



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2018

No. 39

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 6, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GREGG HARPER 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 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

SECURING THE FUTURE OF DREAMERS

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the deadline for the U.S. Congress to secure the futures of hundreds of thousands of Dreamers. Our constituents, who grew up in the United States, have been here at least 10 years, but do not have permanent legal immigration status and, therefore, are deportable, vulnerable, and exploitable.

And guess what? The cynics were right, and Congress has taken no action. There have been a few attempts, but the reality is that Congress has not passed a bill, and the opportunities for us to pass a bill are dwindling.

How did we get here? How is it that we always end up here when it comes to immigration?

Well, it has been a failure of both parties to act, to compromise, and to legislate. But let's be honest, the President doesn't want these immigrants in this country, and Republicans in Congress only want to do what the President wants them to do because they fear his tweets and the effect it might have on their voters in November.

The President said he loved Dreamers. Remember? He wanted to preserve DACA and treat them "with heart." He said he wanted to give a pathway to citizenship for Dreamers, and he told a group of lawmakers on national television that he would take the political heat and sign whatever bipartisan approach they were able to come up with, but he was lying, again.

Just like his conversations with lawmakers on guns after the massacre in Florida—also with the television cameras rolling—what the President says in public, what he does behind closed doors, what he tweets, and what he thinks from moment to moment do not seem to be connected in any logical way.

And when the cameras are turned off, the radical rightwing whispers their orders in the President's ear, and he falls right in line—whether it is with gun manufacturers or the anti-immigration nativists.

And when you cannot trust the President to have a stable opinion for more than 2, maybe 3, hours, it makes it hard for Republicans to figure out what will please him and make him happy from moment to moment.

Bipartisan proposals that could have passed the House and the Senate were

brought to him and he rejected them, saying that he wanted to eliminate various types of legal immigration avenues used by people, especially people of color and people from the developing world. Without these massive cuts to legal immigration, the President just wasn't interested.

And we offered him money for his silly, mindless, stupid, dimwitted, racist wall, but he rejected that, too.

In the end, this is not about Dreamers, it is not about the wall, it is not about border security. Do you know what it is about? It is about a deeply held core belief of the President, and many of his advisers, that there are just too many people of color coming legally to the United States. There are too many family members of immigrants, unless those immigrants are members of Trump's own family.

It is clear that the President doesn't want immigrants who look like the diverse and colorful fabric of the world. And he doesn't want Dreamers who were raised in the U.S. alongside of our own children, who reflect the diversity of America.

Now, to be fair, some of my Democratic colleagues are just as happy about the injunctions in the Federal courts that are keeping the Trump deportation machine from fully engaging and going after Dreamers. Lawmakers—both Democrats and Republicans—don't need much encouragement sometimes to just kick the can down the road.

But let's not kid ourselves. Relying on the courts to save Dreamers is a cop-out, and a lot of people are left out if they do not already have DACA. And for the ones who can renew their status, we may be back here in a few days or weeks trying to prevent the deportation of Dreamers and lots of other immigrants if the courts change course, which they may.

So I will not let my colleagues in either party rest.

□ 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.

H1375

For now, every person who has DACA should renew their DACA as quickly as possible for whatever time they have left. I say run, don't walk, to renew.

I have been here long enough to know that even when faced with an issue on which 80 percent of the American people agree—whether it is sensible gun control or preventing the deportation of children raised in America—it is the 20 percent of the American people who Republicans are listening to, and playing to, and tweeting to, and playing nice-nice with the White House to appease.

And the rest of us, what do we get? Nothing—on immigrants, on guns, on climate change, on healthcare, or on taxes—unless we, as voters, simply reshuffle the deck.

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

BORIS NEMTSOV

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last week sadly marked the third anniversary of the murder of the Russian human rights activist Boris Nemtsov.

On February 27, 2015, Boris was assassinated while crossing a bridge near the Kremlin in Moscow, shot in the back in the most cowardly manner. Boris' murder was no doubt directed by Putin, because Boris had actively organized rallies against the regime and even had the courage to report in detail on corruption in the Putin regime. His death was a great loss for the people of Russia who are fighting for a free and Democratic society.

I was lucky enough to have known Boris and met with him several times over the years. I had the great privilege to work with him on getting the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act passed into law in 2012. In fact, I met with Boris right after the House passed that bill.

That day, Boris told me something that resonated with me, Mr. Speaker. He told me that Putin had made stopping the Magnitsky Act his utmost priority.

Though that resonated with me, it did not surprise me, because I was born in communist Cuba, and I was forced to flee my homeland with my family to get away from the Castro regime. And I know that Castro would have had the same reaction as Putin, because thugs fear the people who are brave enough to challenge their authoritarian rule.

That is why Putin feared Magnitsky; that is why Putin feared Boris; and that is why Putin fears my friend and close friend of Boris' Vladimir Kara-Murza, who the Putin regime has tried to kill on two occasions, both by poisoning.

Vladimir has bravely picked up the mantle from Boris, and he carries out

his mission of speaking the truth about the Putin regime and calling attention to the human rights abuses in Russia. He has carried on the legacy and brought Boris' message to the world. And through Vladimir's efforts, the legacy has been memorialized right here in Washington, D.C.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I attended the unveiling of the naming of the plaza right in front of the Russian Embassy after Boris. Boris personified the fight for human rights in Russia.

And now, in front of the Russian Embassy in Washington, D.C., 3 years after Boris was murdered, he is now memorialized as a symbol—a symbol signifying that one person or one idea can be more powerful and more threatening to a corrupt regime than even the biggest army.

That plaza also serves as a symbol for the future because one day Putin will be gone and Boris' dream will become a reality. When that day comes, the diplomats who come to the United States, representing a free and democratic Russia, will be able to look out the windows of their embassy beaming with pride at what Boris' sacrifice helped them realize.

And they will honor Boris' legacy and everyone else who told the truth about the regime of Putin and who gave everything for a free and democratic Russia, where human rights and the rule of law are respected, not feared. I hope that day is soon upon us, Mr. Speaker.

PASSING A STRONG, BIPARTISAN FARM BILL

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the challenges that we face, not only in my constituency as it relates to California agriculture, but a host of other issues as well.

We are in the process of trying to reauthorize the farm bill, something we do every 4 years. It used to be—and we hope it will continue this year—one of the more bipartisan efforts we are engaged in.

I represent not only the heartland of the San Joaquin Valley, but third-generation farmer.

Last week—as I do every weekend when I go home—I was walking the rows of the almond trees on my ranch outside of Fresno, California. They are beautiful. They are in full bloom this time of year. There is not a time, though, in the year, in the San Joaquin Valley, where the incredible bounty of the 300 crops that we grow are not on display because they are always out there.

The blossoms in the spring grow into the almonds, walnuts, and pistachios until late summer. Tomatoes are harvested in August and September, followed by cotton in October and November. The dairymen and dairy processors work every day because those cows

have to be milked every day year-round to produce the finest quality milk, cheese, and butter.

As I walked through my orchard, I remembered the countless stories and insights by my fellow California farmers, ranchers, dairymen and -women shared with me over the past year, and I think about my father, who farmed all of his life, and my grandfather.

In anticipation of the 2018 farm bill, I have held round tables and listening sessions, attended agriculture town-halls, and met with our farmers and farm workers, who, every day, work so hard to put those food products on America's dinner table.

I have done this to hear firsthand the concerns and priorities of our local producers, farm workers, and nutrition organizations regarding our Nation's food supply.

I have also had numerous meetings with key agriculture and trade officials, including Agriculture Secretary Perdue, who has been out to California a number of times.

And as we in Congress move together with farm bill negotiations, we must maintain strong support for the cultivation and production of fresh fruits and vegetables, which are the foundation of a healthy diet. California produces over half of the Nation's fruits and vegetables. It is truly amazing. Three hundred crops.

We must also make sure that we do not abandon our Nation's most vulnerable through inhumane cuts to the nutrition programs that provide a steady source of food to our Nation's food supply. We are talking about our safety net, we are talking about the SNAP program, and we are talking about Women, Infants, and Children. This has been part of the glue on a bipartisan basis that has kept Democrats and Republicans together in the reauthorization of the farm bill.

But we must have a safety net for those who are most unfortunate in our society. We should work to expand foreign markets for our products and to incentivize sound conservation practices and research. Research is very important to ensure the sustainability. Sustainability is critical—and continued growth of American agriculture.

We have the opportunity with the farm bill to address the crippling agriculture labor crisis afflicting our farms, and it must be addressed as we look at a broken immigration system that not only impacts our Dreamers—the DACA program—but a reliable supply of farm labor.

These are all among the issues that we must address to ensure that our Nation's food supply is reliable, because, guess what, it is a national security issue. People don't look at it that way. People go into the grocery store and they think: Well, what is the problem; grocery stores have all the food in the world. They go to the restaurants, and they have all the food that you need.

But the food doesn't go to the grocery store or to those restaurants without it being grown by America's men

and women who labor—less than 3 percent of the Nation's population—to produce the finest, highest quality, greatest yield, most nutritious food anywhere in the world, every night on America's dinner table.

That is why we must come together—Democrats and Republicans—to improve our Nation's food supply by passing a strong, bipartisan farm bill.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF VIOLENCE AGAINST
WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, otherwise known as VAWRA.

Protecting the Violence Against Women Act is one of our top priorities in the Victims' Rights Caucus, a bipartisan House caucus that Congressman TED POE and I organized some 10 years ago.

□ 1015

The law seeks to both prevent violence in our communities and provides services to survivors of violence, in part, by encouraging collaboration among local law enforcement, traditional personnel, and the private sector organizations, NGOs. In my district, these organizations collaborate, and they have been vital in helping survivors of violence.

We must have numerous organizations working tirelessly together to support the victims of crime. In my district, they include the Marjaree Mason Center, Central California Legal Services, Choice Women Empowerment, Centro La Familia, and Valley Crisis Center. This is critical to end violence not only in our valley, but in our Nation, and that is why we must come together to end this violence, to ensure that the survivors have access to services for essential recovery.

We cannot stop, and we must end this horrendous violence once and for all. That is why we must support the Violence Against Women Act.

CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF
ALTON, ILLINOIS

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the city of Alton, Illinois. Alton was selected from hundreds of cities nationwide to be featured on the reality TV show "Small Business Revolution—Main Street." The city will also receive a \$500,000 investment for its small businesses.

Alton has a rich history. It is home to historic buildings, and has a deep manufacturing heritage. It was the site of one of the Lincoln-Douglas debates, a route on the Underground Railroad, and home to blues musician Miles Davis and history's tallest man, 8-foot-11-inch Robert Wadlow.

These days, Alton is undergoing a small business revolution, from a self-pour craft beer taproom to a post office

converted into a small business hub. And new businesses are popping up all over. It is an exciting time for the Alton community, and they can't wait to show the Nation southern Illinois' spirit of innovation.

RECOGNIZING THE DETERMINATION OF ROWDY
LOYD

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the determination of a young man from my hometown of Murphysboro, Illinois.

Rowdy Loyd has cerebral palsy and a nerve disorder, but that has not stopped him from trying out for the Murphysboro Red Devils basketball team year after year. While he hasn't made the official roster, he serves as team manager. Going to every game all through his high school career, and every practice, Rowdy had a constant presence with the team, coaches, and our community.

Last month, Rowdy finally got the chance to see game time. Rowdy scored 10 points on the night, including a buzzer-beating 3-point shot. In Rowdy's own words:

I got a whole lot of school behind my back, and my family. I've got a lot of people that support me. So it was awesome to know that they all came to the game to watch me play.

Rowdy, we are all proud of you.

WISHING A HAPPY ANNIVERSARY TO TRACY BOST

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, if I could, to take a moment. I would like to read a part of a particular proverb, Proverbs 31:10-31:

An excellent wife, who can find? She is more precious than jewels.

The heart of her husband trusts in her, and he will have no lack of gain.

She does him good and not harm in all the days of her life.

She seeks wool and flax and works with willing hands.

She is like merchant ships; she brings her food from afar.

She rises while it is yet night and provides food for her household and portions for her maidens.

She considers a field and buys it, and from the fruit of her hands she plants the vineyards.

She dresses herself with strength and makes her arms strong.

She perceives that the merchandise is profitable, and her lamp does not go out at night.

