does. We should not be confused about the jihad against banks, because banks, ultimately, are still funding the American Dream. You punish our constituents, you punish small businesses every time you needlessly take away capital that can fund their American dreams.

I urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit. I urge an "aye" vote on Mr. LUETKEMEYER's bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 228, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—185

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

Gutiérrez	Lujan Grisham, M.	Roybal-Allard
Hanabusa	Luiján, Ben Ray	Ruiz
Hastings	Lynch	Ruppersberger
Heck	Maloney,	Rush
Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.	Ryan (OH)
Himes	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez
Hoyer	Matsui	Sarbanes
Huffman	McCollum	Schakowsky
Jackson Lee	McEachin	Schiff
Jayapal	McGovern	Schneider
Jeffries	McNerney	Schrader
Johnson (GA)	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Johnson, E. B.	Meng	Scott, David
Jones	Moore	Serrano
Kaptur	Moulton	Sewell (AL)
Keating	Murphy (FL)	Shea-Porter
Kelly (IL)	Nadler	Sherman
Kennedy	Napolitano	Sinema
Khanna	Neal	Sires
Kihuen	Nolan	Slaughter
Kildee	Norcross	Soto
Kilmer	O'Halleran	Suozzi
Kind	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)
Krishnamoorthi	Pallone	Takano
Kuster (NH)	Panetta	Thompson (CA)
Langevin	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Titus
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Tonko
Lawrence	Peters	Tsongas
Lawson (FL)	Peterson	Vargas
Lee	Pingree	Veasey
Levin	Pocan	Vela
Lewis (GA)	Polis	Visclosky
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Lipinski	Quigley	Schultz
Loeb sack	Raskin	Waters, Maxine
Lofgren	Rice (NY)	Watson Coleman
Lowenthal	Richmond	Welch
Lowey	Rosen	Yarmuth

NAYS—228

Abraham	Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger
Aderholt	Dunn	Knight
Allen	Emmer	Kustoff (TN)
Amash	Estes (KS)	Labrador
Amodei	Farenthold	LaHood
Arrington	Faso	LaMalfa
Babin	Ferguson	Lamborn
Bacon	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Banks (IN)	Fleischmann	Latta
Barletta	Flores	Lewis (MN)
Barr	Portenberry	LoBiondo
Barton	Foxx	Loudermilk
Bergman	Frelinghuysen	Love
Biggs	Lucas	Lucas
Bilirakis	Gallagher	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (MI)	Garrett	MacArthur
Bishop (UT)	Gianforte	Marchant
Blackburn	Gibbs	Marino
Blum	Gohmert	Marshall
Bost	Goodlatte	Massie
Brady (TX)	Gosar	Mast
Brat	Gowdy	McCarthy
Bridenstine	Granger	McCaul
Brooks (AL)	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Brooks (IN)	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Buck	Griffith	McMorris
Bucshon	Grothman	Rodgers
Budd	Guthrie	McSally
Burgess	Handel	Meadows
	Harper	Meehan
	Harris	Messer
	Hartzler	Mitchell
	Chabot	Moolenaar
	Cheney	Mooney (WV)
	Coffman	Mullin
	Cole	Newhouse
	Collins (GA)	Noem
	Collins (NY)	Norman
	Comer	Nunes
	Comstock	Hollingsworth
	Conaway	Hudson
	Cook	Hultgren
	Costello (PA)	Hunter
	Crawford	Hurd
	Culberson	Issa
	Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (KS)
	Curtis	Jenkins (WV)
	Davidson	Johnson (LA)
	Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)
	Denham	Johnson, Sam
	Dent	Jordan
	DeSantis	Joyce (OH)
	DesJarlais	Katko
	DiaZ-Balart	Kelly (MS)
	Donovan	Kelly (PA)
	Duffy	King (IA)
		King (NY)
		Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)	Shimkus	Walberg
Rohrabacher	Shuster	Walden
Rokita	Simpson	Walker
Rooney, Francis	Smith (MO)	Walorski
Rooney, Thomas J.	Smith (NE)	Walters, Mimi
	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Roskam	Smucker	Wenstrup
Ross	Stefanik	Westerman
Rothfus	Stewart	Williams
Rouzer	Stivers	Wilson (SC)
Royce (CA)	Taylor	Wittman
Russell	Tenney	Womack
Rutherford	Thompson (PA)	Woodall
Sanford	Thornberry	Yoder
Scalise	Tipton	Yoho
Schweikert	Turner	Young (AK)
Scott, Austin	Upton	Young (IA)
Sensenbrenner	Valadao	Zeldin
Sessions	Wagner	

NOT VOTING—17

Black	Huizenga	Torres
Carter (TX)	Long	Trott
Cleaver	Payne	Velázquez
Cramer	Pearce	Walz
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Engel	Speier	

□ 1728

Messrs. RUTHERFORD, COLE, REED, GROTHMAN, YODER, STIVERS, and DIAZ-BALART changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. COHEN, KHANNA, and RICHMOND changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 88.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 169, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—245

Abraham	Burgess	DiaZ-Balart
Aderholt	Byrne	Donovan
Allen	Calvert	Duffy
Amash	Carson (IN)	Duncan (SC)
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Dunn
Arrington	Chabot	Emmer
Babin	Cheney	Estes (KS)
Bacon	Coffman	Farenthold
Banks (IN)	Cole	Faso
Barletta	Collins (GA)	Ferguson
Barr	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Barton	Comer	Fleischmann
Bergman	Comstock	Flores
Biggs	Conaway	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Cook	Foxx
Bishop (MI)	Correa	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT)	Costa	Gaetz
Blackburn	Costello (PA)	Gallagher
Blum	Crawford	Garrett
Bost	Cuellar	Gianforte
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gibbs
Brat	Curtis	Gohmert
Bridenstine	Davidson	Goodlatte
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Brooks (IN)	Delaney	Gottheimer
Buchanan	Denham	Gowdy
Buck	Dent	Granger
Bucshon	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Budd	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)



Graves (MO) McCaul  
 Griffith McClintock  
 Grothman McHenry  
 Guthrie McKinley  
 Handel McMorris  
 Harper Rodgers  
 Harris McSally  
 Hartzler Meadows  
 Hensarling Meehan  
 Herrera Beutler Meeks  
 Hice, Jody B. Messer  
 Higgins (LA) Mitchell  
 Hill Moolenaar  
 Holding Mooney (WV)  
 Hollingsworth Mullin  
 Hudson Murphy (FL)  
 Hultgren Newhouse  
 Hunter Noem  
 Hurd Norman  
 Issa Nunes  
 Jenkins (KS) O'Halleran  
 Jenkins (WV) Olson  
 Johnson (LA) Palazzo  
 Johnson (OH) Palmer  
 Johnson, Sam Paulsen  
 Jordan Perry  
 Joyce (OH) Peterson  
 Katko Pittenger  
 Kelly (MS) Poe (TX)  
 Kelly (PA) Poliquin  
 King (IA) Polis  
 King (NY) Posey  
 Kinzinger Ratchliffe  
 Knight Reed  
 Kustoff (TN) Reichert  
 Labrador Renacci  
 LaHood Rice (NY)  
 LaMalfa Rice (SC)  
 Lamborn Roby  
 Lance Roe (TN)  
 Latta Rogers (AL)  
 Lewis (MN) Rogers (KY)  
 LoBiondo Rohrabacher  
 Loudermilk Rokita  
 Love Rooney, Francis  
 Lucas Rooney, Thomas  
 Luetkemeyer J.  
 MacArthur Ros-Lehtinen  
 Marchant Roskam  
 Marino Ross  
 Marshall Rothfus  
 Massie Rouzer  
 Mast Royce (CA)  
 McCarthy Ruppertsberger

Russell  
 Rutherford  
 Scalise  
 Schneider  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sinema  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smucker  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Suozzi  
 Taylor  
 Tenney  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Veasey  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Roby  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Zeldin

Black Engel  
 Carter (TX) Huizenga  
 Cleaver Long  
 Cramer Payne  
 Cummings Pearce  
 Curbelo (FL) Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1737

So the bill was passed.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 748 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1865.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1739

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARTER of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-583, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. MIMI WALTERS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-583, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 308, noes 107, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

AYES—308

Abraham	Dingell	Lawrence
Adams	Doggett	Lawson (FL)
Aderholt	Donovan	Levin
Aguilar	Doyle, Michael	Lewis (GA)
Amodei	F.	Lipinski
Arrington	Duffy	LoBiondo
Barletta	Dunn	Loeb sack
Barr	Ellison	Love
Barragán	Españallat	Lowey
Barton	Estes (KS)	Lucas
Bass	Esty (CT)	Luetkemeyer
Beatty	Evans	Lujan Grisham,
Bera	Faso	M.
Billirakis	Fitzpatrick	Luján, Ben Ray
Bishop (GA)	Fleischmann	MacArthur
Bishop (MI)	Flores	Maloney,
Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	Carolyn B.
Blackburn	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Blumenauer	Frelinghuysen	Marchant
Blunt Rochester	Gallagher	Marino
Bost	Gallego	Marshall
Boyle, Brendan	Garamendi	Mast
F.	Gianforte	Matsui
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	McCarthy
Brooks (IN)	Gonzalez (TX)	McCaul
Brown (MD)	Gottheimer	McCollum
Brownley (CA)	Gowdy	McEachin
Buchanan	Granger	McHenry
Bucshon	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Budd	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Burgess	Green, Al	Rodgers
Bustos	Green, Gene	McSally
Butterfield	Grijalva	Meehan
Byrne	Guthrie	Meeks
Calvert	Gutiérrez	Meng
Carbajal	Hanabusa	Messer
Cárdenas	Handel	Mitchell
Carter (GA)	Harper	Moolenaar
Cartwright	Hartzler	Mooney (WV)
Castor (FL)	Hastings	Moulton
Castro (TX)	Hensarling	Mullin
Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (FL)
Cheney	Higgins (LA)	Nadler
Chu, Judy	Hill	Neal
Cicilline	Himes	Newhouse
Clyburn	Holding	Noem
Coffman	Hollingsworth	Norcross
Cohen	Hoyer	Norman
Cole	Hultgren	Nunes
Collins (GA)	Hunter	O'Halleran
Collins (NY)	Hurd	Olson
Comstock	Issa	Pallone
Conaway	Jackson Lee	Panetta
Connolly	Jenkins (KS)	Pascarell
Cook	Jenkins (WV)	Paulsen
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Correa	Johnson (OH)	Perlmutter
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	Peters
Costello (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Peterson
Courtney	Joyce (OH)	Pingree
Crawford	Kaptur	Pittenger
Crist	Katko	Poe (TX)
Crowley	Keating	Poliquin
Cuellar	Kelly (PA)	Polis
Culberson	Kihuen	Posey
Curbelo (FL)	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Curtis	Kind	Quigley
Davis (CA)	King (NY)	Reed
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger	Reichert
DeFazio	Knigh t	Renacci
DeGette	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
Delaney	Kuster (NH)	Rice (SC)
DeLauro	LaHood	Roby
Demings	LaMalfa	Roe (TN)
Denham	Lance	Rogers (AL)
Dent	Langevin	Rogers (KY)
DeSantis	Larsen (WA)	Rooney, Thomas
Deutch	Larson (CT)	J.
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen

NAYS—169

Adams  
 Aguilar  
 Barragán  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Bera  
 Beyler  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt Rochester  
 Bonamici  
 Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (MD)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Capuano  
 Carbajal  
 Cárdenas  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Cooper  
 Courtney  
 Crist  
 Crowley  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 DeBene  
 Demings

DeSaulnier  
 Deutch  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle, Michael  
 F.  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellison  
 Eshoo  
 Espaillat  
 Esty (CT)  
 Evans  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Gomez  
 Gonzalez (TX)  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hanabusa  
 Hastings  
 Heck  
 Higgins (NY)  
 Himes  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jayapal  
 Jeffries  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kennedy  
 Khanna  
 Kihuen

Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Kuster (NH)  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lawson (FL)  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Loyey  
 Lujan Grisham,  
 M.  
 Luján, Ben Ray  
 Lynch  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn B.  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McNeerney  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Panetta  
 Pascarell

Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus

Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Turner  
Upton

Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Wilson (SC)  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Zeldin

NOES—107

Allen  
Amash  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Bergman  
Beyer  
Biggs  
Blum  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Buck  
Capuano  
Carson (IN)  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Comer  
Davidson  
Davis, Danny  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
DesJarlais  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Emmer  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Ferguson  
Foster  
Foxx  
Fudge  
Gabbard

Gaetz  
Garrett  
Gohmert  
Gomez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Graves (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Harris  
Heck  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (NY)  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (LA)  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kildee  
King (IA)  
Takano  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lee  
Lewis (MN)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lofgren  
Loudermilk  
Lowenthal  
Lynch

Massie  
McClintock  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Moore  
Napolitano  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Perry  
Pocan  
Raskin  
Ratcliffe  
Richmond  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rouzer  
Rush  
Sanford  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Titus  
Tsongas  
Walker  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—15

Black  
Carter (TX)  
Cleaver  
Cramer  
Cummings

Engel  
Huizenga  
Long  
Payne  
Pearce

Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Torres  
Trott  
Walz

□ 1746

Ms. GABBARD changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. EVANS, BROWN of Maryland, GRIJALVA, DEFAZIO, ZELDIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the

state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 748, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCALISE. 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 388, noes 25, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

AYES—388

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Aguiar  
Allen  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barragán  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Bergman  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)

Brownlee (CA)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Cook  
Cooper

Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Crawford  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Curtis  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Deuth  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duffy  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Ellison  
Emmer  
Espallat

Estes (KS)  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxx  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Goodlatte  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (MN)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsock  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Mast  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Norman  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Paulsen  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Kihuen  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Roby  
Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

NOES—25

Amash  
Beyer

Biggs  
Davidson

DeSaulnier  
Duncan (SC)

Eshoo	Khanna	Sanford
Gaetz	Labrador	Scott (VA)
Gosar	Lee	Takano
Griffith	Lofgren	Watson Coleman
Huffman	Massie	Williams
Jayapal	McClintock	
Jones	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—17

Black	Huizenga	Smith (WA)
Carter (TX)	Long	Speier
Cleaver	Payne	Torres
Cramer	Pearce	Trott
Cummings	Simpson	Walz
Engel	Smith (NE)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1759

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 91.

FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING

(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, sex trafficking is a modern-day slavery that violates the human rights of nearly 21 million victims every year. It is a rampant crime, committed around the world, but what many don't realize is that human trafficking is unfortunately a big problem right here in the United States.

Online trafficking is booming because there are no serious legal consequences for the websites that exploit or profit from the exploitation of innocent and vulnerable young children. Websites like backpage.com are able to evade responsibility for their role in trafficking in this industry as they continue to profit from ads selling girls for sex.

That is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, bipartisan legislation that will give Federal, State, and local prosecutors the tools that they need to hold websites accountable for supporting this horrendous industry and help put an end to the online sale of trafficking victims.

PASS THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN OF 2018

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, Sandy Hook, Orlando, Las Vegas, Sutherland Springs, and now Parkland. The common denominator between all these awful tragedies has been the use of assault weapons. Built to kill, these customizable weapons have allowed

gunmen to slaughter dozens of innocent people swiftly, easily, and with no special training.

Since the ban on assault weapons lapsed in 2004, far too many of these weapons have ended up in the wrong hands. There is no one solution to reducing the mass shootings and other forms of gun violence in our Nation, but reinstating the ban on assault weapons would be a critical first step. I urge all of my House colleagues to put public safety before the gun lobby and pass the Assault Weapons Ban of 2018 to keep weapons of war off the streets and out of our schools.

I have heard from students across Maine who want to feel safe in their schools. They do not want their classrooms to look and feel like prisons. They do not want to live in fear that someone could enter their school with a firearm that is capable of committing mass murder. We owe it to the generation of students who are growing up against a backdrop of lockdown drills and mass shootings. We need to act like adults and protect them by banning assault weapons.

STOLEN: THE INNOCENCE OF A CHILD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Jane was 9 years old—9—when she was first trafficked in Brownsville, Texas. For 3 years, Maria Losoya trafficked the child. That is her right there. She trafficked Jane from town to town in south Texas. Losoya filled her own pockets by selling Jane at the marketplace of modern-day sex slavery.

Mr. Speaker, filthy criminals steal children like Jane's youth, innocence, and they try to steal their souls. Jane's story finally came to light when she alerted authorities at her school in 2015. Now she is trying to cope with the guilt and shame of her past.

Mr. Speaker, it is not Jane who should be ashamed; it is the dastardly human traffickers like Maria Losoya who should be ashamed. That is why my legislation, the Shame Act, gives Federal judges the ability to publish the names and photographs of convicted buyers and sellers of our children. Buyers and sellers will no longer be able to hide in plain sight under the cloak of being anonymous. Those who sell and buy the innocence of children should be shamed for all to see.

And that is just the way it is.

MISSILE DEFENSE FUNDING FOR ISRAEL

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

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am filing a bipartisan bill to ensure our ally Israel has adequate missile defenses.

Threats to Israel come from Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Assad re-

gime in Syria, Hamas in Gaza, and Iran. Each has an arsenal that can target Israel. The U.S. and Israel recently signed an agreement that the U.S. would provide Israel with \$500 million a year in missile defense funding and that Israel can seek additional support when the two nations agree exceptional circumstances exist.

My bill would codify this law. This would affirm Congress' recognition that the \$500 million is a floor, not a ceiling, and signal Congress' intent to provide more funds where conditions on the ground justify it. My bill reflects the view that the term “exceptional circumstances” should be interpreted in a reasonable and not overly restrictive manner. Providing Israel with additional missile defense funding could deter Israel's foes from launching an attack and help prevent conflict. The goal of my bill is to preserve the peace and to ensure that Israel prevails if its enemies choose the path of war.

REMEMBERING REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

(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, Roxanne and I will be forever grateful for the positive impact Reverend Billy Graham has had for American families and the world. Reverend Graham had the amazing ability to digest the stories and lessons in the Bible and relay that information in ways that were understandable, relatable, and powerful.

He was followed and adored by millions across the world but still remained humble, with his home in Montreat in the beautiful mountains of western North Carolina, from Grandfather Mountain to Cashiers, where Psalms 72 proclaims the mountain shall bring peace.

Over 200 million people worldwide attended his crusades in over 185 countries. In 1987, our family was grateful to participate in the crusade organized by Harry Dent in Columbia, South Carolina.

Reverend Graham's accomplishments outside of his ministry were inspiring. In 1983, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom award by President Ronald Reagan; and in 1996, he and his wife, Ruth, together were awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian honor. That was also followed by the outpouring of love for Reverend Billy Graham, which will serve as a reminder for his family and staff of how much he was admired and respected.

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

SECURING AMERICA'S ELECTIONS

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security has confirmed that 21 State electoral systems were targeted in the 2016 election, revealing vulnerabilities and jeopardizing the integrity of our elections and our democracy as people lose confidence that their vote matters and that it will actually and accurately be counted.

In 2016, DEF CON, the world's largest hacking conference, revealed startling vulnerabilities in our election's infrastructure. We must take action now to safeguard our electoral infrastructure and ensure that each and every American vote is counted accurately.

I am introducing the Securing America's Elections Act, which will not only provide the American people with a voter-verified, reliable, and independent paper record of their votes that can be implemented before the 2018 elections but will also address the effectiveness and security of our electronic voting software.

We must act now to secure our elections and renew our citizens' faith in the integrity of those elections.

#### TRIBUTE TO MARIA DELITHA GREEN

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, as Black History Month draws to a close, I wanted to recognize one of my constituents who left her own mark on history.

Just 2 days ago, on February 25, 2018, Beaver County lost one of its treasures. A Mississippi native and alumni of Viterbo University in La Crosse, Wisconsin, Maria Delitha Green, fondly known as Dee, received a registered nursing license from the St. Francis School of Nursing in 1954. In 1955, she moved to Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, where she was hired on at Providence Hospital as the first African-American registered nurse in Beaver County. Eventually, she was promoted to head nurse.

Dee faced many obstacles as an African-American nurse in the 1950s, such as the reality of segregated dormitory housing. However, she did not let those barriers discourage her, believing that people would accept her for who she was.

A trailblazer and diligent worker, Dee loved her job and continued her career as a nurse for 36 years, until she retired in 1990. She was a blessing to those with whom she came in contact and remained a caregiver until her health declined at the end of 2017. We are grateful for her decades of exemplary service and the outstanding model that she was.

May God grant her eternal rest, and may her family be consoled with many blessed memories.

#### GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the question is: When? In 2017, there were 11,600 deaths linked to gun violence. In 2017, nearly four 911 attacks. There were more than 15,000 killed by gun violence in 2016. There were 383 mass shootings.

The United States ranks number one in the world in terms of firearms per capita. The problem is so epidemic that gun violence is now the third leading cause of death of our children, which includes those dear souls who died in Florida just a couple of weeks ago. We heard those children's voices. We have heard many voices.

So let me explain to the American people: no one is grabbing the Second Amendment. I honor the amendments of this Nation. For your information, in order to change an amendment, you need a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate and three-quarters of the States. The last time we changed an amendment was 1933, where we repealed the prohibition amendment.

This is a cause of the heart and the mind. It is not a Second Amendment debate. It is a debate on sensible gun legislation to save lives.

Ban bump stocks.

Extend the waiting period.

Ensure that multiple munitions are banned and automatic weapons are banned.

When is there going to be, Mr. Speaker, the coming together of a bipartisan effort to save the lives of our children? Enough is enough. We need to answer the call. Our children are dying.

#### HONORING REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and ministry of Billy Graham. Billy Graham shared a simple message of the good news of salvation through Jesus. He never tired nor wavered from the story of how, as humans, we all have a relationship problem with God because of sin in our lives. But God loves us so much that He doesn't give up on us. In fact, God has offered us an escape from the punishment due for our sin through the free gift of salvation, a gift that we can receive but we cannot earn because Jesus paid the price for our sins when He gave his life on the cross. Jesus overcame death; and through faith in Christ, we can, too.

Billy Graham shared this message out of a deep love for God and his fellow man. Not for fame. Not for fortune.

I thank God for the ministry of Billy Graham and the example he lived. May God comfort his family and a grateful

nation as we mourn his loss, and may we never tire of sharing the good news of Christ.

□ 1815

#### HOPE IN THE WAKE OF SENSELESS TRAGEDY

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about something that gives me hope in the wake of the senseless tragedies and attacks on our communities: the power of students to change the course of history.

Fifty years ago this week, 15,000 students in East Los Angeles rose up in solidarity to demand culturally relevant education, better facilities, and diverse teachers. I rise in honor of those students from Wilson, Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Belmont High Schools, who started a movement that would be known as the East Los Angeles walk-outs.

I also rise in honor of current student activists everywhere. Student activism has always been a powerful response to social injustice, that when those in power fail to listen or to act in the interests of all people, it is time for a new generation of Americans to speak up, walk out, and organize.

Whether you were in East Los Angeles in 1968 or in Parkland, Florida, in 2018, you will be heard, you will be remembered, and you will become the change that we all seek.

#### MICHAEL KENNY NAMED 2018 GRAND MARSHAL OF SAVANNAH'S ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Michael Kenny for being named the 2018 grand marshal of the Savannah St. Patrick's Day Parade, the second largest St. Patrick's Day Parade in the United States. It is important for everyone in Savannah, but most specifically, it is important for the Savannah Irish.

Savannah has a historically large Irish community, integral to the fabric of our city, and the St. Patrick's Day Parade is a direct result of this impact. The first public observance of the holiday began in 1824, and now the parade has around 280 bands, families, soldiers, and floats, all marching through the streets of Savannah.

A family affair, the Kenny family owns a successful local roofing company and has worked with the parade for over 40 years. His father, Nicolas Kenny, Jr., was the grand marshal in 1978.

In past years, the committee has chosen between many candidates for grand

marshal, but this year, Mr. Kenny was the only person nominated, a testament to the support and respect he maintains throughout Savannah.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Mr. Kenny will do a great job with this year's festivities, and I look forward to the celebration.

#### SNAP PROVIDES FOOD SECURITY

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years, Congress has funded the bipartisan Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

For close to 42 million Americans, SNAP provides food security and the freedom to choose what you want to eat, from fresh fruits and vegetables to milk and meat, to sandwich bread and even ice cream sandwiches.

But last week, the Trump administration released a budget proposal that would gut this critical lifeline by a third and completely change what food they get and how they get it.

Instead of being able to go to the store and select fresh food at the supermarket, the corner market, the rural market, or even the farmer's market, half the benefits would now come in a periodic delivery of a cardboard box filled with cheap peanut butter, canned goods, uncooked pasta, dry cereal, and something called shelf-stable milk.

I get that we want to get people who can work to work, but on the central coast of California, 63,000 people rely on over \$127 million worth of SNAP benefits to meet their own family's needs.