She puts her hands to the distaff and her hands to the spindle.

She opens her hand to the poor and reaches out her hands to the needy.

She is not afraid of snow, for all her household is clothed with scarlet.

She makes bed coverings for herself. Her clothing is fine linen and purple.

Her husband is known in the gates when he sits among the elders of the land.

She makes linen garments and sells them. She delivers sash to the merchants.

Strength and dignity are her clothing, and she laughs at time to come.

She opens her mouth in wisdom, and the teaching of kindness is on her tongue.

She looks well to the ways of her household and does not eat the bread of idleness.

Her children rise up and call her blessed. Her husband also, and he praises her: Many women have done excellently, but you surpass them all.

Charm is deceitful and beauty is vain, but a woman who fears the Lord is to be praised.

Give her the fruit of her hands, and let her works praise her in the gates.

Mr. Speaker, many may ask why I would read such a Scripture this day on the floor. Well, because 38 years ago, tomorrow, I married a beautiful young woman who has grown to become the very woman described in this Scripture. She is very beautiful and very charming, but most of all, she is virtuous.

With that, I want to wish her an early happy anniversary. I love you, Tracy.

IN DEFENSE OF DREAMERS AND
THOSE WHO BROUGHT THEM HERE

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise today in defense of Dreamers and those who brought them here. I rise in defense of them, Mr. Speaker, because, quite frankly, there was a desire for persons to come here. There was a desire for them to come and to work, and to work at wages that some considered subpar, a desire for them to work under conditions that were not the best. There was a desire for them to come, and they came.

I rise in defense of them because, Mr. Speaker, we are complicit in this behavior. We were complicit because we knew they were coming, and we wanted them to come.

I rise in defense of them because I don't believe that a country as great as the United States of America can ask young people to accept a pathway to citizenship but not give it to the people who brought them here: their parents, in most cases, but, in a good many cases, other persons who cared for them.

To ask these young people to sell out their parents, to borrow a term that we use, is more than a great nation should ask of young people; to say to them, "You can stay, but your parents may have to go," what kind of country are we if we demand this of young people who came with people whom we wanted to come, who have done us no harm, who have worked hard in our kitchens, who have worked hard cleaning our homes, who have worked hard tending our fields, who worked hard bringing in the fruits of the labor that they brought to this country?

What kind of country says, "You are going to go back," after many years of being here, and send the young people back to places of which they know very little?

Mr. Jose Escobar is a case in point. He was sent back to San Salvador. He hadn't been there in many, many years. He came here around 15 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for this country to take the affirmative action to correct what will be an injustice if we pursue the path that the President would have us pursue. Now is the time

for us to make sure that every person is receiving the kind of liberty and justice for all that we extol in the Pledge of Allegiance. Now is the time for us to make sure that all of these young people are given the opportunity to succeed on their merits or fail on their demerits in the country that they know as home.

Mr. Speaker, we are a great country. A great country does not do what the President is proposing, and I will not stand with the President on this. I stand and defend the Dreamers and the people who brought them here: in most cases, their parents. This is what a great nation ought to do.

I know that there may be people who differ, but when you are standing on right, you don't worry about those who differ. This is the right thing for the United States of America to do.

CONGRATULATING SCHRACK FARMS ON ITS 2018 INNOVATIVE DAIRY FARMER OF THE YEAR AWARD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Schrack Farm Resources of Loganton, Pennsylvania, for being named the 2018 Innovative Dairy Farmer of the Year.

The national award celebrates U.S. dairy producers that apply creativity, excellence, and forward thinking to achieve greater on-farm productivity and improved milk marketing. The award is presented annually by the International Dairy Foods Association and Dairy Herd Management magazine.

Mr. Speaker, Schrack Farm Resources has a rich history in Clinton County. Located in the heart of farm country, Schrack Farms is operated by Jim and Lisa Harbach and Kevin Schrack. Lisa and Kevin are siblings. They run the farm with the help of their children and grandchildren, who now represent the 11th-generation farmers of the land. Yes, that is right; Schrack Farm Resources has been in operation since 1773, 3 years before the Declaration of Independence was even issued. They have 22 full-time employees and some part-time help as well. The owners said it is teamwork that makes it possible for them to receive this award.

It is especially meaningful to see a Pennsylvania farm with such a long history of good stewardship being named the leading innovator, nationwide, for dairy farming. Today, Schrack Farms is managing an 1,100-head dairy herd while advocating for no-till farming and maintaining soil health and promoting awareness of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Its farming practices truly focus on conservation. Schrack Farms also was an early adopter of renewable energy technology and installed one of the

first methane digesters in Pennsylvania. Now the farm generates revenue by selling power back to the grid and reduces electricity costs for the farm.

Schrack Farms is a model operation that is at the forefront of modern-day farming practices. Their operation effectively demonstrates that investment in environmentally friendly practices can lower costs, provide new revenue streams, and offer greater efficiencies on the farm.

They also educate local legislators and the general public about their operation's positive economic and environmental benefits. Jim Harbach said the farm's practices and beliefs go well beyond the borders of farming. Family members and farm staff are involved in associations and organizations that promote dairy farming and its environmental impacts. He has traveled across the country speaking about the practices that they use right there in Loganton, Pennsylvania.

Schrack Farms accepted the award earlier this year at Dairy Forum 2018 in Palm Desert, California. Pennsylvania's Secretary of Agriculture Russell Redding nominated the farm for the award, and I was pleased to add supporting comments to the nomination.

Mr. Speaker, I am most proud of Schrack Farms and the entire family for being a leader in dairy farming not only in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but nationwide. I wholeheartedly congratulate Jim, Lisa, Kevin, and their families and employees on this outstanding achievement.

COMMEMORATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S REEMERGENCE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Representative JACKIE WALORSKI, as co-chairs of the Polish Caucus.

This year, we commemorate the 100th anniversary of Poland's reemergence as a European nation in 1918. As grateful Polish Americans, we join together on a bipartisan basis to acknowledge this historic achievement of freedom's advance.

The reality is history has been brutal to Poland. In the late 1700s, Poland was erased from the map of Europe for 123 years by three adjacent predatory empires because it passed a constitution inspired by ours, which included a separation of powers.

Poland became the first nation in Europe to abolish serfdom by the Polaniec Manifesto on May 7, 1794. Then, in 1918, following World War I, with the support of President Woodrow Wilson, Poland was restored to the map of Europe and resumed its torturous climb to freedom.

□ 1030

But then, in 1939, World War II began. As Poland was invaded, first by Nazi

Germany, and then 3 weeks later by Communist Russia, Poland suffered an unimaginable loss of 20 percent of its population that perished during World War II, the most of any nation in that war.

Of the 14 million civilians killed by Nazi Germany and Communist Russia, over 6 million were killed in Poland; 3 million Jews and 3 million Christians, as well as Roma and Sinti, the disabled, homosexuals, and other innocents.

Poland never surrendered. There never was a collaborationist Polish Government. Establishing a free government in exile, Polish armies fought on every front in Europe, including alongside American soldiers at Normandy.

Despite the Nazi and Soviet campaign to wipe out Poland's most educated and accomplished and, indeed, Poland's history, Poland resisted at home with the largest underground resistance movement in Europe. Poland never surrendered, nor did it ever surrender to Nazi nor Communist, murderous ideology.

At Katyn, Communist Russia, with bullets to the back of their heads, killed over 12,000 Polish leaders from its military, civil society, their educational community, and their religious leadership.

1945 brought allied liberation to a war-torn Europe, but not to Poland, which fell under the Soviet yoke, repressed, and blocked from its own identity, indeed, even denied a true representation of its wartime history of heroism, tragedy, and terror.

But in 1989, after 43 years of increasing resistance to occupation inside Poland, its fierce love of liberty spilled over into successful resistance and massive electoral victory won by Solidarnosc, the labor movement that yielded ultimate liberty for Poland. This was the first wave of major popular and anti-Communist opposition across the Soviet bloc that resulted in the Berlin Wall's collapse in 1989, the wall that divided liberty from tyranny and, ultimately, communism's demise.

Poland has accomplished much in the generation of freedom that followed. She has achieved a steady economic growth in each year since its return to freedom, the most robust of any nation in Europe. Yet, the millions of souls who perished in Poland across every faith, confession, and ethnic origin, most remain unknown to history. Our globe is still weighed down with the collective sense of unresolved grief and the lack of historical truth that humanity must address.

For the millions who perished, this anniversary year of Poland's rebirth should be an occasion to uplift that historical truth to heal, not divide. As we speak, vicious Russian aggression aims to destabilize Europe and our precious transatlantic and NATO alliance, essential to liberty. Free nations, including Poland and her critics, should

use this moment to recommit to liberty and rule of law, setting aside language and gestures that inflame divisions across Europe.

Now is a time for unity, not division. Now is a time for restraint, not antagonism. Now is the time for reasoned dialogue, not media taunts. And let me commend the Polish-Israeli Reconciliation Commission for its reasoned progress and recent statement.

Now is the time for diplomatic excellence and military readiness, not provocative gestures, legislative or otherwise. Now is the time for robust archival restoration so the full truth of millions who perished can be known and recorded forever. Now is the time to strengthen freedom's umbrella, not weaken it.

May I extend all congratulations and blessings to Poland on its 100th anniversary of reborn nationhood.

CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF KEVIN LEZYNSKI

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was fortunate to meet an impressive young man, Kevin Lezynski, and celebrate with him as he earned the rank of Eagle Scout.

Kevin, of Harleysville, Pennsylvania, is a senior at Souderton Area High School. He is involved in the community as a member of the Unified Special Olympics and the regular Special Olympics, where he competes in soccer, swimming, bocce, baseball, and track and field. He is the manager of the school lacrosse team; he is involved in this year's musical; and he was voted homecoming king.

As an Eagle Scout in Troop 91, Kevin earned 36 merit badges and led a group of 38 others in building a gazebo on the high school grounds in just 2 days. Students and teachers now use the space to learn and socialize.

Kevin is a shining example of commitment to community service and what you can accomplish when you put your mind toward a goal.

Congratulations, Kevin, on earning this well-deserved rank of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTINE GUNSIEWSKI, ALLI CURRO, AND KIM MCCLEARY FOR FOUNDING THE TYPE ONE PARENT PROJECT FOUNDATION

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Christine Gunsiewski, Alli Curro, and Kim McCleary for their work in the community combating type 1 diabetes.

After all three women had a child diagnosed with diabetes in 2014, they began raising money to find a cure. In 2016, they took their efforts even further, starting the Type One Parent Project Foundation focused on providing support and guidance for families in my district in Bucks and Montgomery Counties, as well as raising general awareness about type 1 diabetes.

This year, this organization will continue to expand its efforts, increasing the number and range of speakers at their meetings, creating a mentoring program where older kids can mentor younger children about the effects of type 1 diabetes. They will, in the coming months, award several scholarships to local families so that kids can attend the American Diabetes Association's Camp Freedom, a week-long overnight camp for kids with diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Christine, Alli, and Kim for all the work they are doing to keep kids safe and help kids in our community and educate our community about children facing this challenge.

DEMOCRATS HAVE A BETTER PLAN

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, the reckless, regressive, and reprehensible Republican budget cuts funding for Social Security, cuts Medicare, cuts Medicaid. The Republican budget cuts funding for Meals on Wheels, cuts funding for school violence prevention programs. It even cuts funding for the Special Olympics.

Who does that?

The Republican budget seeks to balance itself on the backs of working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, veterans, rural America, and the safety of our children. It is an abdication of responsibility. It is a dereliction of duty. It is a stunning act of legislative malpractice. The reckless Republican budget is a raw deal for the American people.

Democrats have a better deal focused on better jobs, better wages, and a better future for the American people. Democrats have a better deal focused on higher pay, lower costs, and providing the American people with the tools to succeed in a 21st century economy. Democrats have a better deal focused on improving the quality of life of everyday Americans.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 38 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

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

The Prophet Isaiah, in the first chapter, begins his message with these words: "Hear, O heavens, and listen, O Earth, for the Lord speaks." All the heavens and all the Earth cannot grasp or contain Your Word, O Lord. Once spoken and unleashed upon the world, Your Word catapults imaginings to their heights and penetrates everything to its depths. May our hearing turn to listening and our listening make us so attentive that it leads to new understanding and new ways of acting.

Your Word provokes Isaiah to cry out to the people: If only we were free enough to be raised up by its power or strong enough to be embraced by its full passion. Then we, like Isaiah, would be able to hear in our broadcast news the voice of violence coming from our own children, and we would lament as a nation searching for prophetic vision until we and our ways of acting change.

We pray for this vision now, and may all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

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 Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DEUTCH 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.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THOSE KILLED OR WOUNDED IN SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in honor of those who have been killed or wounded in service to our country and all those who serve and their families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING RICHARDSON POLICE OFFICER DAVID SHERRARD

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Richardson Police Officer David Sherrard.

Last month, Sherrard and other officers responded to a domestic disturbance, where Sherrard was shot and later succumbed to his wound.

Mr. Speaker, David Sherrard served with the Richardson Police Department for 13 years. He was known for his generosity and bravery, but above all, he was known for his faith in God, which he shared with others.

Sherrard was the first Richardson police officer to die in the line of duty. His death is a great loss. His wife and daughters remain in my thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the service and sacrifice of David Sherrard, a true hometown hero.

WILLIE O'REE SHOULD BE INDUCTED INTO THE HOCKEY HALL OF FAME

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, 60 years ago, Willie O'Ree broke the color barrier in professional hockey, all while overcoming racial slurs, doubt, and blindness in his right eye.

Often referred to as the Jackie Robinson of hockey, Willie has been a trusted champion for diversity, a proponent of inclusion, and an inspiration for so many young players both off and on the ice.

Each February, we celebrate Black History Month as well as Hockey is for Everyone Month, and no one embodies both of those tributes as profoundly as living legend Willie O'Ree.

He is as humble as he is inspiring, often reminding fans that he only played in the NHL for 45 games, and while that may be true, he changed the game forever.

There are few players worthier of being inducted into the Hockey Hall of Fame, and it is long overdue that Willie's name be added to that list.

As the Hockey Hall of Fame continues to accept and review nominee submissions before the March 15 deadline, I want to remind everyone of the countless ways Willie strengthened and supported this sport.

I thank him for his continued efforts to increase access for all people of all backgrounds to get out on the ice and play the greatest game.

UNLOCKING MONTANA'S PUBLIC LANDS TO INCREASE PUBLIC ACCESS

(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 draw attention to Washington inactivity that has locked up hundreds of thousands of acres of Montana public lands.

In the 1970s, Congress designated over 1 million acres of Montana as wilderness study areas. The U.S. Forest Service and BLM were charged with determining whether to include them in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

By the early 1980s, the Forest Service and BLM had made their recommendations, but Congress did not act. Now, nearly 40 years later, Congress still hasn't acted, and those study areas are still locked up.

Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced the Unlocking Public Lands Act and the Protect Public Use of Public Lands Act. These bills will release nearly 700,000 acres of lands found to be not suitable for wilderness designation and return them to Forest Service and BLM management.

County commissioners, State legislators, and impacted communities support this overdue action.

Congress is about 40 years late in unlocking Montana's public lands and increasing public access to them. It is time to finish the job.

THE NATION WILL NOT FORGET PARKLAND

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, it has been just 20 days since the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida; but when you spend those days going to funerals and memorial services and vigils, and when you spend those days meeting with grieving parents who don't know what life is without their loved one, and when you spend those days demanding that this House take action, it feels a lot longer.

Life moves on, new headlines fight to push our pain aside.

One Parkland student, starting her first full week back at Marjory Stoneman Douglas since the shooting, said this on Twitter: "There are no media trucks in sight. Don't forget about Parkland."

Mr. Speaker, the fight is not over. Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot and will not just move on from this tragedy.

The Nation will not forget Parkland, because this time, we join with the Marjory Stoneman Douglas students in declaring: "Never again."

RECOGNIZING OUR NORTH COUNTRY OLYMPIANS

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the hard work

and dedication of our north country Olympians, who made history at the 2018 Winter Games in Pyeongchang.

The United States women's bobsled team, trained in Lake Placid in my district, finished strong with an incredible silver medal win.

We are also incredibly excited for Saranac Lake's very own Chris Mazdzer, who made Olympic history this year, taking home Team USA's first ever medal in men's singles luge.

Chris trained tirelessly at the Olympic Training Center in Lake Placid, and I know he has inspired the next generation of New York-21 athletes from across our region.

Mr. Speaker, the north country has been buzzing with excitement since the Winter Games began, and seeing Chris on the podium was an incredible moment for us all.

Congratulations to Chris and to all our Olympians, who showed the world just what the north country has to offer.

GREAT LAKES WEEK

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this week is Great Lakes Week.

As a Michigander, I am proud of the fact that Republicans and Democrats in Congress continue to work together to highlight the importance of our shared water resources and to protect the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes generate billions of dollars in economic activity and provide drinking water to 40 million people. We have to do everything we can to protect them from harm.

Unfortunately, President Trump recently unveiled his proposed budget, which cuts funding to the Great Lakes by 90 percent. An important restoration initiative that has succeeded and has had bipartisan support, the President nearly eliminates.

Protecting our Great Lakes has never been a partisan issue. Democrats and Republicans have come together before to restore funding cuts that were proposed by President Trump. I am confident that we will come together again.

This Great Lakes Week, as every week, I stand up for the Great Lakes and those who depend upon them. They are a critical water resource that must be protected.

RECOGNIZING ALBERTO CARVALHO

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alberto Carvalho, the superintendent of Miami-Dade County Public Schools, the Nation's fourth largest school system, with more than 500,000 students.

For the past decade, Alberto has worked tirelessly on behalf of students and educators throughout my congressional district. His efforts have propelled Miami-Dade public schools into a position of national prominence, and it is now one of the Nation's highest performing urban school systems.

Recently, Mr. Carvalho was offered the opportunity of a lifetime to run the largest school system in the country, and that is chancellor of New York City schools, but he showed his dedication and commitment to south Florida's students and teachers when he decided to stay in Miami-Dade. As a former Florida certified teacher, I am so glad that he is staying to continue leading Miami-Dade County Public Schools.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our grateful community and countless individuals who have been positively impacted by Alberto Carvalho's unwavering dedication, I want to say: Thank you, "friend," "amigo." Please stay.

WE SHOULD NOT ROLL BACK FLIGHT SAFETY LAWS

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago, Continental Flight 3407 crashed in western New York, killing all aboard and one on the ground.

The National Transportation Safety Board found that the cause of the crash was pilot error and poor training.

Prior to the enactment of flight safety laws, there were two levels of safety: one more stringent for the commercial carriers that we are all familiar with, and one considerably less stringent for the ones that we are less aware of. There were two levels of safety.

Now there is only one because of the courageous work of the families of the survivors who came to Congress and helped Congress enact very strict safety regulations. We have not had a commercial crash that ended up in fatalities since that time.

It is important that we not roll back these safety standards, as they are based on the National Transportation Safety Board's findings and the work of this Congress.

LIMIT SCOPE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the special counsel investigation has pushed way beyond its authorized purpose.

Recent reports indicate that individuals have been questioned about President Trump's business activities prior to his entering the 2016 campaign. The private interests of Trump family members also are being probed.

These lines of investigation clearly violate the scope of the special counsel, which is limited to: "... any links and/or coordination between the Russian Government and individuals associated with the campaign..."

In the interest of justice, the investigation must be limited. The Deputy Attorney General should do so immediately to ensure a fair process.

A rogue investigation should not be allowed to continue.

□ 1215

FLORIDA HOUSE PASSES GUN SAFETY BILL

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, MARCO RUBIO's Florida State Senate got shocked enough by the Parkland shooting to pass a token gun safety bill. The Florida House has yet to act. Whatever Florida does, RUBIO's token gun bill in Washington is belied by his pending bill to eliminate virtually all of the District of Columbia's gun safety laws. Worse, RUBIO has put his D.C. bill in the Congress to raise his NRA rating for the last two Congresses. It did raise his NRA rating from B plus to A.

I have managed to save D.C.'s gun safety laws, but RUBIO's shamefully token responses in the Senate to the Parkland tragedy will be seen as one more act of hypocrisy until he stops meddling in the District of Columbia's affairs and withdraws his D.C. gun bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIANFORTE). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward Members of the Senate.

THE ALAMO—MARCH 6, 1836

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours it was cold, damp, and dark in the old, beat-up Spanish mission.

It was the Alamo.

It was March 6, 1836.

It was a battle for Texas independence.

The volunteers were from most of the States and several foreign countries, including Mexico.

The small band of 186 Texians and Tejanos, led by defiant Colonel William Barrett Travis, had already repelled two attempts by Dictator Santa Anna and his army of thousands to take the garrison.

But on this morning, after a fierce battle, the enemy overwhelmed the volunteers and killed them all. Survivors were murdered.

However, Travis wrote in a letter on March 3 that "a victory by the enemy will cost Santa Anna more than defeat."

He was right. The enemy losses were staggering.

The Alamo volunteers gave General Sam Houston time to organize another army. So, on April 21, Houston and his troops vanquished and routed the enemy and secured Texas independence.

Then Texas was a republic for 9 years.

Independence was successful because the valiant, relentless Alamo defenders believed death was preferable to tyranny. Today we honor their sacrifice on the altar of liberty.

And that is just the way it is.

TRADE AND TARIFFS

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, last week I was invited to the White House to meet with President Trump and his advisers to discuss trade and the renegotiation of NAFTA. My district is the eighth largest agriculture district in the country. For districts like mine, free trade is crucial to ensuring that there are new markets for our farmers and manufacturing to sell their products and goods. That is why I urged the President to maintain and strengthen our existing trade agreements, including NAFTA, not withdraw or create new barriers to free trade.

The American economy is currently booming, thanks to once-in-a-lifetime tax reform, with disposable income seeing its highest jump since 2015. We should be working to build upon this success, not instituting protectionist tariffs that could start a trade war. In the end, the cost of tariffs are passed on to consumers and act like a new form of taxation, which could undo much of the gains we have seen since tax reform.

I urge the President and his team to reconsider the blanket tariffs discussed last week, and instead focus on fighting specific unfair trade practices that put American businesses at a disadvantage.

THE UNHRC MUST STOP UNFAIRLY TARGETING ISRAEL

(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, Israel is America's treasured ally in the Middle East, and we must stand up for our friends when they are being treated unfairly. Recently, we have seen the United Nations targeting Israel with six anti-Israel resolutions passed in the last year alone. This is hypocritical discrimination.

That is why I introduced House Resolution 728, which recognizes that the United Nations Human Rights Council wastes U.S. taxpayers' money by targeting Israel and reiterates that they

need to stop the shameful, prejudicial behavior toward Israel. Even U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has expressed disappointment with the Human Rights Council singling out Israel, given the multitude of other human rights violations occurring around the world.

I was grateful for the opportunity to have attended the AIPAC Policy Conference this weekend, where I participated in a panel discussion on the threat to Israel from Gaza. There I highlighted the broad security concerns Israel is facing, such as the Hamas tunnels, and discussed ways in which the United States can assist to address the threats of kidnapping and murder, such as the murder of Taylor Force.

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

Americans appreciate Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, a world statesman, for his visit to Congress today.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF SNAPa IN THE LIVES OF STUDENTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will meet with leaders from the School Nutrition Association of Pennsylvania, commonly known as SNAPa, which is a statewide organization of school nutrition professionals.

SNAPa works to advance quality child nutrition programs through education and advocacy. Organized in 1955, SNAPa is an all-volunteer board of directors elected by its membership, which currently stands at more than 2,300 individuals. As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition and a senior member on the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I know the essential services that SNAPa works to provide. Students throughout the Commonwealth receive high-quality, low-cost meals thanks to SNAPa.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that, for some students, the only meal they may receive may be at school. This organization works to keep our children healthy and ensure that they have healthy food options through the school meal programs.

I look forward to speaking with Travis Folmar, a food services director from State College. I sincerely thank SNAPa for advancing the availability, quality, and acceptance of school nutrition programs as an essential part of education in Pennsylvania for more than 60 years.

SUPPORTING THE COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

As a former regulator at the FDIC, I can tell you that the road to a really bad economy is paved with seemingly good regulations. Regulations like the ones that came out of Dodd-Frank were intended to protect the consumer, but ended up creating more burden, more complexity, more cost, and fewer choices.