Those same benefits provide local businesses with over \$227 million in economic activity. That is why the administration's proposal to change SNAP won't work for the families and the store owners that I represent, and it will not work for many of the Americans that you represent.

#### BIPARTISAN SOLUTIONS TO REVISE FISA PROCESS

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America, cash at a political party should never be convertible to a warrant to spy on American citizens.

Because I expect Republicans and Democrats will both be empowered at some point in the future, we should be looking for bipartisan solutions to revise the FISA process so that what happened to President Trump never happens to a future American President.

I went looking for solutions, and I found that, in 2013, the gentleman from California, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, wanted to give

the President of the United States the power to appoint FISA judges. He argued that then judges would be more ideologically diverse. They would come from different areas in the United States, and they would be subject to Senate confirmation.

Today, I filed that legislation, and I would encourage the gentleman from California to join me as a cosponsor so that we could advance bipartisan legislation to improve the FISA process, because, Mr. Speaker, if it was good enough to give President Obama these powers, it is good enough to give President Trump these powers.

#### MAKING ENDING GUN VIOLENCE A PRIORITY

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, we don't want to go to school in a prison. That was the message I heard today from five incredible students from Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida.

As they get ready for their school to reopen, what kind of school will we be sending them and all of our children back to? It should not be one of armed teachers. They should be there to teach. What they need are real solutions.

Military-style assault weapons and high-capacity magazines are designed for the sole purpose of killing as many people as possible. They have no place on our streets.

No matter what gun you are buying, nobody should be able to complete a purchase without clearing a background check. That is common sense.

But Republicans are refusing to act because the NRA and gun manufacturers value profits over safety. That is not right.

The students told me today that they want to make ending gun violence a priority for their generation, and that means acting today.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF ALAN WILLIAMSON OF GREENE, NEW YORK

(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 Alan Williamson from Greene, New York, in New York's 22nd District.

Alan Williamson is a true craftsman who keeps history and tradition alive through his business ventures in Greene. Each of his businesses is inspired by trades that are slowly becoming a lost art in our country.

Alan runs an antique sawmill, a shingle machine, a shoelace business, a rope-making business, and a broom-making business.

Alan recently created a one-of-a-kind broom for President Trump. It is alter-

nating red and white, with stars wrapped up the handle. The "Presidential Broom" is fitted perfectly inside a wooden and glass case that Alan also crafted.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Alan the best of luck and hope that his beautiful, patriotic, and handcrafted broom makes it to the White House.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF REGINA FARR ROSS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ms. Regina Farr Ross, lovingly known in her North Side, Fort Worth community as Big Mama.

Ms. Ross was born in Fort Worth, Texas, on the Fourth of July in 1914 in Stick Town, which was a Fort Worth neighborhood. She attended Ninth Ward Elementary School and graduated from historic I.M. Terrell High School in Fort Worth.

She worked as a dishwasher and a general helper for several restaurants, including the famous Pig Stand drive-in, the Farmer's Daughter, and the Cattlemen's Steakhouse in the stockyards, where she spent 39 years and retired at the age of 80.

Ms. Ross was active in the community and volunteered her time to teach young children how to read, and on her birthday, every Independence Day, she had a huge party on Prospect Avenue in the North Side near the stockyards for everybody to come out and celebrate.

Through her membership with the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, she traveled across the East Coast advocating for lower utility rates for senior citizens.

On Wednesday, January 31, Ms. Ross passed away at her home at the age of 103. She is survived by five daughters, two sons, hundreds of grand-, great-, great-great-, and great-great-great-grandchildren.

I know the Fort Worth community will miss seeing Big Mama from her porch, waving to every passerby while she sits in her favorite chair.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and legacy of Reverend Billy Graham. He was America's pastor. He was a humble man, and he devoted his life to helping people of all backgrounds discover the true peace and joy found in the life of service to Jesus Christ.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of problems to solve in this country, much of which are too deep for mere legislation. We need prayer more than we need policy solutions. We need repentance more than we need reform.

Mr. Speaker, we need God more than we need government. Billy Graham understood that.

We need more of what Billy Graham talked about for six decades, that simple story that God so loved the world that He gave His only son to die for us, and that if we believed that, we would have eternal life with Him. That is what we need.

Thank God for Billy Graham.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF BRIAN FRASER

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Brian Fraser, who attended the Route 91 Festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Brian loved adventures. He enjoyed hunting, deep-sea fishing, snowboarding, and above all, attending the sporting events of his four kids. When he wasn't working as the vice president of sales at Greenpath, he was out flying a plane with his newly earned pilot's license.

Brian was known for being willing to help anyone and everyone. He loved giving back to the community and acted as a mentor for so many. He will be remembered for his love and passion for his children and family.

I would like to extend my condolences to Brian Fraser's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the entire country grieve with you.

#### THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HULTGREN. 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 the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, tonight, the U.S. House is joining together to begin honoring a man known worldwide but who embodied the humility of who Christ called the poor in spirit, Reverend Billy Graham.

Tomorrow, Reverend Billy Graham will be just the fourth person in the history of this great country to be laid in honor in the United States Capitol. But tonight, we want to briefly try to describe the life of this man, his ministry, his impact on the Nation and on the world, the impact he has had on all of our lives.

I am so grateful for the outpouring of support from my many colleagues who are wanting to join tonight to remember and to celebrate the amazing life of Billy Graham. I want to get to my colleagues immediately, and then hopefully have a couple minutes to wrap up at the end of this hour.

I want to first yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) to share with us.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for arranging this opportunity for us to remember the life and legacy of Dr. Billy Graham, although I have to say it is not an easy task to find words that sum up his life, not because Billy Graham is not worthy, but because words and a few sentences seem incapable of describing a life that had such a large impact on, literally, the entire world.

I had the great opportunity to meet Dr. Graham just a few feet from here several years ago at one of the many Presidential inaugurations he attended.

□ 1830

While I only had that chance to meet him one time, Billy Graham was one of those people whom you felt like you knew. His honesty and his openness in preaching the gospel made him seem like a close, personal friend.

I have fond memories growing up in my hometown of Haleyville, Alabama, of being at my grandparents' home, and if a Billy Graham Crusade was being televised, you can rest assured that we were watching it around their television, regardless of what was on the other networks.

He was very clear in how he presented the gospel, that whosoever believeth in the son would have eternal life.

He will be greatly missed by a world that desperately needs more people like Billy Graham, but we can take great comfort in knowing that he has now made it home with his Maker.

Author James Allan Francis, in writing about the impact of Jesus Christ on the world, wrote this: "All the armies that ever marched, all the navies that were ever built; all the parliaments that ever sat and all the kings that ever reigned, put together, have not affected the life of man upon this Earth as powerfully as has that one solitary life."

That one solitary life, of course, is of Jesus Christ, who brought salvation to the world through faith in Him and in Him alone.

While no one could ever come close to having an impact on the world like Christ did, I believe the late Billy Graham was one of those great messengers, probably the best that we have seen any time in recent history, and he will long be remembered for the message that he gave about a personal salvation in Jesus Christ.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what an honor it is to likewise stand.

I remember the first live crusade I ever went to where Billy Graham was there in Atlanta in the early 1970s. As a young pastor and as a pastor for almost 20 years, I likewise had the opportunity to meet him. As a young pastor, he signed a Bible for me, which today still remains a treasure.

But what we don't need to forget is the message that he gave us. It is the message of Scripture. It is the message of God. It is a message that talks about all of us and our condition, that we are sinful, that we are separated from God, that we have committed things that separate us eternally unless they are dealt with.

That gospel message from the Scripture that Billy Graham so eloquently shared was that God loves us, and He gave His son to die in our stead.

I noticed the other day we are told that archeologists may have found the signature of the Old Testament prophet Isaiah. When I thought of that, I actually thought of Billy Graham and how he would have taken that Isaiah passage in chapter 53 and made a gospel message from the Old Testament prophet, where he said in chapter 53 that all of us, like sheep, have gone astray, that every one has gone his own way. Yet God has laid on him the iniquity of us all.

Here we are, and here is our sin. Here comes Christ without sin, and God laid on Him the iniquity of us all.

As much as we remember Billy Graham these days, let us never forget the importance of his message and never forget the message.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and I urge America to hear the gospel message and to respond in faith to the love and the grace of God through Jesus Christ that Billy Graham so powerfully presented to all of us.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HULTGREN for assembling this great group together. We treasure this opportunity to honor Dr. Billy Graham. Each of us has a special memory of Billy Graham.

I can recall having graduated from college, my first job was with Campus Crusade for Christ. I lived in Dallas, Texas, to prepare for a big meeting, a convocation that brought 84,000 young people. I was asked in 1971 if I would like to caddy for Billy Graham. He was playing in the Byron Nelson Golf Classic with Arnold Palmer, Bob Hope, and Byron Nelson. I can assure you we chased golf balls all over the golf course. It was a great occasion.

But what I saw as a young believer in Christ—I had come to Christ in my senior year in college—I saw a man who looked you in the eye. He didn't look at his watch. He cared about people. Billy Graham didn't walk over people to reach the world. He understood the



importance of every person before God. I think that is why his ministry and his mission was so outstanding with Presidents, kings, or cab drivers, whoever it might be, the millions of people who came to Christ because of him.

On this meeting that we planned in Dallas, 250,000 people came to downtown Dallas. They heard Billy Graham and Johnny Cash. It was a great assembly. But through my years, the next decade, working for Dr. Bright with Campus Crusade, I had the occasion to be around Dr. Graham on many occasions.

On one such occasion, I picked him up at the airport in 1975 here in Washington and was taking him back to the hotel. He said to Dr. Bright: the next challenge we have in the world today is terrorism. He said that this group who doesn't honor God and they don't honor Christ are going to be the force we deal with.

How remarkable that it was Billy Graham who helped heal our Nation after 9/11 as he spoke to that National Cathedral to bring the message of hope in God.

Yes, I went with Billy to his crusades in Cleveland, Dallas, and Charlotte. In fact, the first time he ever brought together young people, he had a Friday night big crusade for young people. They came out by the tens of thousands. Michael W. Smith played, Jars of Clay, and D.C. Talk.

Billy could reach anybody because he was real and he was personable. They understood him. His message was clear—so simple—that God loves us, He has a plan for our life, and Jesus Christ is the means to that plan. He died on the cross for our sin, that we could receive Christ, know Him, and know eternal life.

He gave that message all over the world. I have met people in Romania, Czech Republic, and the former Soviet Union—now Russia—all over the world who met Christ because Billy Graham came, and he took the gospel to them.

Probably in my funniest moment to have a conversation with him was with Franklin, his son. Now, Franklin will charge hell with a water gun. Franklin will go anywhere. He was headed to Moscow. I was with him on a little plane, it was a twin engine Mitsubishi. We stopped in Burlington, Vermont, and then we stopped over in Nova Scotia to stay overnight at a little \$6 motel. The phone rang while we were checking in. The man said: Yes, he is here, and he gave the phone across the counter to Franklin.

Franklin said: Hello? Yes, Daddy. Yes, sir, I am headed to Moscow. Yes, sir, I have got another pilot. Yes, sir. ROBERT PITTINGER. He is going with me.

At that point, his father, said: ROBERT PITTINGER? I thought he had more sense than that.

That was Billy. He knew his son, and he loved his son. But Franklin will take his gospel just like his father, just like every single person in that family.

Probably the greatest legacy to Billy Graham is the testimony in all of our lives through his own children who followed him into the ministry.

So I commend our Nation for honoring him in the way that we are. He will lay and he will be a part of this great assembly, this great Capitol, forever as a statue. I thank Mr. HULTGREN for bringing us together, and I thank the Lord for sending His messenger, Billy Graham.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the incredible life of a great man. The Reverend Billy Graham spent his life serving God and proclaiming the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Many who heard him share the Good Word considered him to be America's pastor. But throughout his life, he was always a humble and faithful servant.

Decades ago, I had the opportunity to attend a Billy Graham Crusade at Notre Dame with my family. I will never forget seeing so many people having the opportunity to hear the message that God loves you—a very simple message. No matter who you are, no matter your background, Billy would declare: God loves you.

Billy Graham brought this message of compassion, hope, and the power of God's grace to millions of people from all walks of life. He also brought it to the leaders of the free world as a friend and counselor to the Presidents of both parties.

Tomorrow he will lie in honor in the Capitol rotunda. It is fitting to honor him as we honor our Nation's leaders, not just because they changed history, but because he changed our hearts.

His greatest legacy is the people he helped to be closer to the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, Billy Graham is home now. We give thanks to God that He raised up such a humble man with a servant's heart, and we pray that his powerful message will live on.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is an incredible honor to stand today in honor of the legacy of the Reverend Billy Graham.

The population of the United States when Reverend Graham was born was 103 million. Over the course of his life, Reverend Graham spoke to more than twice as many people who existed in the country the day he was born in person about the greatest gift that one can ever be given, and that is the gift of eternal life and salvation by a Creator so benevolent as to look the other way on the undeniable sins of each of us.

So as I look to try to leave an impact on the world, I understand that people far greater than me have left far greater an impact than I could ever leave. I want to use Reverend Graham's words in closing to honor Reverend Graham not for who he was, but for his commitment to his Savior Jesus Christ.

Reverend Graham said: When wealth is lost, something is lost. When health is lost, something is lost. And when character is lost, all is lost.

Reverend Graham said: The greatest legacy one can pass on to one's children and grandchildren is not money or material things accumulated in one's life, but a legacy of character and faith.

I think most appropriately, in closing, he said: I look forward to death with great anticipation to meeting God face to face.

Finally, he said: I haven't written my own epitaph. I am not sure I should. Whatever it is, I hope it will be simple and it will point people not to me, but to the God that I served.

I thank Billy Graham, and I pray God would send us more. Amen.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN).

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, many decades ago, a missionary named John Williams made the long and difficult journey in the 1800s to bring Christianity to the people of the Pacific islands, including American Samoa.

He and the others in his footsteps in those early years probably surpassed their fondest hopes. Today, faith and church provide a strong foundation to a very large percentage of our population. I think he and Billy Graham would have understood each other very well, though their ministries are separated by more than a century.

Billy Graham's influence went around the world rapidly and powerfully, and seemed divinely timed to coincide with the rise of the communications and travel of the 20th century.

As he lies in honor this week at the U.S. Capitol, it is a new opportunity for a younger generation to learn more of his exceptional life and hear his message once more—that God loves each of us, and when times seem troubled around us, there is someone greater to depend on.

As Scripture says: "How shall they hear without a preacher?"

Billy Graham answered that call.

He described himself simply: a preacher of the gospel of Jesus Christ. That life's purpose defined him, and what a life it was.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Billy Graham.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for putting this on. Let me say that as many of the people who have spoken here tonight have talked about how Billy Graham spread the gospel of Jesus Christ, at a young age, Billy Graham, if you read his history, took a walk through the woods and devoted his life to Christ.

He understood what was written in Matthew 22 when Christ was asked, Which is the greatest commandment? He said that the greatest commandment is to love the Lord your God with

all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. The second is like unto it, to love your neighbor as yourself.

He understood those commandments. But most of all, he understood the commission that was given at the end of Matthew: Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

Billy Graham understood this. He understood it, and he was also very, very humble. I want to take, if I can, just a moment to go over something that was written by the author Max Lucado about a meeting that Michael W. Smith and his pastor had. I will just read it:

“A few hours before the event,” where Michael W. Smith and Max Lucado were going to go on stage together, “Michael and I met to go over the weekend’s schedule. But Michael was so moved by what he had just experienced, he could hardly discuss the retreat. He had just met with Billy Graham for the purpose of planning Reverend Graham’s funeral. The famous evangelist was, at the time, 94 years old. He was confined to a wheelchair, on oxygen. His mind was sharp and spirits were high. But his body was seeing its final days. So he called Michael. And he called for his pastor. He wanted to discuss his funeral. He told them that he had a request.”

They both said: Of course, anything. What is it?

He said: It is to do with the funeral.

They said: Yes?

He said: Would you not mention my name?

They said: What?

He said: Could you not mention my name? Just mention the name of Jesus.

Mr. Speaker, you see, Billy Graham has preached to over 1 billion people. He has filled stadiums on every continent.

□ 1845

He has advised every President of the last half century. He has consistently been the top of every “most admired” list, yet he wants to be anonymous at his funeral and only call on Jesus’ name.

1 Peter 55 said:

God resists the crowd, but gives grace to the humble.

For a man like this to hold and be humbled when the world knew him.

John 15:8 says:

By this my Father is glorified, that you bear much fruit and so prove to be my disciples.

There is no question whose disciple Billy Graham was.

On February 21, I don’t doubt that he heard these words: “Well done, my good and faithful servant.”

We just pray that God sends us more like him.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that I get to speak on behalf

of someone who has changed the lives of millions of people across the globe, but today, I do.

Billy Graham, who passed away last week, was known as America’s pastor, and rightly so.

When I was spending time this week in the district, someone who is a baseball fan came up to me and said: Do you know who’s got the most saves in Yankee Stadium?

I said: “Sorry, I don’t know my baseball history that well.”

He said: It was Billy Graham, in 1957. I had to laugh to think that it was truly God who did the saving.

But let’s think for a minute about Billy Graham. He was born in 1918 on a dairy farm in Charlotte, North Carolina, just south of my district. His crusades in the 1950s attracted thousands of people and shaped the beliefs of a generation by introducing many to the evangelical faith.

In July of 1957, Graham invited Martin Luther, King, Jr., to preach in front of his audience at Madison Square Garden on the issue of racial justice. This was just months after the Montgomery Bus Boycott.

Graham was a White pastor from North Carolina, and King was an African American pastor from Alabama. But both of them knew that the Lord doesn’t see skin color and that the love of Christ could heal any racial division. Mr. Speaker, in today’s polarized political culture, we could learn a thing or two from their friendship.

Throughout his life, he met with 12 Presidents, dating back to Harry Truman. President Eisenhower called Graham “one of the best ambassadors our country has,” and John F. Kennedy brought Graham in before his inauguration to express his worry over the moral and spiritual condition of the Nation.

Aside from his role in the civil rights movement and vocal opposition to communism, he uplifted the souls of millions of Americans. By introducing them to the love of Christ, Graham gave hope to the hopeless and love to those who were in need.

Mr. Speaker, while our economy now is growing and wages are rising, Americans have still become increasingly more isolated, more lonely, and more depressed. This social crisis needs to be addressed but can’t be solved by a bill that we pass in Congress or an executive action by any President.

We have gotten to a point in our country where too many people put their hope in elected officials. These people will most certainly be let down, because elected officials, like everyone else, are fallen, imperfect, sinful people.

Graham knew this, and he knew that the only person who would not let us down is Christ himself, and that we should trust in him for the forgiveness of our sins and have everlasting life. This is now the life Billy Graham will enjoy forever.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for putting this together.

The loss of Billy Graham to this country, to this world, is more profound than any lips can ever express.

As TED mentioned, he was born in 1918, and married Ruth in 1943. What a dynamic couple they were. How devoted they were to each other. They had five children. I have come to know and dearly love Anne. I have met and come to know Franklin to a lesser extent.

But he knew, he believed, he preached that you don’t go to Heaven by being a grandchild of someone. You have to have that personal relationship with the Lord as an individual child of God. It is not something you can inherit.

He has been called home.

He spent his life trying to persuade people that he loved to accept Jesus with the words that Jesus uttered:

I am the way, the truth, the light. No one gets to the Father, but by me.

He believed with all his heart that, unless someone professed Jesus Christ as Savior, they had no chance of getting to Heaven.

We know from Jesus that greater love hath no one than a man that lay down his life for his friends. We have paid tribute to people who have laid down their life in one great moment of saving others. We have heard of those type of heroic actions at the school in Parkland in trying to save others.

Yet, this man, for 99 years, or at least after he accepted Christ, laid down his life day after day after day for others, trying to help them come to a personal relationship with Jesus so that he could share eternity with Him in Heaven. That is his belief. That is my belief.

Yet, several years ago, we passed what is called a hate crimes bill. I said at some point it would be used to prosecute a preacher for simply reading Scripture from the Bible, so I can’t help but wonder if he has been called home so he can never be charged with a hate crime.

We live in a time when things have gotten so perverse that there are actually people who say that these evangelical Christians are so hateful, so mean, they actually believe that if you don’t think exactly like they do, you go to hell.

Well, that is a perversion of the one religion that is 100 percent based on love. God so loved the world, He sent His son. His son so loved the world, He laid down His life for others.

Billy Graham has laid down his life. He has put a marker down. In his memory, we can give no greater memorial than that we persevere and we perpetuate that love in bringing others to eternal life with us.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to pay tribute today to the late Reverend Billy Graham, a very cherished Christian leader and exemplary North Carolinian.

Born on a dairy farm almost 100 years ago in Charlotte, North Carolina, Billy Graham grew up learning the value of hard work, personal commitment, and developed an unwavering commitment to our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

After being ordained and graduated from Wheaton College, Billy married the love of his life and fellow student, Ruth McCue Bell. Shortly after, he began preaching throughout the United States and Europe, emerging as a rising young evangelist.

By 1949, at the young age of 31, Billy was launched into international prominence following his Los Angeles crusade. Originally scheduled for just 3 weeks, the crusade in Los Angeles had to be extended to more than 8 weeks, due to the overwhelming interest and overflow crowds.

During his lifetime, Reverend Graham preached all over the world, from remote villages in Africa to the Middle East to the former Communist bloc. I find this feat quite notable, considering the hostility that communists and tyrants of all stripes have for Christianity and their hatred for the spread of the Gospel.

Without question, Billy Graham was preaching in hostile territory; and without question, God protected him. It is said that his ministry reached an estimated 215 million people in more than 185 countries, and probably many more than that. After hearing the messages and teachings of the Holy Scriptures, many of those millions accepted Christ as their Lord and Savior.

There is no doubt that Billy Graham was called by God to share His Word, and he did so with wisdom and humility. In fact, I believe he heeded that call as well, if not better, than anyone else ever has.

His legacy and influence in the world will continue to be felt for generations to come. If there has ever been a good and faithful servant, it is most certainly Billy Graham.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Mr. HULTGREN, for arranging this opportunity to honor Billy Graham.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will we witness something that we have never seen before: the laying in honor of the body of an American who was not a government official, didn't lead a political movement, and wasn't a war hero or social movement hero.

The Nation will mourn a man who was single-minded in his devotion to one thing, whose life and vocation centered on one thing and one thing only: proclaiming the saving grace of God through Jesus Christ.

I hope we pay close attention to this. We will most likely never see it again.

In Mark, Jesus tells his disciples to "go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Few people followed this instruction more faith-

fully than the Reverend Billy Graham and with as much success and impact.

Billy Graham has been called America's Preacher. But the fact of the matter is that he was, for many decades, the most recognized and respected evangelical in the world.

Reverend Graham preached the Gospel to more than 200 million people during his more than 400 crusades and rallies in more than 185 countries and territories. The impact of those reached through TV, radio, video, and the internet is unquantifiable.

Reverend Graham did this sacrificially, giving up opportunities for other, much more lucrative opportunities that most people would have jumped at were they given the opportunity. Moreover, Reverend Graham estimated that he was gone from home for about 60 percent of his children's adolescence.

Despite being a pseudo-single mom, his wife, Ruth, understood the importance of the sacrifice. She once said: "I'd rather have a little of Bill than a lot of any other man."

At a time when Christians are so often shunned and ridiculed, particularly those who have major followings, Billy Graham was almost universally regarded as a steady and well-respected voice. He appeared on Gallup's list of most admired men in America 60 times since 1955. That is every year since the research firm began asking the question.

He counseled and covered in prayer every President, from Truman to Trump. Former President Clinton said: "When he prays with you in the Oval Office or upstairs in the White House, you feel he's praying for you, not the President."

That is the magnitude of this man: no matter how big or small you were, he cared about you, not your position. Titles and wealth and social status didn't matter to Reverend Graham. The only position of a person that mattered to him was their eternal position before God. Race did not matter either.

Reverend Graham was courageous. When other church leaders remained silent, he was an outspoken advocate for racial equality, consistently stating: "Christ belongs to all people."

In 1951, he called for the Southern Baptist Convention to accept Black students at their colleges. At a 1953 crusade in Tennessee, he personally took down ropes segregating the audience. In 1957, during his crusade in New York, he invited Martin Luther King, Jr., to open one night with a prayer. Despite his actions, he later said he wished he would have done more to help Dr. King.

In 1964, just months after the bombing at the 16th Street Baptist Church, Reverend Graham brought his crusade to Birmingham, Alabama. Before he agreed to come, Reverend Graham insisted that the audience be integrated. Over 30,000 people attended, making it, at the time, the largest integrated audience in the history of Birmingham.

The next year, he spoke to an integrated audience in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, with University of Alabama President Frank Rose and head football coach Paul "Bear" Bryant with him on the stage.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there is or will be anyone else in our lifetime who so clearly and effectively called people out of spiritual darkness into the light than Billy Graham.