By the way, it destroys relationship banking in rural America and districts I represent. The best way to protect consumers and weed out the bad-acting businesses is a healthy market with robust competition, transparency, and more choices for the consumer.

The last 8 years gave us an administrative state in place of the freest and greatest economy in the world. We inherited trillions of dollars in regulatory costs, millions of hours in paperwork, and an economy that has grinded to a near halt.

Let's continue to rein in the unnecessary regulations. Let's get this economy growing again, and let's make America great again.

HONORING CALIFORNIA FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, last December, the Thomas fire raged through Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties, eventually becoming the largest wildfire in California's history. Our heroic firefighters left their families behind during the holiday season to fight tirelessly on the front lines, saving homes, businesses, and lives.

A few short weeks later, our first responders were called back into action when heavy rains brought debris flows that tragically claimed the lives of 23 people in Montecito. As residents were evacuating, these brave firefighters ran towards the disaster without a second thought, pulling people out of the mud and debris for days afterward.

I would like to thank all our first responders who so bravely answered the call of duty in these difficult conditions.

Mr. Speaker, with us here today are firefighters from IAFF Local 2046, CAL FIRE Local 2881, and the Ventura County Professional Firefighters Association, and the California Professional Firefighters.

I thank them all for their unparalleled level of service to keep our loved ones on the central coast safe.

Thank you for your service.

A MESSAGE TO THE MILITARY RETIREES OF ALABAMA'S SECOND DISTRICT

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the news that I recently received that Alabama's Second District has the 13th largest population of military retirees in the Nation.

It goes without saying that this is significant. At the end of last year, there were more than 16,000 military retirees living in Alabama's Second District.

But, Mr. Speaker, while I am glad that these retired servicemembers chose us, we are truly honored to have them. As their neighbors, it is our job to make sure that they feel at home, welcome, and, most of all, appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, to the 16,000 retired military personnel who call Alabama's Second District home, I join our State and community in thanking them for their service to our country. We thank them for sacrificing on our behalf. Now let us care for them. That starts with making sure that our veterans are receiving the care that they were promised when they signed up to put their lives on the line for this Nation.

If you are a veteran who needs any kind of casework assistance with the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Social Security Administration, or other Federal agency, please contact my office now. Do not put this off. My staff and I work for you. We are grateful for you. As the Representative from Alabama's Second District, I am here to fight for you.

COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 747, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARRINGTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 747, 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 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. 4607

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 "Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS OF THE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND REGULATORY PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.

Section 2001(c) of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 252 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(8) COVERED PERSON.—The term ‘covered person’ has the meaning given such term in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).”

“(9) FEDERAL FINANCIAL REGULATOR.—The term ‘federal financial regulator’ means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and the National Credit Union Administration Board.”.

SEC. 3. ENSURING A COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 2222 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 3311(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “10 years” and inserting “7 years”;

(2) by striking “each appropriate” and all that follows through “review” and inserting “the Federal financial regulators shall each conduct a comprehensive review”;

(3) by striking “such appropriate Federal banking agency” and inserting “such Federal financial regulator, jointly or otherwise,”; and

(4) by inserting “or covered persons” after “insured depository institutions”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is amended—

(1) in subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), by striking “the appropriate Federal banking agency” each place that term appears and inserting “the appropriate Federal financial regulator”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “the appropriate Federal banking agencies” and inserting “the appropriate Federal financial regulator”.

SEC. 4. CONSIDERATIONS FOR COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW.

Section 2222 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 3311), as amended by section 3, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “10 years” and inserting “7 years”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) tailor other regulations related to covered persons in a manner that limits the regulatory compliance impact, cost, liability risk, and other burdens, unless otherwise determined by the Council or the appropriate Federal financial regulator.”.

SEC. 5. REVIEWS CONDUCTED BY THE BUREAU.

Section 2222 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 3311), as amended by section 4, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) REVIEWS CONDUCTED BY THE BUREAU.—The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall—

“(1) use any relevant information from an assessment conducted under section 1022(d) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(d)) in conducting the review required under subsection (a); and

“(2) conduct such review in accordance with the purposes and objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 1021 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 5511).”.

SEC. 6. 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 “\$7,495,714,285”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on May 1, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill 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 to 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 yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the bill before us in the House, not unlike yourself, I am a proud Texan—in my case, a fifth-generation Texan.

In listening very carefully to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, I do wish to remind all my colleagues that it was this day in 1836 that brave men in Texas took on the minions of tyranny at the Alamo. And although they lost that battle, they inspired their nation at the time, Texas, that would later become part of our Nation. So, on this day that is special to all Texans, it should be special to all Americans.

We remember the cradle of liberty. Remember the Alamo. God bless Texas.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, otherwise, I rise also, today, in support of H.R. 4607, which is a very important piece of legislation brought to us by a very hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

It is a bill that helps address the burden of unnecessary, duplicative, and outdated regulations that too often have imposed cost on our community financial institutions that ultimately make credit more expensive and less available to our constituents. It passed out of our committee with a very strong bipartisan vote of 38–17, and I congratulate him for his bill.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, this bill requires that all of the prudential financial regulators that now include the CFPB and the NCUA, the National Credit Union Administration—it ensures that all of our financial regulators, not just some, but all, will participate in the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, known as EGRPRA, a law that dates back to the Clinton era, and this ensures that our agencies review all rules that are prescribed by themselves that impact our insured financial institutions.

The purpose of this review, again, is to reduce regulation that is proven

overly burdensome, duplicative, or outdated, while maintaining our safety and soundness standards. And, again, Mr. Speaker, all this is a review. It ensures a review.

Additionally, H.R. 4607 will require that these agencies meet every 7 years for a comprehensive regulatory evaluation, as opposed to the current 10-year standard. This is especially important. I salute the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership, because we have seen our financial sector of the economy suffer under the weight, the load, the burden of regulation, particularly because six of the seven heaviest regulatory years occurred under the last administration; so we need a more thorough review of these regulations. And requiring our Federal agencies to simply review their actions in a transparent manner on a more frequent basis, it is simple; it is fair; it is straightforward; it is wise.

Mr. Speaker, a healthy financial system that provides equal opportunity to all Americans to achieve financial independence can only exist if we have smart regulation. And the explosive growth of regulation, following the enactment of Dodd-Frank, has made it significantly harder for our community banks and credit unions to serve their customers and members.

And, in fact, the complexity and cost of this regulatory burden has forced many of them out of business or has forced them to cut back services to their customers and members, and it is one of the reasons why, on average, we continue to lose one community bank or credit union a day, or every other day, in America. This should not be happening.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it is not the banks and credit unions we are so concerned about. It is their customers. It is customers like Missouri mom, Michele, who explained to us how frustrating it has been for her 20-year-old daughter, with a full-time job, to get a loan to buy her first car. And, again, her daughter has a first-time job. And as Michele explained to us: “It’s a catch-22. You need credit to get credit, but no one will give you the credit to begin with. I would like to see our young adults be able to build the credit they need so they can have a decent future.”

Mr. Speaker, it is for people like Michele and her daughter that we need this regulatory review. It is why we need the bill from the gentleman from Georgia. These are the people we are trying to help.

Like Anne in Wisconsin, who was trying to get a loan to remodel her attached garage when her son was born, and she said: “My husband and I have very high credit scores, and we have equity in our home, but because my husband has a seasonal job and finds other employment in the winter, the many banks we contacted rejected our loan request. They base that on our annual income only on the job he was currently in and said it was part of the new regulation.”

Well, of course it is, Mr. Speaker. That is why they need to be reviewed. It is people like Anne in Wisconsin we need to help.

Or Dan, a Navy veteran from Illinois, who actually had to close down—close down the small auto finance company he started with his wife 25 years ago, and he had to close it down because of new Federal regulation. He explains: “Large companies can afford a separate legal department to deal with these issues and the myriad of new regulations. A small business like ours cannot. We had to make a decision. It was just not worth the risk to continue operations in this antibusiness environment.”

So, Mr. Speaker, it is people like Michele, it is people like Anne, it is people like Dan who deserve the opportunity to have credit for their homes, their autos, their small businesses, and so we must ensure that all of our Federal regulators—all of our Federal financial regulators take a thorough comprehensive review of their regulatory burden so that we can continue to support the people who need credit.

H.R. 4607, again, has garnered strong bipartisan support. It is practical; it is common sense; and I urge all of my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. Speaker, 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 opposition to H.R. 4607, the so-called Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act. So instead of advancing legislation that improves our financial regulatory framework, the Republican majority is pushing yet another bill that is a giveaway to Wall Street and predatory lenders.

Let's be clear. This bill is intended to dismantle rules considered inconvenient by the financial services industry. If this bill were enacted, financial services regulators would be forced to spend more time and resources on backward-looking reviews and deregulating the financial services industry rather than strengthening protections for consumers and the economy.

Allow me to explain. The Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, or EGRPRA, currently requires the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, and the OCC to conduct a review of the regulations that they have issued in order to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on insured depository institutions.

The banking regulators conduct this review every 10 years, but until now, this review has been a relatively balanced, careful assessment that the banking regulators have done twice in the last two decades, and the regulators have taken this process seriously.

The last review took about 3 years to complete. It involved field hearings and public engagement. The final review included many balanced and

thoughtful recommendations to improve rules. Many of these would provide relief for community banks and credit unions but in a way that also maintains safeguards for consumers and protects the interests of the public and the broader economy.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4607, this bill, would make three major mistakes in changing the current review process. First, this bill actually requires regulators to change regulations so that they are less costly and burdensome for “covered persons.”

Well, who are these covered persons? Are they the millions of consumers who were harmed by Wells Fargo's scheme to open fraudulent accounts without their knowledge? Were they? No.

Are they the many consumers who learned just a few days ago that Citigroup violated the law by charging them too much interest on their credit cards? No, no.

Are these covered persons in this bill the Latino or African-American families who were discriminated against by JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, and so many other banks steering them into more costly mortgages when they qualified for more affordable loans? No, not at all.

Are they—the ones who are being protected—are they seniors or service-members who fall prey to payday lenders that trap them in a cycle of debt? No.

Are they college graduates who are harassed by debt collectors for their student loan debt? No.

Under this bill, Mr. Speaker, covered persons are defined as “any person that engages in offering or providing a consumer financial product or service; and any affiliate of”—such—“person . . . if such affiliate acts as a service provider to such person.” You know what that means? You know who these so-called covered persons in this bill are who they are talking about? That means Wells Fargo, JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, Bank of America, payday lenders, mortgage brokers, debt collectors, and thousands of other financial companies.

All of these companies would get easier rules that limit their costs and burdens without appropriately considering the impact they are going to have on their customers. And this bill does nothing, absolutely nothing, to strengthen protections for consumers where there might be deficiencies or gaps in our regulatory framework.

Second, unlike the other banking regulators, which are tasked with ensuring the safety and soundness of the financial services sector, the Consumer Bureau's unique mission is the protection of consumers and of ensuring that the consumer marketplace operates in a fair, transparent, and competitive manner.

Although it may make sense for the banking agencies to periodically review their prudential rules, with a focus on their regulated entities, the

Consumer Bureau should be making sure that its rules are appropriately protecting consumers and the interests of the public, not the big financial corporations.

In addition, the Consumer Bureau is already subject to unique accountability and oversight measures that the other financial regulators are not. These special checks and balances include the requirement that the Consumer Bureau have small business review panels as a part of its rulemaking process and the ability of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, that is, FSOC, to repeal any of its final rules. And the Consumer Bureau is already required to review all of the significant rules within 5 years of the time they go into effect, but in a balanced—balanced—manner.

The third problem with H.R. 4607 is that it would make it harder for the regulators to do their jobs. The bill would require a comprehensive review of all banking and consumer protection regulations once every 7 years instead of every decade. If regulators take these reviews as seriously as their previous reviews, as I believe they would, then that would mean they would be tied up spending nearly half of each 7-year cycle doing regulatory reviews instead of supervising their regulated entities and enforcing the law.

This bill would impose an unbalanced review process on regulators that favors industries' wishes—favors industries' wishes over consumers and the economy. The methodology in this bill promotes deregulation. That is what this is all about. This is a bill about deregulation instead of creating a robust process to identify gaps or deficiencies in oversight that harm consumers, undermine the safety and soundness of our financial system, or jeopardize the country's financial stability.