□ 1900

Untold millions were exposed to the saving message of the Gospel through his ministry. I mourn the void of moral and spiritual authority that, with his death, has been left in this world, but I rejoice in knowing that he is finally at home and at rest with God.

As it is written about David in Acts 13:36, so it can be said of Billy Graham. He served God's purpose for his generation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am next honored to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to share and reflect, just briefly, on Reverend Billy Graham. What a tremendous legacy he leaves in so many forms, and I think of how his humility has had such an impact on so many.

I was one of the thousands in a stadium at a crusade in California back, I believe, in 1985, and to personally witness the impact that that meeting had was a great opportunity. But I also realized how one person can really impact the world and how his efforts have led to humanitarian efforts, whether it is his family members or others, really stepping out and ministering to others all around the world.

So I am very grateful to honor Reverend Billy Graham for certainly his stewardship of religious freedom. I hope that we can all reflect on our country and religious freedom and how important it is and hopefully follow in the footsteps of someone who, I think, as the list of most admired Americans would reflect, with Reverend Graham being on that list for 60 years—that someone like that can have such a great impact. So I appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am next honored to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Representative HULTGREN, for taking this time to do something that is so worthy.

You know, we live in a city where we have vast monuments erected for people who have left an impact on this Nation or on the world. When you walk the Halls of this grand and beautiful Capitol, there are statues of those who have made significant marks and changes to this Nation.

As I stand here today, I think of the gentleman who is going to lay in honor in the rotunda tomorrow, how he left such an impact on the world. He is probably the greatest impact on this

Nation and this world of modern times. The monument to him is in the hearts of literally billions of people who he touched with one simple message: God loves you.

That was as simple as Billy Graham would speak to the hearts of millions of Americans that God loves you and he cares about you individually as a person. That resonated so strong that it is estimated that—and this was in 2008—that through his ministries and his radio and television and his crusades, he reached over 2.2 billion people with a simple message that God loves you, and it is a message of truth.

He has had such an impact, as had been spoken of earlier, on a number of world leaders that he impacted with that simple message. The words that he shared—and he left us many quotes, and many of us are inspired by those quotes—but the words that he used that were most impactful were the words of Jesus. He just repeated the words that Christ had given us.

He was also a man of great, great courage. A lot of people don't realize the close relationship he had with Martin Luther King, Jr. And in the 1950s, when Billy Graham came to the south and he was going to preach at one of the crusades, he noticed that there was a rope running through the middle of the congregation, a rope that separated Whites from Blacks. He was so offended, he went and asked that that rope be removed; and when the ushers refused to do it, Billy Graham went and moved the rope himself.

That sparked a friendship with him and Martin Luther King, Jr. When Martin Luther King, Jr. penned his famous "Letter from Birmingham Jail," he condemned a lot of churches for not being engaged in what we believed that God created everyone in his image and that they should all be equal. But Billy Graham was not one of those. He stood strong.

In fact, in 1960, when Martin Luther King, Jr., was in prison, Billy Graham paid his bail. Billy Graham has left a mark, but we still fight some of the battles that he warned us of and he fought back then.

A couple of the quotes that have meant so much to me that Billy Graham left us with is one that God's will will not take us to where God's grace will not sustain us, knowing he was preparing us for battles that we have to fight.

He also stated that the Founders who pinned our Constitution believed in a freedom of religion, not a freedom from religion. And finally, even though we are in a time of crisis in this Nation, things are happening we don't understand, the last quote that I will leave you with that Billy Graham said is: "I've read the last page of the Bible. It's all going to turn out all right."

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am next honored to recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. HULTGREN for leading this ef-

fort here tonight but also his great spiritual counsel and partnership in this building here. It is very much appreciated. Indeed, he is one of God's great servants.

So, you know, as I harken back on my years of when we saw Billy Graham on TV and the inspirational character he was, and all my colleagues here tonight have alluded to it as well, he lived a very, very full life, a selfless life. And when I think about the leaders that have come through Washington, indeed, what is this town named for? George Washington, who is probably the single most selfless politician I can ever think of in terms of giving of service, putting himself last and the country first. He didn't want to be king. He didn't really want to preside so much, but he wanted to help. God was always on his side.

And I see in Billy Graham that same kind of greatness of the founding policies, the founding values of George Washington's and some of our Founders manifested, in a man who reached and saved millions in this country over those years with his crusades.

A couple of my colleagues already mentioned his interaction with Dr. King. And with this being Black History Month, the last couple of days of it here, I thought it would be appropriate to touch on that as well because Billy Graham helped be a force in the civil rights movement, showing the way for others who may have been hesitant or breaking down the barrier for those who still wanted to sustain segregation.

My colleague mentioned the Chattanooga rally there where he himself went down when the ushers would not do it, and he removed those ropes so it would be integrated because, in God's eyes, all are equal, and then setting out in the Constitution all are created equal.

So Billy Graham sustained that in his years of friendship with Dr. King, and showing that he was a nonpartisan, nonracial leader, helped saved the lives of all men who are created equal. So that goes so far that he is willing to put it on the line. He made people mad. He made the head usher resign that day when he made that courageous—but what he probably felt wasn't courageous at all—but the right action.

So Billy Graham, even to his last day when he made a short video, was all about informing people about Jesus, about the salvation they could have if they would just embrace Jesus and find what eternal life really is all about, that it isn't what treasures we store here on this planet but the ones we store in Heaven when we embrace Him.

There will never be another like him, but we can always remember him with pride. And as he would say himself, that his stores of treasure are up in Heaven. And he will be even stronger up there with his legacy and his memory and his family members that go on to do what he did.

So God bless Billy Graham, and I thank, again, Mr. HULTGREN for this opportunity tonight.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Congressman LAMALFA's words.

I am next honored to recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Illinois. No one knows how many lives and souls Reverend Billy Graham saved. We know that for every one he saved, he saved two, two saved four, four saved eight, et cetera.

One life we know he saved was Louis Zamperini. Louis' story is in a book called, "Unbroken," and a movie by that same name. He was a track star, a silver medalist, 1936 games, Olympic games in Munich. In World War II, he flew B-24 bombers. That was a dangerous plane. Twice, his plane crashed. The second time, he floated the Pacific Ocean for 47 days. He said: "God, if I survive this ordeal and get back to America alive, I'll seek You and serve You."

He was captured by the Japanese and spent the rest of the war in a prison war camp in Japan. A guard there he called, "The Bird," knew of Louis' fame, and he beat him to a pulp every single day. Louis said: "I was constantly being tormented by the guy. And you talk about hate. I wanted to kill him."

His nightmares of the POW camp came home. He was consumed by anger. One night, Louis dreamed he was strangling The Bird to death. Instead, he woke up to find out he was strangling his wife, Cynthia. He started getting drunk as a skunk every night to forget about the horrors that plagued him.

With her husband getting drunk every single night, Cynthia filed for divorce, and that is when a friend invited her to see the Reverend Billy Graham crusade in a Los Angeles tent dubbed, "The Canvas Cathedral." She accepted Christ that night.

She convinced Louis to attend Reverend Graham's service. After storming out of that tent the first night, Louis returned for one more evening. That time, the Bible verse Billy Graham quoted went straight to Louis' heart. He said: "Of all my near-death experiences, my life never passed before my eyes. But when Billy Graham quoted Scripture, my life did pass before my eyes." For the first time in years, Louis remembered the promise he made God when he was floating in the South Pacific.

That night, he went forward and accepted Christ, and the biggest miracle of his life was set in motion. Louis' transformation was so complete that he returned to Japan to share the Gospel with the hundreds of Japanese troops that tortured him that he once hated. He watched many of them accept Jesus Christ.

He went to share his faith all around the world, speaking at several Billy Graham crusades, and had a great

friendship with Reverend Graham that lasted until Louis' death on July 2, 2014.

Before he died, Louis said these important words: "This Billy Graham thing is a phenomenal miracle the way it started, the way it spread out. I'm one guy that got saved, and I've spoken to hundreds of thousands and had my testimony in papers where millions read it. One person. Think of the spider-web effect all over the world."

Thank God for Reverend Billy Graham. Amen, Louis. Thank God for Reverend Billy Graham.

□ 1915

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful for so many of my colleagues who were able to join us tonight to remember Reverend Billy Graham, born November 7, 1918, and died February 21, 2018.

Billy Graham was a lion of the Christian faith and a believer in the all-encompassing love of God for all people.

I knew Billy Graham from such an early age: knew of him, knew of his ministry, and was struck even more so most of my growing up years in Wheaton, Illinois, where Billy Graham went to school, met his wife. Much of his ministry started in Wheaton and in that area around Wheaton.

His ministry spanned generations of American religious thought and culture, but his core message remained unchanged throughout his entire lifetime. His evangelistic gatherings attracted millions throughout the globe for decades. His name is known around the world, as many have said tonight, maybe one of the most recognized names and most respected throughout his entire lifetime.

I remember way back in 1971—I was 5 years old—my mom and dad brought me down to McCormick Place down in downtown Chicago, to be part of the 1971 Billy Graham crusade. My dad was a counselor at that crusade. I was a little 5-year-old boy, but I still remember that night. I remember the power of the message, I remember the power of this messenger of God sharing his love for us, but also the truth of the love that Jesus has for us. That he gave everything so that I could have hope, so that I could have new life.

Even as a little boy, that affected me. It moved me. It moved me so much that it had me ask more questions of my own mom and dad when I got home. And, ultimately, it was that same year, right around that time, when I recognized that I was sinful, even as a little boy, that I was selfish, that I needed help, I needed a savior, and that I needed someone to pay a price that I couldn't pay.

And as Billy Graham had stated, and as my mom and dad had taught me, and as my own grandpa had taught me, only Jesus could pay that price, and he wanted to do it to give me that free gift of redemption, the hope that we can have only through Jesus. That was the story and the message of Billy Graham.

Jumping forward quite a few years, I had the privilege, just 12 years ago, of being down in Louisiana. I went to the Louisiana State Penitentiary. It is also known as Angola. Louisiana State Penitentiary was known as the bloodiest prison in all of America for decades and decades and decades—more killings and more violence than any other prison. And then something happened.

God used some people, specifically a warden there, Warden Cain, who came, and others, to change the hearts of these inmates. They brought a seminary into this Louisiana State Penitentiary.

Now, hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of prisoners in Louisiana State Penitentiary have gone through seminary—New Orleans Seminary—that is right there in the prison, and have gained their own Bible graduate degrees of being pastors, although they are still in prison.

One of the things that changed in Louisiana State Penitentiary—it had been when prisoners died in prison, and almost all of them die there, because life means life in Louisiana—what happened before was, when prisoners died, they would just be thrown in a ditch in the back behind the cafeteria and thrown some dirt on top of them. The warden and others felt like this was absolutely inhumane treatment for anybody, even prisoners, so they changed something.

They have a woodworking program there, and the inmates of Angola, Louisiana State Penitentiary, started making caskets for their fellow prisoners who would die in prison. They handcraft these caskets so that they are actually gorgeous, handcrafted, recognizing that every life is of infinite value because God lived and died for that life.

Well, Franklin Graham, Billy's son, was down in Louisiana State Penitentiary a few years ago. He went on a tour there, saw these caskets that were being made for inmates, went back and talked to his mom and dad.

Billy Graham and Ruth Graham said: Do you know what? We want to be buried in caskets that were made by prisoners.

I am so excited. Tomorrow, this unbelievable honor of Billy Graham being laid in honor in the United States rotunda, one of only four people who have had that great honor, but also the story that is going to be told, that Billy Graham is going to be laid in the rotunda in a casket that was made by prisoners in Louisiana State Penitentiary. What an amazing statement of humility of recognizing that we are all the same. We are all broken people, we all need saving, whether we are preaching to millions and millions of people, or whether we are in prison for the rest of our lives because of the mistakes we have made. We all cannot reach that standard, that perfect standard, to be with God forever. We need someone to help us reach that, and only Jesus can help us do that.

Billy Graham recognized that. The statement is going to be very clear in the rotunda, just outside of these doors tomorrow over the next day and a half, of recognition of his life, and then, ultimately, he will be buried there.

I remember back—and I will end with this—just the message of Billy Graham very clear. Two questions that I think were so important for Billy Graham. One he talked about in his book, "Just As I Am."

He said: The first question I have for God when I get to heaven is, Why me? Why me, a farm kid from North Carolina that could barely make it through school? Why me? Why did you choose me as an instrument?

And I think the answer to that question goes back to Isaiah 6:8. That when Isaiah heard the Lord say, "Whom shall I send," Isaiah said, "Here I am, Lord, send me."