So I cannot support a bill that forces the Consumer Bureau to weaken rules for Wall Street and payday lenders. I am talking about the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4607.

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

□ 1245

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), a very hard-working member of the Financial Services Committee and the author of H.R. 4607.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from the Republic of Texas, Chairman HENSARLING, for giving me this time to move away some of the hyperbole that you may hear today and speak about the truth of what this really simple and commonsense measure really does.

Mr. Speaker, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act is a bill that I introduced simply to reduce the burden that outdated and unnecessary Federal regulations place on our small banks and lending institutions across the landscape of America.

I would like to start by thanking some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked tirelessly to make this a strong, bipartisan piece of legislation. I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for negotiating reasonable changes to this bill and for being an original cosponsor. I also appreciate Mr. DUFFY and Ms. SINEMA and the others who have reached across the aisle to cosponsor this important piece of legislation.

To fully understand this bill, Mr. Speaker, we have to go back to 1996, when Congress gave the financial regulatory agencies a useful tool by passing the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, or, as you have heard today, more commonly known as EGRPRA. This law directed the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve, and the FDIC to review their regulations once every 10 years to identify those regulations that may be outdated, unnecessary, or overly burdensome. After that, the regulators were to send a report to Congress and eliminate any regulations they determined were unnecessary.

This law has been somewhat useful, and it was a good idea back in 1996 because, after all, who would be opposed to eliminating rules that even regulators thought were unnecessary? But too often, EGRPRA has been viewed as merely a check-the-box exercise by the agencies and the financial sector.

Now that we have two EGRPRA reports, a 2007 and a 2017, it is obvious that EGRPRA could have been more effective and produced more useful recommendations to policymakers. In retrospect, we also realize we need more direct action from the regulators to clean up outdated and unnecessary rules. That is why it is important for Congress to revisit EGRPRA, as this bill does.

My bill contains several reforms to the EGRPRA review process that will breathe new life into this law, this tool for the regulators, and make sure it is not simply a check-the-box exercise.

This bill will require more frequent regulatory reviews by moving the review cycle from once a decade to once every 7 years. It will expand EGRPRA to include all regulated financial institutions instead of only depository-insured institutions. It will codify the National Credit Union Administration into EGRPRA, since the agency participated in the latest review voluntarily.

The bill will also add the controversial Consumer Finance Protection Bureau, CFPB, to the EGRPRA review process. This provision is especially important because, before Dodd-Frank, consumer financial laws were implemented by the three banking agencies; but when Dodd-Frank was enacted, the CFPB was given the responsibility for enforcing consumer financial laws. Since the CFPB is exempt from EGRPRA, these laws and regulations are no longer being comprehensively reviewed.

Dodd-Frank requires the CFPB to review its regulations every 5 years after they are enacted, but this leaves out rules which are considered nonsignificant. It also excludes rules that were adopted before the CFPB was created. Also, the CFPB's regulatory reviews are under a single, 5-year look-back period.

We must ensure that each regulatory agency is comprehensively reviewing its rules, and on a regular basis.

This bill is not duplicative because it requires CFPB to use its findings from its existing regulatory reviews in its EGRPRA reports so the CFPB does not waste time on rules it has already reviewed. And, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill will require the agencies to tailor rules that they find to be unnecessary based on the size and risk profile of the bank or the credit union.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat that last point because it is so important. This bill does not require the agencies to cut regulations with a broad brush, as it has been presented so far, nor does it cut regulations on the payday lending industry, as some have argued. It simply states the rules will be adjusted based on a company's risk if the regulators determine that to be appropriate.

The bill ensures that if the financial regulators—the regulators—determine that a regulation is important to consumer protection for safety and soundness, the agency will still have every right to leave that regulation completely intact.

This bill is not just about eliminating unnecessary regulations; it is about good government and cleaning up unnecessary red tape that inevitably hurts the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Secretary came to our committee for a hearing last month, and I asked him about this very issue. He simply said:

Rules and regulations need to be constantly looked at as markets continually change.

He also said:

I'm not sure why the CFPB was exempted from EGRPRA, so I agree with the change.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed out of committee with a strong bipartisan vote of more than two-thirds of the committee members, and I urge my colleagues to join us in support of this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I knew that my friends on the opposite side of the aisle would basically refer to small banks.

This is what is normally done when we see deregulatory efforts being made. They talk about how they are trying to help small and community banks, and they fail to talk about the major financial institutions that I have talked about in my presentation that are the beneficiaries, also, of this deregulatory effort that is being put forth.

When I take a look at the existing law now and the Economic Growth and

Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, I see that their mission is to conduct a review of their regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on insured depository institutions.

This deregulatory bill that we have before us goes a lot further. As I said, it is about deregulation, and it is about reducing cost and liability risk. This does not benefit our consumers at all.

Again, what we would do in the passage of this bill is simply open up opportunities for the big banks and financial institutions to get rid of the kind of oversight, the kind of laws that we have worked so hard for because it is inconvenient for them or it interferes with their bottom line in some way.

So I do not want our Members to be tricked or fooled to think, number one, this is simply about further getting rid of paperwork or that this is about supporting the small banks. This is about new ways by which to deregulate so that the big banks that are now found to be defrauding, found to be discriminating, found to be doing things like Wells Fargo has done, this is about deregulation that will further enhance their ability to do the kinds of things that we claim to be so opposed to and that harm our consumers.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that they are now including by way of H.R. 4607 should be looked at very carefully.

First of all, my friends on the opposite side of the aisle hate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. They want to get rid of it. They have tried, time and time again, to undermine it in so many ways. The President has sent Mr. Mulvaney over there, who is supposed to be over at the Office of Management and Budget, to basically destroy it.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the Members of Congress to be tricked or fooled that somehow this is helpful that they are bringing in the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. What they want to do is tie the hands of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and basically change their mission from protection for consumers to deregulation for the biggest banks in America.

Why do we have the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau? That is the centerpiece of the Dodd-Frank reform legislation that we worked so hard on.

Are we forgetting about what happened in 2008?

Are we forgetting about the recession that was caused by the big banks who had been involved with all of these exotic products and ways by which they were enticing would-be homeowners to try and get mortgages?

We can't forget about all of that. We have to know that not only did we have a recession, we were headed for a depression. Dodd-Frank reform has gone a long way toward eliminating some of the bad practices that were in place that got us into that situation in the first place.

Now, little by little, my friends on the opposite side of the aisle keep trying to creep in with new ways that they can support these big banks and financial institutions and deregulate and let them get in the position again where they are tricking our consumers, where they are coming up with these exotic products that caused our consumers to eventually get into foreclosure, and that would allow the big banks again, like Wells Fargo, to come up with all of these tricks that they use in order to enhance their bottom line. I think we are smarter than this, and I don't think that we are going to go for this legislation that is just another way to open the doors to deregulate.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and the entire Financial Services Committee for their continued critical work on financial regulations.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I consistently hear from Main Street businesses, small businesses from all over the country, that overregulation is preventing business expansion and job growth.

Just last week, I chaired a hearing on a recent report by the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office that explored whether financial regulations were adversely impacting community banks and credit unions. One of the major takeaways from that report was that we need to improve the tools available to financial regulators to reduce those burdens.

Because small businesses most often rely on conventional bank borrowing to finance their development, any additional red tape that reduces access to capital can be a monumental problem for the Nation's smallest firms. The bill that we have before us today, which would reform the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996, is a move in the right direction.

Making sure all financial regulators have a comprehensive process in place to review regulations will strengthen our financial sector and make it more possible for America's small businesses to have access to the capital that they need to grow and expand and create more jobs for more Americans. Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge my colleagues to support the commonsense reforms that are in H.R. 4607, and I urge them to support this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), who is vice

chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for this time to be able to speak to an important piece of legislation.

In my home State of Colorado, we have a tale of two economies. The urban areas have realized economic recovery since 2008, while the more rural communities have been slower to find sustained economic growth. Essential to these areas and their ability to be able to recover, a topic that I speak frequently on, is access to credit.

As Treasury's report to the President in June of 2017 notes: Regulations on capital, liquidity, and leverage requirements, as well as regulatory parameters that guide loan underwriting, have undermined the ability of financial institutions to deliver attractively priced credit in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of the economy.

□ 1300

In other words, our community financial institutions have lost access to the tools that they need to be able to help their communities recover as they have struggled to comply with regulations intended for the largest institutions. Mr. Speaker, it is our local communities, our small businesses, our first-time home buyers, and our working families who suffer the consequences from these regulations.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you one example of what unbridled regulation does and how it impacts families trying to be able to live that American Dream.

I have an example of a credit union in my home State of Colorado that had to stop offering home equity lines of credit to its members because the cost of keeping the forms in compliance with Federal regulation exceeded the income generated by the program. In other words, regulation priced this credit union out of a critical market and at a time when the rural environment the credit union serves needed access to credit most.

Fortunately, Mr. LOUDERMILK's legislation being considered here today will take important steps to require regulators to consider the institution's size and risk profile as they evaluate the necessity and effectiveness of regulatory rulemaking under the self-review mandated to them by the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act. Importantly, Mr. LOUDERMILK's legislation will also expand the EGRPRA process to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the National Credit Union Administration, encouraging the tailoring of regulations across the regulatory spectrum.

This legislation takes steps to encourage regulators to allow small institutions adequate leeway to exercise reasonably constructed consumer lending regimes to make sure consumers have the broadest array of choices and

that institutions can appropriately navigate the compliance landscape.

Mr. Speaker, by requiring regulators to more frequently review and tailor regulations, this bill will help put Main Street back on the path to prosperity and help to end the tale of two economies in Colorado and throughout the Nation. Making these adjustments will help community banks and credit unions once again be able to meet the needs of their neighbors and encourage our businesses to be able to grow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), who is yet another hardworking member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, the House Financial Services Committee has been working hard for consumers, local banks, credit unions, and American entrepreneurs during the 115th Congress. Today, we continue our work with H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

Introduced by my colleague from Georgia, Representative BARRY LOUDERMILK, this bill brings accountability and modernization to the current regulatory review process for banks, credit unions, and financial institutions across the country.

Currently, the regulatory audit conducted by our Federal financial regulators happens just once every decade, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the National Credit Union Administration are not technically a part of that review.

It has been 21 years since we evaluated possible changes to this antiquated and inefficient system. That is why we need Representative LOUDERMILK's Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act to ensure the regulations we have in place are working to do what they are supposed to do: protect consumers.

This legislation is made even more urgent given that unchecked and inefficient regulations are working against the very consumers our regulatory regime was designed to help. Take, for example, the fact that the United States lost nearly 12,000 of its federally insured banks between 1984 and 2016, making it harder for small business entrepreneurs and families to access the credit and capital they need to create new opportunities and grow.

These banks struggled under the weight of new regulations, either to disappear completely or to be swallowed up by the big banks that are able to absorb the heavy cost of compliance. For those banks that are able to survive, significant tradeoffs are required.

In Rockford, Minnesota, for instance, instead of adding another lender to their team, one small community bank needed to hire a full-time compliance officer simply to keep up with the regulatory onslaught from Washington.

That same bank is spending over \$100,000 each year on compliance costs instead of using that money in ways that would benefit the local community.

Minnesota's credit unions have also been hit hard by unchecked and outdated regulation. One study found that credit unions in my State of Minnesota have incurred \$102 million in costs directly related to the increased regulations created by the Dodd-Frank Act. Worse still, one in every four Minnesota credit union employees spends their time solely on regulatory compliance.

Mr. Speaker, we have a duty to stand up for these struggling financial institutions and, more importantly, the consumers whose communities are hurting without them. We can do that today.

Representative LOUDERMILK's legislation sailed through committee in January receiving support from both sides of the aisle because Republicans and Democrats know that H.R. 4607 takes necessary and important steps to ease the regulatory burdens which challenge community financial institutions in each and every congressional district.

I appreciate the hard work of the bill's sponsor and the chairman of the committee to bring this legislation to the floor today, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), who is a Democratic member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Congressman LOUDERMILK for working together on the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act. Congressman LOUDERMILK has been a true partner who has been tireless in pursuing smart regulatory reform policies and in finding solutions for the people he serves. We both want to get something done for the people we represent.

I also want to thank Congresswoman SINEMA for her help and support in leading this legislation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bipartisan Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

America's economic engine has been under pressure for some time now from unnecessarily burdensome and outdated regulations building up on the books of our regulators. It costs us in economic growth. And while there are clear times where smart guardrails are necessary, there are others when it actually holds back smart growth for our country and for our families.

We need a smarter, more efficient government. It is time to relieve these unnecessary burdens and spur business job growth and access to credit in New Jersey's Fifth District and across the country while protecting consumers

and our economy. This bipartisan regulatory relief bill does just that. It updates and expands regulators' mandatory review of financial institutions while protecting consumers. It also requires the review be performed every 7 years rather than every 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER: It requires regulators to consider tailoring regulations when appropriate. In short, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act will cut bureaucratic red tape and help our economy thrive without putting consumers at risk.

There should be nothing partisan about helping entrepreneurs and businesses of all sizes grow, create jobs, and expand the economy. With this measure, Democrats and Republicans join together to ensure outdated, unnecessary, and burdensome regulations are eliminated or reformed to better fit the needs of individual financial institutions, which ultimately saves Americans money, helps consumers and families grow—and businesses, too—and it protects, always, American consumers.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia for leading on this issue.

I rise today in strong support of his bipartisan bill, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

It strikes me as common sense that Federal regulators should review their regulations and rules on a consistent basis. They should also seek comment from the people whom these rules actually affect. Mr. LOUDERMILK's bill helps accomplish this goal by requiring the CFPB and National Credit Union Administration do so every 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, since the implementation of Dodd-Frank, community banks and credit unions have had a more difficult time serving their customers. The red tape and additional burden brought on by Dodd-Frank has increased costs for the consumer and reduced their choices in the market for financial products.

One agency in particular that is guilty for this additional burden is the CFPB, which has finalized over 60 rules since their creation. Many of their rules are duplicative and unnecessary. I think, at the very least, they should review and study how their regulations are affecting real folks in the real world.

I hear from financial institutions back home how the CFPB has done nothing but harm their community bank or their credit union. They are being overwhelmed by the volume and complexity of regulations, and that is just not okay.

Harmonization is the goal of this bill, and that should not be partisan or even controversial. We simply want less people buried in paperwork and more people starting businesses through their local financial institution.

This bill is supported by folks across the political spectrum, and I am excited about the good it will do for our financial institutions back home and consumers in my district.

I want to again thank Mr. LOUDERMILK for introducing this important piece of legislation that will ensure our financial system is functioning efficiently for hardworking Americans.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who is a real leader on our committee for commonsense regulation and the chairman of our Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for all his great work and leadership on our Financial Services Committee and also thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) for crafting a commonsense, bipartisan bill that requires the Federal financial regulators and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to conduct a comprehensive review of all the regulations promulgated with the intent of identifying those that are outdated or duplicative.

Across the Nation, financial companies continue to suffer as a result of the burdensome regulations. What my friends on the other side of the aisle don't always recognize is the impact that has on the ability of those companies to serve their customers.

Take cybersecurity as an example. Financial firms of all sizes are forced to adhere to an overlapping regulatory regime that is focused on fighting yesterday's war.

I spoke with a major bank just last week that has cybersecurity examinations from the Federal Reserve, the Comptroller of the Currency, the FDIC, the Treasury Department, and multiple State banking agencies; and that doesn't include the foreign entities that regulate the international businesses of this bank. Each agency has a slightly different exam process and requires slightly different information.

This type of regime doesn't protect companies from cybersecurity threats. The lack of coordination means this institution spends more time reacting to the regulators than it does protecting its customers.

Or look at the antiquated regime surrounding examination and enforcement of the Bank Secrecy Act and anti-money laundering laws. What was originally intended to be a reasonable process that fostered collaboration between financial institutions and law enforcement to root out bad actors and

illicit financing has become so onerous that banks are choosing to drop customers or close entire books of businesses just to avoid compliance burdens. Processes like these do very little to help consumers or the integrity of the financial system.

Every time I speak to a bank or credit union in Missouri, I ask what one rule or regulation they find to be the most burdensome or they would like to see changed. The answer is always the same: It isn't just one. It is the weight of all the rules combined that is restricting credit and the availability of financial services in our communities.

We have to make a change, Mr. Speaker. Mr. LOUDERMILK's legislation would institute a more thoughtful approach to regulations that will not only offer regulatory relief, but also foster a more responsible and stable financial marketplace.

As the gentleman from Georgia has said in the past, this bill isn't just about regulatory relief; it is about good government. This should not be a partisan exercise. I hope every Member of this body stands for responsible government and joins me in supporting H.R. 4607 today.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with my closing, I would just like to make a few comments about some of the information that was shared with us by Members on the opposite side of the aisle. I want to remind them that these poor little banks that you are talking about, which include all of the big banks in America, made record profits in 2016—more than \$170 billion—and they are going to make billions more from that tax bill, that tax scam giveaway to Wall Street. Lending is up 75 percent since 2010.

So when my friends on the opposite side of the aisle continue to talk about how the banks are suffering, I don't know who they are talking about. As a matter of fact, the real bipartisanship of this committee is about community banks, and Democrats have led and will continue to lead on every way and everything that we can do for community banks.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I notice that when my friends on the opposite side of the aisle come in with deregulation, they frame it in such a way that you would think that it is all about community banks, when, in fact, they always attach anything they do for community banks to the biggest banks in America.

So, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4607 demonstrates just how much my colleagues on the other side of the aisle value the interests of Wall Street over families and consumers on Main Street.

This bill would direct the banking, credit union, and consumer protection

regulators to loosen their rules to benefit bad actors on Wall Street. The bill doesn't even allow regulators to consider how to improve safeguards to better protect consumers.

It is absurd that we are here today discussing yet another bill that leads to massive deregulation and seeks to tip the scales in favor of the financial industry. The interests of the public are what we should be focused on.

This bill is yet another piece of the harmful and reckless Republican agenda. Only a few months ago, Republicans jammed their tax scam legislation through this Chamber. They added \$1.8 trillion to the Federal debt in order to line the pockets of Wall Street and other megacorporations with billions in tax cuts, leaving families on Main Street and generations of their children just to pick up the tab. Democrats rejected that terrible piece of legislation and should now reject H.R. 4607 as well.

Americans for Financial Reform, a coalition of more than 200 consumer civil rights, investor, retiree, community, labor, faith-based, and business groups said that H.R. 4607, "contains no consideration of the public benefits that are the justification for creating the regulations in the first place, and which regulators should be seeking to preserve. Any mandate to tailor regulations must include consideration of public benefits, rather than being a one-sided directive to reduce business costs." I agree.

For Members who are concerned with maintaining strong protections, I would highlight that Trump's OMB Director, Mick Mulvaney, has been illegally installed as Acting Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and is working every day to dial back the important work of the Consumer Bureau from within.

Congress should not be giving Mr. Mulvaney, or anyone the President eventually appoints and is confirmed to serve as the next Director of the Consumer Bureau, a green light to gut consumer protections and reduce the Consumer Bureau's ability to hold bad actors accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4607, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to my friend on the other side of the aisle. Again, her comments were very heavy on thematics, very heavy on extraneous material. Unfortunately, it was a little light on the facts of H.R. 4607.

The text of the bill is 3½ pages long; so it doesn't take very long to read. But I remind all of my colleagues that this is common sense. In and of itself, this bill changes no rules. All it does is tell our regulators that every 7 years, why don't you look at what you have done and publish a report.

If you want to change any rule, you have to go through the formal rule-

making process to repropose a rule, to get public comment. So, again, in and of itself, it changes no rules. I almost want to ask my friend on the other side of the aisle: What is she scared of? What is so wrong with simply looking at the rules that have been promulgated to see if they are actually working? Are they helping our constituents? Are they making economic opportunity more available for all?

What is so odd is, the original EGRPRA legislation that dates back to the Clinton era was overwhelmingly supported on both sides of the aisle.

So what the gentleman from Georgia is doing in H.R. 4607 is simply saying all financial regulators, including the National Credit Union Administration and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which really didn't even exist in the Clinton era, ought to do the same thing. They are saying, instead of doing it every 10 years, let's do it every 7 years. Just take a look and report. That is all it is.

It is a self-reporting requirement, which I think, Mr. Speaker, is why this has already been supported overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis in the House Financial Services Committee.

So with all of the various scare tactics and horror stories that we have heard from the other side of the aisle on a mere reporting requirement, again, I ask, Mr. Speaker: What are they scared of?

What we are ultimately trying to do here is make sure that the regulatory burden is not such that it harms the very people I spoke about earlier in my opening comments: that it doesn't hurt Dan, a Navy veteran from Illinois who, because of the regulatory burden, was forced to shut down his small business; that it doesn't hurt Anne in Wisconsin, who is just trying to get a loan to remodel her garage; that it doesn't hurt Michele and her daughter in Missouri. Her daughter was just simply seeking a car loan to buy her first car.

These are the people whom we are trying to help.

And by the way, all banks—small, medium, and large—are lending to businesses and to consumers, and we want them to do that in a robust but responsible way.

So, from time to time, let's look at the regulations and ensure that they are still helping us achieve equal financial opportunity for all so that our constituents can achieve their share of the American Dream, that they can achieve financial independence.

This received strong, bipartisan support, Madam Speaker, in the House Financial Services Committee. It ought to receive strong, bipartisan support on the House floor.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote for and adopt H.R. 4607, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 747, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4607 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 21, strike "otherwise determined" and insert "such action is at the request of and for the personal gain of the President, his or her immediate family members, or senior Executive Branch officials who are required to file annual financial disclosure forms, or is otherwise determined inappropriate".

Mr. LEUTKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam 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.

My amendment is a commonsense measure that protects the American people from corruption and conflicts of interest.

My amendment simply states that before taking any action to eliminate or change a regulation, regulators must disclose any communications from the White House or the President's family advocating for the action and whether the President, his family, or any senior administration officials would benefit financially from such action.

The American people need to have confidence that their government is working in the best interest of the people and not to enrich a President and his family and wealthy friends.

Every day, the news is filled with stories that raise this very question. Does the Trump family benefit when the EPA loosens environmental safeguards on construction projects?

Does Jared Kushner's deeply indebted family business receive favorable treatment when he advocates for certain policies?

Do the President's sons get special permits from foreign governments when the President changes policies towards those countries?

Who in the administration gets richer when our coasts are opened up to oil drilling, when tariffs are levied on steel, or when predatory lenders are allowed to prey on college students?

President Trump has rejected the norm that all modern-day Presidents have followed. His refusal to release his tax returns or to remove himself from his family business necessitates codifying the norms and practices of previous Presidents into law in this disclosure.

Congress must do its job and provide a necessary check on a President who has shown contempt for his basic duty to put Americans first. All of these policies affect American families. They affect the taxes we pay, the air we breathe, and whether our kids can afford to go to college.

We deserve to know if these decisions are being made to enrich a President and if they are being made at the taxpayers' expense. This simple act of disclosure will allow the American people to judge for themselves who this administration is really looking out for.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss this matter today.

It is kind of interesting that we have before us an amendment that basically is something that deals with a financial services bill, something that deals with a financial services issue, yet we had the EPA and a whole bunch of other agencies brought into the discussion here, which has nothing to do with what we are trying to talk about here today.

The amendment talks about the President or his immediate family members. How is it possible that, unless those family members have the authority to make the request, they even should be considered?

This is sort of pulling things out of the air here that make no sense to me. This is a very simple bill that we have where all we are looking at trying to do is take the EGRPA law that says that, every 10 years, all the rules and regulations are reviewed.

All we are doing is putting two agencies back into this group of agencies that are under review, one that was not even in existence at the time of the bill's passage back in the nineties, the CFPB; and the other one that needs to be included is the National Credit Union. All we are doing is taking that 10-year review down to 7.

Why is this controversial? We are taking an agency that was not even in-

cluded in this originally and putting it under the purview of this bill so that there can be a review of the rules and regulations.

Is there lack of transparency on the other side?

Do we no longer want to be concerned about what is going on?

Do we no longer want to know that the rules and regulations are appropriately adjudicated here by these agencies?