That is exactly what Billy Graham did. He said: Here I am, Lord, send me. Broken, imperfect, not a great speaker, but here I am, send me.

And through that willingness, millions and millions and millions of lives were touched.

The last question was one that I heard when I went to that crusade in 1971. And it was: Who is Jesus to you? This person of Jesus that has impacted more people in this world than any other person, who is Jesus to you?

It was a question that I had to struggle with, even as a 5-year-old. I continue to learn and grow and understand Jesus. And different people have different ideas of who Jesus is. No one can deny he was a real person who had more impact on this world than anybody else.

We talk about the impact that Billy Graham has had. Jesus is the reason for the impact that Billy Graham had.

So he asked the question: Who is Jesus?

And I think it is worth the study, to take the time to look into who was this man who lived 2,000 years ago, yet affected everything. Even our calendar is adjusted to his life.

Who is this Jesus?

As you dig in and you ask questions and study, the question is either: Is this Jesus who he said he is or isn't he? Is he a liar? Is he a lunatic? Or is he Lord?

Lord and Savior, the only hope, the light of this world, I believe that that is exactly who this Jesus is. It was what Billy Graham talked about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with a verse many people remember from the Billy Graham crusades. The closing of those crusades were led with a call for people to come forward, but also with an amazing hymn, "Just As I Am." I want to read a verse or two, and then close.

Just as I am, without one plea,  
But that thy blood was shed for me,  
And that though bidst me come to thee,  
O lamb of God, I come, I come.  
Just as I am, and waiting not  
To rid my soul of one dark blot,

To thee whose blood can cleanse each spot,  
O lamb of God, I come, I come.

Thank you, Billy Graham. Thank you for your faithfulness. Thank you for sharing this message of hope with so many people.

We are so honored to recognize him and to thank his family.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the late Reverend Billy Graham who is just the fourth private citizen to lie in honor in the U.S. Capitol.

In 1918, Rev. Graham was born in Charlotte, North Carolina where he was raised on a dairy farm. At the age of 15, the young Billy Graham made his personal commitment to Christ during a tent revival meeting in Charlotte. Following graduation from Wheaton College and his marriage to classmate Ruth Bell in 1943, Rev. Graham began his ministry. While his ministry would take him to every corner of the globe, Billy Graham never forgot his purpose or his roots in the Old North State.

As the Lord's faithful servant, Billy Graham lived a simple life in North Carolina with his dear wife Ruth and their five children. Yet his ministry touched the lives of millions, as he taught God's word and spread the good news of the gospel. It has been estimated he preached to nearly 215 million people in more than 185 countries and territories, embracing innovation and new technologies to reach as many people as possible.

Affectionately known as "North Carolina's Favorite Son" and "America's Pastor," Billy Graham's counsel was sought by presidents and leaders throughout the world in times of despair and prosperity. No matter his audience, he preached a constant message of finding "strength for the present and hope for the future" in Jesus Christ.

I join with our entire community, state, nation and world in mourning his passing, while rejoicing in the knowledge that Billy Graham is home with his beloved Ruth in the presence of our Father in heaven.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Billy Graham holds a special place in the hearts of millions of Americans and people throughout the world. He is most deserving of this honor and I urge our fellow Americans to join me in paying their respects to America's Pastor and celebrating the life of Reverend Billy Graham.

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Reverend Billy Graham, America's Pastor, who passed away on February 21, 2018 to return home to his Lord and Savior. As a nation, we mourn the passing of Billy Graham, and send our deepest condolences to the Graham family. Billy Graham preached the Gospel, and his influence can hardly be quantified. His ministry career and crusades inspired and motivated millions, and carried out his mission to save souls around the world.

Early in his career, Reverend Graham served the Midwest as a pastor in Western Springs, Illinois. He attended Wheaton College and in 1981, they opened a center in his honor. During his time in Illinois, Graham took on a radio ministry program based in Chicago and expanded his activism. From there, he began to completely transform American religious life through his compelling sermons and preaching. Billy Graham went on to serve across the country, in many ways and on

many platforms. He provided spiritual counsel to every President of the United States from Harry Truman to Barack Obama, and was a strong figure in the civil rights movement urging for integration.

Mr. Speaker, Billy Graham was a humble servant to the Lord who changed countless lives for the better. His was a life well lived. And I know his legacy will live on forever. Today, let us look up in the sky and give thanks to our faithful, steadfast friend who is finally at home with God and resting in eternal peace.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for reminding us of the enormously important work that was done for tomorrow's session here on the floor and here in the Capitol, where he will be lying in state.

I recall very clearly the day that my wife and I met Reverend Graham in Sacramento when he was having one of his ministries there in the city. We attended, and it was an incredible experience. We met with him personally after the event. And like the millions and, indeed, billions of people that heard him speak, we, too, were moved.

Earlier, when I learned of his passing, I said that, while he is no longer with us physically, his work remains with us. His speeches, his recordings, and his videos are all there for future generations and, indeed, for our generation. So I thank my colleagues for bringing to our attention what is a profoundly important event here in the Nation's Capitol when Reverend Billy Graham lies in state.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other things I would like to bring to the attention of the floor. One, fortunately, is not a death, but rather a retirement. This one is for Debbie Davis, the editor and assistant publisher of the Davis Enterprise, for her service to the Davis community and to congratulate her on her retirement.

For over 38 years, Ms. Davis has helped unite and inform the Davis community through her work at the Davis Enterprise, the local paper. Her work expertise earned her a reputation as a respected journalist, and there is no doubt in my mind that her legacy will have a lasting impact on the Davis community.

The breadth of Ms. Davis' accomplishment is in itself an achievement. Some of her most notable milestones include the development of the 2017 centennial magazine that celebrated the businesses and leaders that built the Davis community, the "Those Who Make Memories" book, and over 10,700 editions have been used at the Davis Enterprise.

I speak on behalf of the entire Davis community when I say "thank you" to

Debbie Davis for her generous service to the community of Davis, California. We all wish her the best as she enjoys her well-deserved retirement.

If I might, Mr. Speaker, move on to other events, some of them events here in Washington, D.C., in the days ahead. If I might retrieve my chart, Mr. Speaker. Normally I would bring this out with me, but I wanted to cover the Billy Graham event. I think he might have enjoyed this particular saying from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I use this whenever I start my presentations here on the floor because it reminds me of values, at least a value that I think ought to be basic to our work here in Congress. So allow me to repeat not for the first, but maybe for another dozen times:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

The test of our progress. It is interesting that there is so much we need to do, so much we need to do here in America, particularly for those who have too little. It is interesting to note what has actually happened over the last several years.

Are we really making progress?

Well, I think we ought to spend some moments talking about our infrastructure.

Are we making progress?

Well, no, not really. We once were the most advanced infrastructure—highways, rail systems, transit systems, airports, maritime ports—in the world. We had great drinking water systems. You could come to America and drink water anywhere and not have to worry about the quality or the contamination of that water.

But here it is from the American Society of Civil Engineers: aviation, we are ranked a D; bridges, a C; dams, a D; drinking water, a D; parks and recreation, a D; ports, a C; rail, we are doing okay; roads, a D—we see that every day when we travel back and forth.

School systems—and we want to talk about safe schools; lots of talk as a result of the tragic shooting in Florida about making schools safe. Well, schools really rank in the D category. Whether they are safe or not, they are ranking as Ds.

Transit is a D. Declining wastewater is a D.

We are familiar with places around the Nation.

□ 1930

This bridge, about 6 years ago, this was a bridge that connected the United States to Canada. This was the Interstate 5 bridge, a road, Interstate highway from Vancouver, British Columbia, to Tijuana, Mexico. Infrastructure. The bridge collapsed.

On the water side of life, I think most of us would be familiar that, 1 year ago, the spillway at the Oroville Dam, the highest dam in the United States and quite possibly in the world, gave way during the heavy rains of the



2017 year, and we created the biggest waterfall in the world. It went on for some time.

It also threatened the lives of over 200,000 people downstream that had less than 3 hours to evacuate; because had this spillway further eroded, a 30-foot wall of water would have descended upon those communities and the water would have been more than 50 feet deep within 1 hour. Fortunately, the rain stopped; otherwise, who knows.

So we have a need for infrastructure. Just 2 weeks ago, the President announced his great big infrastructure plan. Two hundred billion new dollars, \$1.5 trillion of public and private investment beyond the Federal participation. Sounds good until you read the big print; not even the small print, but the big print.

So what does the Trump infrastructure plan bring to us? Well, the \$200 billion of Federal money, it is not new money; it is existing money, it is the reprogramming of existing money. In fact, it takes \$168 billion from existing transportation programs, highways and transit, and repurposes it over to some new programs that are supposed to do the same thing. No new money; just money taken from an existing program that is working, underfunded to be sure, but working, and transferred over to a new program that the President can then put his gold letters, T-R-U-M-P, on it, and, wow, what a wonderful thing that has been done. Oh, yeah. Well, confusion and the like.

It also paves the way; it doesn't pave the highways, but it does pave the way for Wall Street and foreign investors to set up toll roads on our interstate freeways. Well, there is a great idea. It slashes Federal investments and passes the buck to cash-starved States and local governments.

You see, right now the Federal Government for highways and transit, about 80 percent of that money comes from the Federal Government, 20 percent from the locals.

In levies—I represent one of the most flood prone areas. I can put that picture of Oroville Dam back up. Seventy-five percent Federal, 25 percent local. So what does the great Trump infrastructure plan do? It flips that over, and guess what? The Federal Government will pay 25 percent for levies and the locals will pay 75 percent. Wow. That is helpful. Where are they going to get the money?

For transit, 80 percent Federal, 20 percent—no, not in the Trump plan. It flips it over: 20 percent Federal, 80 percent local. Where are they to get the money? Big question.

So where did the money go? Why is it that the President's big, new, fabulous, wonderful transportation/infrastructure program has no money, just existing money taken from existing programs and put into new labeled programs that are to accomplish the same thing but with less Federal support?

So one might wonder, what happened here? Why is there no new Federal

money? Why aren't all of those Ds supported by new Federal programs so that we have a robust infrastructure program for the United States, one in which men and women would be employed building the foundation for tomorrow's economy? Tens of thousands, indeed hundreds of thousands, millions of people, could be employed if the \$1 trillion, \$1.5 trillion that he talks about, were real money. It is not.

Where did the money go? Well, I suppose some of you may have been listening when the President signed the legislation and then took his Air Force One jet to Florida, entered his resort at Mar-a-Lago, and announced to his guests: I just made you a whole lot richer.

Well, indeed he did. One person that he made richer was this gentleman, who has said repeatedly over the last 2 years: I don't need more money; I am quite wealthy, thank you; don't do a tax cut that makes me even more wealthy. Warren Buffett.

What did the tax cut do for Warren Buffett and Berkshire Hathaway? Well, it was a \$29 billion Christmas gift.

Mr. Speaker, the President was quite correct. He did make the rich even richer.

I thank Mr. Buffett for being brutally honest and saying he doesn't need more money. He would undoubtedly look at what FDR said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much."

Warren Buffett said this last line: "It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

I thank Mr. Buffett. I don't know what he is going to do with the \$29 billion, but I know what we could have done with \$29 billion. We could have repaired the bridges of America. We could have repaired the tens of thousands of dams across America that are at risk. That is what could have been done with the \$29 billion that went to Mr. Buffett.

And he wasn't the only one who benefited from those tax cuts. One of the Wall Street companies, Morgan Stanley, did an analysis of the corporate tax cuts, that about \$1 trillion of the \$1.5 trillion tax cut went to corporations.

So what did the American corporations do with that \$1 trillion windfall? Morgan Stanley, just this last week, reported that their analysis is that 62 percent of that \$1 trillion windfall will be used by the corporations to buy other companies; mergers and acquisitions, about 19 percent; and 43 percent will go for buybacks of stock and dividends.

All the talk about the employees benefiting. Well, let's see. About 13 percent is headed for bonuses and raises. Just 17 percent of that \$1 trillion is expected to be used to increase the size of the business, not through mergers and acquisitions, which usually result in layoffs, not in new jobs, but rather in what are called savings, in other words, known as layoffs—just 17 percent.

So where are the jobs? I will give you an example. Nine of the large pharmaceutical companies in America have already announced that they are going to spend \$50 billion of that tax cut that they received in buybacks, not in creating new pharmaceuticals and drugs for such illnesses as Alzheimer's. In fact, Pfizer, one of the large pharmaceutical companies, the day that they announced that they were going to stop their research on Alzheimer's, decided that they would spend their money instead on buying back their stock.

So thus far—we haven't finished all this; this is where they expect to go—American corporations have already announced \$178 billion, nearly one-fifth of that \$1 trillion tax cut, would be used to buy back stock. That is the largest amount ever reported in any single quarter in American history.

Now, many folks here on the floor say: Oh, but look at what Walmart is doing; they are giving over \$400 million of bonuses.

Well, if you average that out among all of their workers, it is \$190 per worker. Now, that is not chump change, and that is certainly not crumbs. That is \$190, and that is important, but the total tax cut to Walmart was \$18 billion. The \$400 million is 2.2 percent for bonuses. And so it goes.

There is more. Boeing said it will spend \$300 million on employees in increased wages or bonuses, and, at the same time, they will spend \$18 billion to buy back shares.

Did I explain what a buyback of shares really does? Well, it reduces the number of shares that are in the market, and, therefore, simultaneously raises the price per share.

And how are executive salaries and bonuses determined? By the share price. The share price goes up, bingo, more money for the corporate executives.

So if you were given a huge \$1 trillion windfall in reduced taxes, would you use that for capital investment, where the actual return to the corporation may take 3, 4, 5 years, or would you use it to buy back stock, which automatically will, in virtually every case, raise the share price and immediately reward the executives' bottom line salary? Not a tough decision. Or would you give it to your employees in bonuses and raises, when you could use it to buy back stock? Raise the share price, and, lo and behold, guess what? The corporate executive's pay increases, because his pay is based on the stock price. Pretty simple stuff.

Did I mention Comcast laid off over 500 employees after reportedly saying that they would use their tax cuts to give a \$1,000 year-end bonus? And at the same time, they announced a \$5 billion stock buyback for 2018.

It goes on and on.

Apple, \$38 billion reduction in taxes; Microsoft, \$6.3 billion; Citibank, \$22 billion reduction; Johnson & Johnson, \$13 billion; Qualcomm, \$5.3 billion.

So if we wanted to repair the dams or the bridges, we would have to have money.

Where did the money go? Well, it didn't go to the bridges, it didn't go to the roads. The great infrastructure plan from the President is simply a shell game, moving money from under this shell to under that shell, no new money, and making the local governments and State governments pay even more.

And for those of us who represent California, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, there is one more, and that is we get to pay taxes on taxes that we pay to the State and to the local governments.

□ 1945

Now, that is a change. When the first income tax law was written nearly a century ago—in fact, more than a century ago—they said that you would not pay taxes on the taxes that you paid, and so they allowed for the deduction of State and local taxes. But, hey, that changed. Our President said it is a wonderful gift. Well, it is not for California, not for New York, not for New Jersey.

So where are we going to get the money? We are going to have to go back and look at this. We already know that, for every 1 percent reduction in the corporate tax rate, there is a \$100 billion reduction in revenue to the Federal Government. We might want to look at that.

I am going to wrap this up in just a few moments.

We have been talking about a better deal for America for a long time. What we have from the Trump tax cut is a raw deal, a bad deal, a terrible deal for America. The Federal Treasury was gutted.

Yes, there are benefits for the broad American public, but that is like 17 percent of the total tax cut goes to the broad American public: middle class, upper middle, and the bottom quartile of Americans. It is useful. It is certainly going to be helpful.

But more than 80 percent went to American corporations, which, as I just showed, are not using it for their employees, not using it to build their capital infrastructure, their ability to manufacture more, but, rather, for those who already have a great deal of wealth: the stockholders of America, who happen not to be the bottom 80 percent.

We need a better deal. We really need to invest in America. We need that infrastructure, not the phony infrastructure program that the President has proposed, but a real infrastructure with real money. And we need to make that infrastructure in America.

And so make it in America, invest in America. It adds up for a better deal for America.

My colleague, AL GREEN from Texas, has some important things to add to the discussion tonight on a different subject, but I just want to remind the

public that, when we talk on the floor here, we talk about infrastructure, we talk about real concrete, steel, programs that actually build infrastructure. We talk about trying to collect resources so that we can pay for this. We talk about how we might engage in various financing programs so that we can, over time, build the solid foundation for economic growth.

And as we do all of this, we are talking about a better deal for the American public, not the raw deal that this tax scam gave to Americans, not the kind of deal that The New York Times says: "Well-Heeled Investors Reap the Republican Tax Cut Bonanza."

Mr. Speaker, I include this New York Times editorial, dated February 25, 2018, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From The New York Times, Feb. 25, 2018]

WELL-HEELED INVESTORS REAP THE  
REPUBLICAN TAX CUT BONANZA  
(By The Editorial Board)

After President Trump signed the Republican tax cut into law, companies put out cheery announcements that they were giving workers bonuses because of their expected windfalls from the tax reductions. The president and Republican lawmakers quickly held up these news releases as vindication for their argument that cutting the top federal corporate tax rate to 21 percent, from 35 percent, would boost workers' incomes even as it added \$1.5 trillion to the debt that future generations would have to pay off.

Now corporate announcements and analyst reports confirm what honest observers always said—this claim is pure fantasy. As executives tell investors what they intend to do with their tax savings and their spending plans are tabulated into neat charts and graphs, the reports jibe with what most experts said would happen: Companies are rewarding their stockholders.

Businesses are buying back shares, which creates demand for the stocks, boosts share prices and benefits investors. Some of the cash is going to increase dividends. And a chunk will go to acquiring other businesses, creating larger corporations that face less competition.

In addition to benefiting investors, these maneuvers will end up boosting the pay of top executives because their compensation packages are often tied to the price of their companies' stock. Finally, a small sliver of the money will find its way into paychecks of rank-and-file employees, but it won't be a big boost and will probably come in the form of a temporary bonus, rather than a lasting raise.

Morgan Stanley analysts estimated that 43 percent of corporate tax savings would go to buybacks and dividends and nearly 19 percent would help pay for mergers and acquisitions. Just 17 percent would be used for capital investment, and even a smaller share, 13 percent, would go toward bonuses and raises.

Other Wall Street analysts have issued similar reports. If more evidence was needed, Axios reported that just nine pharmaceutical companies have announced \$50 billion in buybacks since the tax law was passed.

Mr. Trump might argue that it doesn't much matter that the tax cuts will be a boon for investors because many Americans own stocks. The president has recently touted the rising value of 401(k) accounts as a benefit of the tax law. But roughly half of all families own no stock, and most people have holdings that are worth less than \$5,000. Most stock holdings, a whopping 84 percent, are in the hands of people whose incomes put them in the top 10 percent of households.

Republicans might further argue that none of this matters because the tax law is becoming more popular as people learn more about it. Indeed, a recent poll for The Times found that the law now has more supporters than opponents. But this swing in public sentiment might be less important than it appears. Consider the results of a recent Politico/Morning Consult poll that shows that just 25 percent of registered voters said they had noticed an increase in their paycheck because of lower tax withholding while 51 percent had not. The poll also found that high-income people were more likely to notice that their take-home pay had gone up. That's because Republicans designed the law to principally benefit wealthy families while offering crumbs to low-income and middle class families.

Those crumbs, by the way, disappear after a few years. Further, many taxpayers in states like California, New Jersey and New York will be hit with higher tax bills when they file their 2018 tax returns and realize that they can now only deduct up to \$10,000 in state and local taxes.

There was a legitimate argument for reforming the tax code in a way that reduced the corporate tax rate, closed loopholes and made the economy fairer and more productive. But Republicans chose a plan that rewards the rich at the expense of workers. They had to lie to make this scheme seem legitimate. Now the true effects are coming to fruition.

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

#### RESOLUTION HONORING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored tonight to present a resolution on behalf of the NAACP, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, a great organization founded in this country on February 12, 1909. It just happens to have been the centennial of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

I am honored to be a proud member of the NAACP. I hold a life membership, and I look forward to acquiring an even higher membership in the NAACP.

I am honored to say that this resolution has the support of the Congressional Black Caucus, and it is a bipartisan resolution as well. Also, I am honored to say, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is one that I hope will shed some additional light on the NAACP, its purpose, and some of its accomplishments.

The NAACP is the Nation's oldest civil rights organization. It is an organization that was founded in a time when African Americans were being lynched, a time when it was not commonplace and not every place, but it did take place with a great degree of regularity in this country, such that

African Americans were being lynched with impunity, I might add.

It is an organization that has always been integrated. It was integrated from its genesis and continues to this day to be an integrated organization.

Some of the notable founders of the NAACP were Mary White Ovington, a white female; Ida Wells-Barnett; and also, I would add, Oswald Garrison Villard; William English Walling. Many of these persons were persons of goodwill who simply concluded that there had to be something done about the conditions impacting African Americans. And so they decided to move forward, and they formed, at that time, the organization known as the National Negro Committee, which has, of course, evolved into the NAACP that we know today.

Let me pause for a moment with the history and remind people that in Houston, Texas, we are very fortunate. The Houston branch of the NAACP has a president who is a former dean of the law school, Thurgood Marshall School of Law in Houston, Texas, former president of Texas Southern University, James Douglas—very fortunate to have a lawyer of his standing as the president of the NAACP.

Currently, at the law school, there is a person who is working who happens to be the State president of the NAACP. We have a national board member in Houston, Texas. Gary Bledsoe, State president, is working at the law school as the interim dean. The national board member, Howard Jefferson, is in Houston, Texas.

Houston's NAACP has its own facility, one of the few around the country to hold its own facility, but I am proud to say that that is something that we worked hard to acquire. The Houston NAACP is one of the outstanding branches of the NAACP in this country. The NAACP has branches in all 50 States.

Continuing, the NAACP's national headquarters, located in Baltimore, Maryland, the NAACP was founded to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination.

I am proud to say that the NAACP has always used the tactics of non-violence in its movement forward, in its effort to help all persons benefit in this country because, quite frankly, everyone has benefited from the NAACP and its movement in this country. It has used negotiation, litigation, and protestation as its tactics.

The NAACP was there to win lawsuits before the Supreme Court, was there to protest so that persons might acquire not only the right to vote, but also the opportunity to elect people of their choice.

The NAACP has been there with the great litigator, Thurgood Marshall, who was the first African-American Justice on the Supreme Court, was the chief litigator for the NAACP for many years. He won 29 of 32 cases before the

Supreme Court. He was there to fight on behalf of the NAACP.

The NAACP is the organization that won *Barrows v. Jackson*, *Shelley v. Kraemer*, *Brown v. Board of Education*. These are lawsuits that allow us to live in the neighborhoods that we live in, to go to the schools that we attend.

The truth be told, we eat where we eat and sleep where we sleep because of the NAACP. It is an organization that has brought not only desegregation to American life, but also integration to American life.

Many of our institutions were desegregated. That meant that a lot of institutions were lost in the process when we desegregated. But we also have integrated, and we have brought together persons in new institutions.

The NAACP can claim a good deal of responsibility for the integration that we see in the House of Representatives and in the Congress of the United States of America. I can say to you, truthfully, that I believe I am standing here tonight because of the good works of the NAACP, and a good many other persons are here because of the good works of the NAACP as well.

I am also proud to tell you tonight that the NAACP has fought for the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Civil Rights Act of 1960 and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The NAACP has fought for human rights as well as civil rights. The NAACP, in 2005, went beyond human rights and civil rights, in a sense, when it developed a disaster relief fund to help hurricane survivors in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama.

So the NAACP has metamorphosed into an organization that not only deals with the rights of people in the sense of their needs when they are voting and when they are being brought before the justice system, but it has also now metamorphosed into an organization that helps in times of need in general.

If there is a storm, you can depend upon the NAACP to be there to be of some help. If persons are suffering as a result of some sort of disaster related to fires, the NAACP is likely to be there to help.

The NAACP is also helping abroad. It has been there to help persons in Haiti after the disaster that took place.

The NAACP, in 2008, supported the passage of the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007. It was an act that allowed us to have the resources to solve some of the heinous crimes that occurred in the early days of the civil rights struggle here in the United States of America.

The NAACP celebrated its centennial anniversary in New York City on July 16 of 2009.

The NAACP continues to, in 2010, advocate for sentencing reform, something that is still needed to this day and is still being worked on.

In 2011, the NAACP led the charge to defend the constitutional right to vote.

The NAACP has fought voter suppression laws across the length and breadth of the country.

The NAACP elected its new president, unanimously, Derrick Johnson, in 2017.

This organization has been on the front line for justice for all in the United States of America. And I would dare say that, if we did not have the NAACP, we would create it because we need an organization that is willing to step forward and take on the needs of people who, but for the NAACP, wouldn't have a voice.