I think that is the wrong way to go. I think that we need to have more transparency. Reducing from 10 years down to 7 gives us an opportunity to have a more constant review of these things to make sure that the bureaucratic folks in the executive branch of the government don't run away with what should be, in my view, the authority of the Congress.

□ 1330

Madam Speaker, I think that the motion to recommit is way out of line here, and I don't think we need to waste any more time on it.

Madam Speaker, I ask folks to decline the amendment, and 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 yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

PORTFOLIO LENDING AND MORTGAGE ACCESS ACT

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2226) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution's portfolio, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2226

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 “Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act”.

SEC. 2. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS.

Section 129C(b) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) SAFE HARBOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A residential mortgage loan shall be deemed a qualified mortgage loan for purposes of this subsection if the loan—

“(i) is originated by, and continuously retained in the portfolio of, a covered institution;

“(ii) is in compliance with the limitations with respect to prepayment penalties described in subsections (c)(1) and (c)(3);

“(iii) is in compliance with the requirements related to points and fees under paragraph (2)(A)(vii);

“(iv) does not have negative amortization terms or interest-only terms; and

“(v) is a loan for which the covered institution considers, documents, and verifies the debt, income, and financial resources of the consumer in accordance with subparagraph (C).

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a residential mortgage loan if the legal title to such residential mortgage loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person unless the legal title to such residential mortgage loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred—

“(i) to another person by reason of the bankruptcy or failure of the covered institution that originated such loan;

“(ii) to an insured depository institution or insured credit union that has less than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets on the date of such sale, assignment, or transfer, if the loan is retained in portfolio by such insured depository institution or insured credit union;

“(iii) pursuant to a merger of the covered institution that originated such loan with another person or the acquisition of a the covered institution that originated such loan by another person or of another person by a covered institution, if the loan is retained in portfolio by the person to whom the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred; or

“(iv) to a wholly owned subsidiary of the covered institution that originated such loan if the loan is considered to be an asset of such covered institution for regulatory accounting purposes.

“(C) CONSIDERATION AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.—The consideration and documentation requirements described in subparagraph (A)(v) shall—

“(i) not be construed to require compliance with, or documentation in accordance with, appendix Q to part 1026 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

“(ii) be construed to permit multiple methods of documentation.

“(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘covered institution’ means an insured depository institution or an insured credit union that, together with its affiliates, has less than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets on the date on the origination of a residential mortgage loan;

“(ii) the term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

“(iii) the term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

“(iv) the term ‘interest-only term’ means a term of a residential mortgage loan that allows one or more of the periodic payments

made under the loan to be applied solely to accrued interest and not to the principal of the loan; and

“(v) the term ‘negative amortization term’ means a term of a residential mortgage loan under which the payment of periodic payments will result in an increase in the principal of the loan.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Madam 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 this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2226, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act, represents a very simple solution to a significant policy challenge facing our economy: how to expand access to mortgage credit without replicating the accumulation of excess risk in the mortgage-backed securities market like we witnessed in the run-up to the 2008 financial crisis.

My legislation achieves both goals by extending the qualified mortgage legal safe harbor to small creditors, banks, and credit unions with total consolidated assets of \$10 billion or less, that originate and hold residential mortgage loans in portfolio, rather than selling or securitizing them, allowing those lenders to satisfy Dodd-Frank’s ability-to-repay rule.

Such a policy would actually incentivize private sector risk retention—a goal of the Dodd-Frank Act itself—and mark a return to relationship lending in which a bank or credit union can tailor products to a consumer’s needs and credit risk, without running afoul of one-size-fits-all government requirements. Under CFPB regulations, only government-defined qualified mortgages enjoy a presumption that a lender has satisfied the Dodd-Frank law’s ability-to-repay requirements.

Small banks and credit unions have been disproportionately impacted by these rules, given their reliance upon residential mortgage lending and greater involvement in small dollar or balloon loans that run afoul of current QM regulations. It is no surprise that Harvard researchers have found that, since Dodd-Frank’s passage, community banks have lost market share at a rate double that experienced between 2006 and 2010, a period including the entirety of the financial crisis. It is also not a surprise that many small community financial institutions have testified in front of the House Financial Services Committee and to many of my colleagues that they have simply left

the mortgage business altogether because of the difficulties associated with the QM rule as currently constructed.

Indeed, a third of the National Association of Realtors survey respondents reported being unable to close mortgages due to a requirement of the qualified mortgage rule. Residential mortgages were the product or service most often identified by surveyed banks as a candidate for discontinuation as a result of Dodd-Frank. A recent study by the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University documents the falling share of bank participation in mortgage originations.

Everyone agrees, especially after the 2008 financial crisis, that a borrower should be required to show a demonstrable ability to repay. The only question is: Who is in the best position to make that determination—a community banker with a professional and, perhaps, even a personal relationship with the borrower who has full view of that borrower’s character, creditworthiness, financial situation, and who is willing to assume 100 percent of the downside risk of default; or is it an unaccountable, unelected bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., who literally knows absolutely nothing about that borrower?

By bearing 100 percent of the risk, financial institutions have every incentive to make sure that a borrower can afford to repay a loan. Banks and credit unions would have more than just skin in the game. Under this legislation, their interests would align perfectly with that of a borrower.

As one witness in front of our committee testified: “A financial institution that retains a loan’s credit and interest-rate risk has a keen interest in engaging in thorough, sound underwriting to determine the borrower’s ability to repay. Allowing a financial institution to make a customer-specific lending decision on a loan it intends to hold in its portfolio can be a more effective way of protecting consumers than regulatory attempts to micromanage mortgage terms with inflexible standards.”

No less than Barney Frank, former chairman of the committee, endorsed this concept in a hearing before this committee, saying he “would like the main safeguard against bad loans to be risk retention, because that leaves the decision in the hands of whoever is making the loan,” the CFPB also, itself, acknowledged this key point in its own rulemaking, where it recognized that portfolio lenders “have strong incentives to carefully consider whether a consumer will be able to repay a portfolio loan at least in part because the small creditor retains the risk of default.”

This legislation also presents a viable alternative to the “originate to distribute” mortgage lending model that contributed to the subprime mortgage meltdown and bubble in residential real estate and taxpayer bailouts. The

result is expanded access to mortgage credit without additional risk to the financial system or to the taxpayer.

In fact, this is particularly important for young families and first-time home buyers, who tend to have difficulty meeting the ability-to-repay requirements due to circumstances, such as significant student loan debt, but who are otherwise creditworthy.

I have been working on this legislation for 5 years now, and I am happy to announce that, this year, we had a bipartisan breakthrough. That is because, at the committee markup, I offered an amendment that limited the scope of this bill to financial institutions with less than \$10 billion in assets. And my distinguished colleague, Representative CAPUANO, offered a technical amendment that enhanced the legislation by clarifying a few key provisions. I am pleased to report that, because of those two amendments, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act passed with unanimous support in the committee and is now on the floor today for consideration.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING, Ranking Member WATERS, Representative CAPUANO, the Kentucky Bankers Association, the Kentucky Credit Union League, the American Bankers Association, the Independent Community Bankers of America, the Credit Union National Association, the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, the National Association of Home Builders, and the United States Chamber of Commerce for their hard work on this important legislation.

If passed by the House, it is my hope that the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act moves quickly through the Senate. Eleven of our Democratic colleagues in the upper Chamber support this exact language, which is in Chairman CRAPO's community financial institution relief bill. Together, Republicans and Democrats can deliver on the regulatory relief that many of us in this body have promised to our constituents that will enable more of them to buy the home of their dreams.

Madam Speaker, I invite all of my colleagues to vote for this important pro-homeownership legislation that perfectly aligns lender and borrower interests to the benefit of America.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his persistence in offering this legislation. As he said, in committee, we had a successful markup where we were able to unanimously support this legislation. It is important legislation.

We don't agree on everything. One doesn't have to go very far. Back in committee, right now, where we have a rather contentious markup on a budget using estimates, as I said in that meeting: When we do agree, we should come together. Representative BARR and I

have talked about this issue for quite some time, and I am really pleased to see it move forward.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2226, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act, which would allow certain mortgages that are originated and retained in portfolio by a bank with less than \$10 billion in total assets to be considered as qualified mortgages.

In the lead-up to the financial crisis, there were a number of mortgage lenders that did not do their due diligence in underwriting mortgages. We saw a number of exotic products being offered to individuals and families premised on a continually rising housing market.

These included "no doc" loans where the lender did not document or verify a borrower's income. There were real consequences for those sorts of loans. Many of these borrowers never really had any hope of paying back those loans. As those mortgages went into default, the foreclosures helped lead to a financial crisis that devastated the U.S. economy, and millions of families were stripped from their single source of wealth: the equity in their home.

In the wake of that crisis, Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Act and required lenders to assess a consumer's ability to repay their mortgage loans.

We also provided statutory penalties for mortgage lenders that did not follow these new underwriting standards.

Congress also directed the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to enact regulations to create a safe harbor for creditors, where it would be presumed that the creditor evaluated the borrower's ability to repay.

In 2013, under the direction of former Director Cordray, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau released its ability-to-repay and qualified mortgage rule. This rule defined how lenders could take advantage of that safe harbor.

Qualified mortgages, commonly referred to as QM loans, are a special category of loans that have strong underwriting standards and certain non-predatory loan features that help make them more likely that borrowers will be able to afford their mortgages.

So if a lender originates a QM loan, it means that the lender met certain requirements, and it is assumed that the lender followed the ability-to-repay rule as drafted by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This also allows the lender to be shielded from certain types of liability associated with originating bad loans.

I and my colleagues were pleased that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau tailored the rule to ensure that lenders who serve rural and underserved communities have flexibility in serving their customers.

While that was a very good first step, Congress has pushed to expand this tailoring to include even more community banks and credit unions, consistent with safe and sound operations.

H.R. 2226, as amended in the committee, provides this targeted and, I think, reasonable relief.

As Representative BARR and I have indicated, there are additional refinements to the bill that I would have still liked to have seen adopted, such as additional guardrails on the types of products offered. I am glad, however, and as Mr. BARR indicated, the leadership of the committee, the majority, agreed to crucial language offered by Mr. CAPUANO to improve the bill.

As amended, lenders are required to continually hold these loans in portfolio, and not only consider and document, but verify a borrower's income information.

Congress should not be in the business of allowing lenders to underwrite and offer mortgage loans that borrowers have no ability to repay.

I am supportive of this bill for that reason, but also because I believe it will help in areas of the country that have weaker housing markets. This has really been the reason that I have been interested in the issue of portfolio lending.

As many know, I represent Flint, Michigan, which not unlike a number of communities across the country have very weak and very low cost markets. You can purchase a single family home in Flint for \$25,000—not \$250,000—\$25,000.

Under the QM rules, financial institutions sometimes, justifiably, struggle to make these small mortgages, resulting in even more stagnant markets—it is a vicious cycle—and weakening these markets permanently. If we can't get people financed into mortgages, these communities and the market will never recover.

□ 1345

This bill will encourage community banks and credit unions to make those smaller mortgages, to help weaker markets.

It is for that reason and many others, but particularly for that reason, that I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation. It is a big step in the right direction for weak markets. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), for his constructive comments, his support. And the gentleman is absolutely correct. He engaged with me and my colleagues who were co-sponsoring this legislation in a very constructive manner. He made valuable contributions, along with Mr. CAPUANO and the ranking member. Several other members on the other side of the aisle, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for example, offered his thoughtful comments as well. I appreciate the support, the bipartisan support, working through a compromise to get this legislation to where

it is today, so I thank the gentleman for that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), who is also a sponsor of this legislation and a distinguished member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, when the House passed the Financial CHOICE Act to repeal Dodd-Frank last year, we did so because we believe in Main Street, we believe in the consumer, the American consumer.

Dodd-Frank promised to protect consumers from the big banks on Wall Street. In reality, Dodd-Frank has punished small banks and credit unions and, ultimately, the American consumer.

The loss of community financial institutions tells the story. In my State of Minnesota, we had 513 community banks in 2000. Today, we have about 309, and continue to experience a drought in *de novo* charters.

Credit unions have, unfortunately, faced similar challenges. This means there are fewer places for Americans to turn when they are seeking a loan for their first home or perhaps to get a small business off the ground.