It is a bold organization. It does not fear the powers that be. It does not, in any way, concern itself with the consequences of challenging the establishment. It is an organization that has sought to change the status quo. It is an organization that moves people from poverty, in many cases, into an opportunity to move forward into the middle class. So it is an organization that truly benefits all.

I am proud to be a member of this august organization.

□ 2000

I will mention a few more things about the organization, and then bring this to closure. But I do want people to know especially that the NAACP does not and has not ever segregated itself from any part of society. It has always sought to bring society together. It has always sought to find some sort of common ground for people to stand on so that we might all move forward together. It has always been an organization that not only wanted to integrate schools, integrate various parts of our social order, but also wanted to bring a sense of brotherhood to our country.

Dr. King indicated that we must transform neighborhoods into brotherhoods. This has also been the work of the NAACP.

Rosa Parks, the great NAACP member who took that seat on the bus and, in so doing, challenged the segregation in the South, the NAACP was there to do these things to bring people together and to help us understand each other.

I do believe that America is a much better place because the NAACP has made it such. And if not but for the NAACP, I do believe that the Congress of the United States of America would not be the integrated institution that it is.

I think there is still much work to be done, but I am proud that the NAACP has done the work that it has because, in so doing, it has made opportunities available for a good many people who would not have them.

So, tonight, I wanted to have it resolved that the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America recognizes the 109th anniversary of the historic founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP.

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

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for February 26 and today on account of health issues.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 1:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4116. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification that no United Nations agency or United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 287e note; Public Law 103-236, Sec. 102(g) (as amended by Public Law 103-415, Sec. 1(o)); (108 Stat. 4301); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4117. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4118. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 17-115; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4119. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-75, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4120. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-01, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4121. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-66, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4122. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Report to Congress on Gifts Given by the United States to Foreign Individuals for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 22 U.S.C.A. 2694; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4123. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to

Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTT 17-021; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4124. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's Annual Privacy, Data Mining and Semi-annual 803 Reports for FY 2017, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-2(a)(6); Public Law 108-447, Sec. 522(a)(6); (118 Stat. 3268) and 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-3(c)(1); Public Law 110-53, Sec. 804(c)(1); (121 Stat. 363); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4125. A letter from the Secretary and Treasurer, Financing Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2017 Audited Financial Statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4126. A letter from the President and CEO, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's FY 2017 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4127. A letter from the Secretary and Treasurer, Resolution Funding Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2017 Audited Financial Statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4128. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Low-Income Housing Credit Disaster Relief for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico [Notice 2018-17] received February 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4129. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 2019, including the Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867) and 45 U.S.C. 231f(f); Aug. 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 7(f) (as amended by Public Law 93-445, Sec. 416); (97 Stat. 436); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and Appropriations.

## 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. ESTES of Kansas (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 5099. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a fusion center technical assistance program; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 5100. A bill To amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States to establish and operate recovery home certification programs, and for other purposes; 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. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 5101. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay rewards under an asset recovery rewards program to help identify and recover stolen assets linked to foreign government corruption and the proceeds of such corruption hidden behind complex financial structures in the United States and abroad; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 5102. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a loan repayment program for substance use disorder treatment employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BASS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 5103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise tax and special occupational tax in respect of firearms and to increase the transfer tax on any other weapon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, the Judiciary, Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. CUREBELO of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 5104. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a special enrollment period under Medicare for individuals enrolled in COBRA continuation coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, 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. YOHO (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 5105. A bill to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 5106. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers to disclose in an annual report any substantial financial relationship with any manufacturer or dealer of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5107. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a grant program to secure elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRUJALVA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr.

ELLISON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 5108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for current year inclusion of net CFC tested income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5109. A bill to amend the 21st Century Cures Act to ensure the equitable distribution of resources to address the opioid epidemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to report revenue generated by each sports team, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

H.R. 5111. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide certain purchasing authority for recipients or subrecipients of grants under chapter 53 of title 49 of such Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 5112. A bill to reduce, from 21 years of age to 18 years of age, the minimum age at which a person may obtain a handgun from a Federal firearms licensee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BARRAGAN (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 5113. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to require sexual harassment training for the employees of Federal contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 5114. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take action to eliminate human exposure to asbestos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5115. A bill to expand and improve the programs and activities of the Department of Health and Human Services for awareness, education, research, surveillance, diagnosis, and treatment concerning rare diseases and conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 5116. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the jurisdiction of courts of the United States and of the States over certain foreign entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 5117. A bill to authorize the President to enter into a cooperative project agreement with Israel to counter unmanned aerial vehicles that threaten the United States or Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 5118. A bill to establish USAccounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 5119. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a STEM grant program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GAETZ (for himself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 5120. A bill to require Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. KELLY of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 5121. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 5122. A bill to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 to provide mandatory funding for grants to upgrade agricultural and food sciences facilities at 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 5123. A bill to abolish the Conscience and Religious Freedom Division in the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself and Mr. SMUCKER):

H.R. 5124. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a community action opioid response grant program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 5125. A bill to improve and expand authorities, programs, services, and benefits for military spouses and military families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 5126. A bill to authorize assistance for procurement of missile defense systems for Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 5127. A bill to establish a grant program for the funding of water recycling and reuse projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in ad-

dition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 5128. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to award grants to tribal health programs located on reservations impacted by uranium mining or milling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. CILLINE):

H.R. 5129. A bill to reauthorize the Global Food Security Act of 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5130. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the Secretary of a military department to grant veterans access to certain fitness centers under the jurisdiction of such Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 5131. A bill to improve the effectiveness of Federal efforts to identify and address homeland security risks to surface transportation, secure against vehicle-based attacks, and conduct a feasibility assessment of introducing new security technologies and measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CILLINE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HECK, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BEYER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WELCH, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SMOZZI, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COHEN, Mr.

MOULTON, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SIREs, Mr. CRIST, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MENG, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. BASS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BERA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. CARDENAS):

H.J. Res. 129. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Restoring Internet Freedom"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. YOHO, Mr. COLE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BOST, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ARRINGTON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BRAT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BACON, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BARR, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Ms. FOX):

H.J. Res. 130. A joint resolution honoring the life of William (Billy) F. Graham, Jr.; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 109th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DUNN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the CubeSat Launch Initiative and recognizing the development of

WeissSat-1; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HILL, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. GABBARD):

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution recognizing the rich history, heritage, and strategic importance of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Marshallese population residing in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Foreign Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H. Res. 752. A resolution recognizing the rise of cardiovascular disease as the world's leading cause of preventable death and disability and as the global public health crisis of our generation and recognizing February 2018 as "American Heart Month"; 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. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. KHANNA):

H. Res. 753. A resolution encouraging people in the United States to recognize March 2, 2018, as Read Across America Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 754. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Dominican Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H. Res. 755. A resolution recognizing and celebrating Black History Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H. Res. 756. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 21, 2018, as "National Rosie the Riveter Day"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 757. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 17 as "National Vitiligo Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H. Res. 758. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of February 2018 as "National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month"; 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. ESTES of Kansas:  
H.R. 5099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and clause 18 of section 8 of article I

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. SCHRADER:

H.R. 5104.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 5105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 5106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—interstate commerce clause

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 5108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 5109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 5110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1, "all legislative powers herein granted shall be



vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to “provide for the common Defense and general Welfare” of Americans.

In the Department of Education Organization Act (P.L. 96-88), Congress declared that “the establishment of a Department of Education is in the public interest, will promote the general welfare of the United States, will help ensure that education issues receive proper treatment at the Federal level, and will enable the Federal Government to coordinate its education activities more effectively.” The Department of Education’s mission is to “promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.”

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 5112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the authority to enact legislation that ensures access to firearms.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 5113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution

“All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 5116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 5117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 Section 8 of Article 1:

The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 5119.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 5120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 5121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 5122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 5124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. McEACHIN:

H.R. 5125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Necessary and Proper Clause

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 5127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 5128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 5131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—“necessary and proper” clause.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.J. Res. 130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 34: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 51: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 113: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 389: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 392: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 525: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 592: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 754: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 785: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 816: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 820: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 846: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 878: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 911: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 914: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 936: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 959: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1002: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1060: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1120: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1134: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1150: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1200: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1227: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1276: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1278: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1295: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1326: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1409: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1434: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1444: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1456: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1458: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1472: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1478: Mr. MAST and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1515: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1552: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1612: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1683: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1784: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1802: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1813: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1836: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1903: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1928: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1953: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1957: Ms. BASS and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2005: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2012: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2050: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2150: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 2174: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 2278: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2285: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2345: Mr. GALLEGRO.

H.R. 2380: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2428: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 2452: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. BACON.

- H.R. 2553: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 2561: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. NORMAN.
- H.R. 2598: Mr. SIRES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BASS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BERA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. KIHUEN.
- H.R. 2599: Mr. PAULSEN.
- H.R. 2640: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 2652: Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 2723: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 2784: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2827: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
- H.R. 2841: Mr. COHEN and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H.R. 2851: Mr. UPTON.
- H.R. 2895: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
- H.R. 2902: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 2913: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MAST, and Mr. SUOZZI.
- H.R. 2952: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 2987: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 3144: Mr. GIANFORTE.
- H.R. 3174: Mr. RASKIN.
- H.R. 3222: Mr. KIHUEN.
- H.R. 3249: Mr. MACARTHUR.
- H.R. 3252: Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 3301: Mr. ROSS, Mr. TROTT, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
- H.R. 3349: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 3378: Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 3464: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PASCRELL, and Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 3520: Ms. BASS.
- H.R. 3574: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 3586: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. HUNTER.
- H.R. 3592: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 3605: Mr. KHANNA.
- H.R. 3642: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 3654: Mr. TONKO and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 3671: Mr. JEFFRIES and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
- H.R. 3692: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 3709: Mr. CARBAJAL.
- H.R. 3751: Mr. GALLAGHER.
- H.R. 3767: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 3889: Mr. POE of Texas.
- H.R. 3918: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.R. 3938: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 3975: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 3999: Mr. MAST and Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 4022: Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LOVE, and Ms. SPEIER.
- H.R. 4057: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. NORCROSS.
- H.R. 4097: Mr. LEVIN.
- H.R. 4099: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. WALBERG.
- H.R. 4107: Mrs. DINGELL and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 4177: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
- H.R. 4180: Mr. RASKIN.
- H.R. 4198: Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 4202: Ms. BASS and Mr. FASO.
- H.R. 4222: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
- H.R. 4229: Mr. POCAN and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 4234: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 4240: Mr. LANCE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. LEE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MAST, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KIHUEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MENG, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 4275: Ms. STEFANIK.
- H.R. 4327: Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. HUNTER.
- H.R. 4342: Mr. SIRES and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 4343: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 4344: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 4345: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. GAETZ.
- H.R. 4392: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
- H.R. 4445: Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 4471: Mr. MACARTHUR.
- H.R. 4490: Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 4548: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Mr. YARMUTH.
- H.R. 4575: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 4635: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
- H.R. 4673: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 4677: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
- H.R. 4706: Mr. CICILLINE.
- H.R. 4747: Mr. POSEY, Mr. FASO, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
- H.R. 4766: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 4770: Mr. TROTT and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
- H.R. 4775: Mr. SABLAN and Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 4811: Mr. COLE, Mr. MAST, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Ms. STEFANIK.
- H.R. 4827: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. NORCROSS.
- H.R. 4829: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. KHANNA.
- H.R. 4830: Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 4831: Mr. BLUM and Mr. FASO.
- H.R. 4846: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 4859: Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 4881: Mr. BLUM.
- H.R. 4904: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 4912: Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 4916: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
- H.R. 4922: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 4942: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 4949: Ms. PLASKETT.
- H.R. 4957: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 4973: Mr. DAVIDSON.
- H.R. 5001: Mr. YARMUTH and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
- H.R. 5006: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
- H.R. 5012: Mr. TAYLOR.
- H.R. 5022: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 5041: Ms. STEFANIK.
- H.R. 5071: Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 5074: Mr. KATKO and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
- H.R. 5087: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. COOPER, and Mrs. DINGELL.
- H.R. 5090: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. DENT.
- H.J. Res. 1: Mr. LATTA.
- H.J. Res. 2: Mr. LATTA.
- H.J. Res. 122: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. ROUZER.
- H. Con. Res. 49: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
- H. Con. Res. 66: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. HUNTER.
- H. Res. 157: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
- H. Res. 188: Mr. PETERSON.
- H. Res. 274: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H. Res. 621: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H. Res. 673: Mr. GROTHMAN.
- H. Res. 730: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
- H. Res. 738: Mr. GOMEZ.
- H. Res. 746: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PALONE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.