One specific provision in Dodd-Frank requires lenders to deny loans to individuals who do not meet government-prescribed standards. This, according to Washington, makes loans safer, since, of course, government knows best. But in reality, these mortgages have not been made safer. They have been made unavailable. As a result, the likelihood of getting approved for a loan and becoming a homeowner has plummeted.

Representative BARR's legislation, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act, takes steps to empower lenders in Minnesota and across the country and to better serve the needs of their customers by extending important protections to institutions and ensuring access to credit for American borrowers.

At the end of the day, the most effective way to ensure an individual has the ability to repay does not always need to be government-prescribed.

I appreciate my colleague from Kentucky's hard work to protect and reinvigorate our community financial institutions, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2226, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act, as it comes before the House for a vote.

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

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), who is also, I believe, a sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman BARR for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 2226, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

This is something that Chairman BARR has worked on for at least two

Congresses now, and I feel that we are finally in a place where we can get some commonsense changes to the CFPB's qualified mortgage rules that provide relief to community banks and credit unions.

I was very pleased to see this legislation get a unanimous vote in the Committee on Financial Services earlier this year. I am also very happy to see that the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is taking note of this issue and has advanced similar legislation.

The Dodd-Frank Act required the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to come up with a series of new rules regarding mortgage lending. One of these rules was the so-called qualified mortgage rule, which provides a safe harbor to loans if they meet certain criteria prescribed by the Bureau. This effectively means that the market treats any loans that are not qualified mortgages as being much riskier.

The Bureau's rule is especially challenging for community banks and credit unions. These lenders do not tend to be as automated as larger financial institutions. They also tend to put more time into underwriting mortgages to reflect the unique circumstances of the customers in their communities.

However, the CFPB's qualified mortgage rule took away much of this flexibility from these lenders by doing things like instituting a 43 percent debt-to-income ratio. This might be a good indicator of repayment risk for a lot of mortgages, but a one-size-fits-all is almost never a good approach.

The CFPB's rule also did not acknowledge the fact that small lenders do not tend to sell these loans into the secondary market. They keep 100 percent of the risk on their portfolio. This means these lenders have a very strong incentive to issue loans that they believe will be repaid.

If loans held on portfolio can be treated as qualified mortgages, then these banks and credit unions will have a stronger incentive to manage any risk associated with these mortgages.

The Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act would treat loans held on portfolio by community banks and credit unions as qualified mortgages if they meet some other criteria, such as not having a negative amortization or interest-only features.

This change to the CFPB's qualified mortgage rule will go a long way towards simplifying how our community financial institutions can help families achieve the dream of home ownership.

I have been hearing about this legislation from community banks and credit unions in Illinois, and I am confident it will help my constituents.

Madam Speaker, I want to encourage all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

Madam Speaker, just to reiterate, we don't agree on everything. Even some of the debate in this conversation, I

think we could find areas of disagreement. But when it comes to the specifics of this legislation, I think it strikes a good balance. The balance, for me, being the notion that we can deem these mortgages held by smaller institutions, as long as they are held in portfolio, as meeting the QM requirements.

In exchange for that, what we get is, in weak markets, we get a chance for folks who essentially have been locked out of home ownership to be able to get a small mortgage literally on a \$25,000, \$30,000, or \$40,000 home and begin to build equity that will return value to that family and to that community for a long, long time.

For that reason, I support this legislation and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on it.

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

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, let me just reiterate that this legislation solves two problems. It solves the problem of responsible expansion of access to mortgage credit, access to that American Dream of home ownership; and, at the same time, preventing the mistakes that led to the 2008 financial crisis, the originate to distribute model where originators of mortgages had no skin in the game and they allowed those mortgages to be poorly underwritten or not underwritten at all, with no documentation, and then securitized and sold into the secondary market, really without any eye towards the consumer and the borrower's ability to repay.

Everybody in this institution, as evidenced by the bipartisan work here, we all recognize that a borrower should demonstrate an ability to repay that loan, but the crux of this legislation, at the core of this legislation is a recognition that a local community banker, a local credit union, a lender with a personal relationship with a borrower is in the best position to determine whether or not that borrower, that prospective homeowner, can repay that loan.

When there is risk retention, when that lender is charged with the responsibility of maintaining that loan in portfolio, the lender is much more incentivized to properly underwrite that loan and make sure that that customer, that borrower, that future homeowner, has a demonstrable ability to repay. I think it is a much better substitute to a one-size-fits-all credit box from, frankly, bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., who have no eye towards the creditworthiness of that particular borrower.

We have worked with our friends on the other side of the aisle to make this a bipartisan piece of legislation limiting the size of the institutions that can access this regulatory relief. But, clearly, when community financial institutions, bankers from around the country, every part of the country, are saying that they see the QM rule as not "qualified mortgages," but as "quitting mortgages;" and when we see an

unnecessary constraint of mortgage credit; and when the National Association of Realtors are reporting that they are unable to close mortgages due to this onerous qualified mortgage rule, clearly the pendulum has swung too far.

So, yes, we needed some reforms in the aftermath of the financial crisis. This QM rule went too far. This is a recalibration of that. And this is important regulatory relief for our community financial institutions that will inure to the benefit of the American home-buying public, and it will do so in a responsible way, providing a viable alternative to the originate to distribute practices that really led to the financial crisis.

Madam Speaker, let me just make one final observation, and that is to give credit to the administration. The Department of the Treasury, in their findings and recommendations in their report on banks and credit unions, they recognized that this was a problem in the mortgage lending space and they made a recommendation also to increase the portfolio lending safe harbor to institutions with \$10 billion in assets or lower; and that, as they argued, will accommodate loans made and retained by small depository institutions, provide that needed regulatory relief to our community financial institutions, and also expand access to mortgage credit in a responsible way.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their support. At this time 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 Kentucky (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2226, 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.

COMMUNITY BANK REPORTING RELIEF ACT

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4725) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require short form call reports for certain depository institutions.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4725

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 "Community Bank Reporting Relief Act".

SEC. 2. SHORT FORM CALL REPORTS.

Section 7(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(12) SHORT FORM REPORTING.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall issue regulations that

allow for a reduced reporting requirement for a covered depository institution when the institution makes the first and third report of condition for a year, as required under paragraph (3).

"(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'covered depository institution' means an insured depository institution that—

"(i) has less than \$5,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets; and

"(ii) satisfies such other criteria as the appropriate Federal banking agencies determine appropriate."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today in support of H.R. 4725, the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act.

Community banks were hit hard by the Great Recession and the ensuing regulations. Numerous bankers have told me they are spending more and more money and resources and time on compliance costs and less money and resources on actually providing services to customers. This is particularly alarming because these small banks are so critical to their communities. From sponsoring the local T-ball team, to lending money to a farmer for the next year's crop, to helping the single mom purchase a used car so she can get to work, these banks are involved at every level of our communities all across America, but because of over-regulation, these banks are rapidly closing and consolidating.

Unfortunately, the headline for banks in the Commonwealth of Kentucky is no different. Since the enactment of the Dodd-Frank financial control law, we have seen a 20 percent drop in the number of banks in our State and there has been a dearth of charters for new banks. In fact, since 2010, there have been only a few de novo charters for banks nationwide.

Now, some people say that consolidation and mergers have been a long-term trend for the last 30 years and, therefore, not related to the recent uptick in regulations unrelated to Dodd-Frank, but they are clearly not seeing the bigger picture, because even after mergers, many branches in rural and other underserved communities are closing, leaving many Kentuckians to drive a town or two over just to get to the nearest bank.

It is not just about a long-term trend of consolidation. There have been literally no new charters, whereas before the Dodd-Frank law was enacted, there were many, many new charters every year; and since the Dodd-Frank law was enacted, no new charters. So the consolidation trend has gotten a lot worse since this avalanche of red tape coming out of Washington, D.C., and that is having a very negative impact on rural and underserved American communities.

While new technologies are helping bring banking services to anyone with an internet connection, many people still prefer the personal one-on-one banking style that they grew up with and the personal interaction often that helps the banks themselves understand the exact needs of their customers.

□ 1400

The Dodd-Frank law was almost 2,300 pages and required dozens of agencies to create new regulations or revise existing ones. As a result, these agencies issued hundreds of regulations and, according to the Mercatus Center, the law placed about 28,000 new restrictions on the banking industry, effectively doubling the number of regulatory restrictions in title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulation to more than 52,000.

Although not part of the Dodd-Frank rush of regulations, a growing number of banks have cited the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council's, or FFIEC, Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income—or call reports, as they are commonly called—as too burdensome.

Each quarter, all national banks, State member banks, insured State nonmember banks, and savings associations are required to file these call reports. The reports contain approximately 50 pages of financial data on each bank, including their assets, liabilities, capital accounts, expenses, and income. However, these reports are very burdensome for community banks with limited resources and offer little value to the regulators relative to the last quarter's report.

Thankfully, H.R. 4725, the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act, is fighting back against the bureaucratic nightmare of complying with these 52,000 restrictions by allowing banks with less than \$5 billion in consolidated assets to file their call reports every 6 months as opposed to every 3 months.

The impact of this regulatory change will be a huge development for banks across the country. Now they will spend less time on call reports and more time on actually helping customers. This means more capital will be flowing into our local economies, spurring job growth and economic development, while making a real difference in the lives of Americans trying to access affordable capital to buy a new home or car or start a business.

I want to thank my good friend from Illinois, Congressman RANDY HULTGREN, for his leadership and for introducing this important legislation. Due to his leadership, this great community bank bill is being considered as a suspension on the floor today. That means that there is a great chance that this bill will build on its unanimous support earned during the House Financial Services Committee markup and will be a bipartisan provision in the Senate Banking chairman's Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, which is expected to pass out of the Senate very soon.

In addition to Congressman HULTGREN, I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for their hard work on this critical legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 4725, the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 4725, the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act, which would reduce reporting requirements through first and third quarter call reports for depository institutions with less than \$5 billion in total consolidated assets.

This bill provides targeted regulatory relief to many of our smaller financial institutions, as has been the desire of both Democrats and Republicans on the committee and in this Congress for some time.

Under the Obama administration, the Federal banking agencies began taking a series of steps to reduce and streamline various bank reporting requirements. Many of these requirements had existed for decades, including the quarterly Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income for a Bank, which is commonly referred to as a call report.

These efforts by regulators have included creating a simpler call report for most community banks with less than \$1 billion. Regulators have already been exploring raising the threshold to a comparable level that is proposed by this legislation. The regulators also allow for some data to be reported semiannually, as this bill would allow, or annually rather than quarterly.

I am pleased that H.R. 4725 would give the regulators discretion to decide what information should be included in a reduced call report. It is also key that the bill would require a full call report every other quarter for banks under \$5 billion, including at the end of the year, to make sure that regulators and the public have sufficient information on the health of financial institutions.

Furthermore, this bill would permit regulators to limit the regulatory relief, as appropriate. This would, for example, exclude banks with foreign offices or ones that are affiliated with much larger banks, as they do today.

This bill would appropriately maintain robust oversight of our Nation's largest banks while providing targeted relief for smaller institutions.

As I said, we don't agree on everything. Many of us on this side believe that the robust protections built into Dodd-Frank have strengthened the financial system but that there are ways that we can improve and refine those restrictions in order to support particularly smaller institutions. This is a step in that direction, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4725.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the sponsor

of the legislation and the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act.

I would like to begin by thanking Leader MCCARTHY and Chairman HENSARLING for their support in getting this legislation to the floor. I also want to thank and express my appreciation to my colleagues, ANDY BARR and TERRI SEWELL, for serving as original cosponsors on this legislation.

I would also like to point out that this identical language has been included in the bipartisan regulatory relief bill that the Senate is expected to take up maybe sometime this week.

By way of background, the Federal Financial Institutions Examinations Council requires banks and savings associations to file a quarterly Consolidated Report of Condition and Income, also known as the call report. Banking regulators use data in the call report to monitor the safety, soundness, performance, and risk profile of each institution and to assess the overall condition of the banking system.

I think we can all agree that our Federal banking regulators should have regular updates on the overall performance and health of financial institutions. For example, this is important if Federal banking regulators are going to be prudent stewards of Federal deposit insurance. However, this does not mean that the Federal banking regulators need regular reports about every single data point on every single financial institution.

Unfortunately, the reporting burden has grown significantly over the years, which means banks have to spend more time with compliance issues rather than working with families and businesses to meet their financial needs.

When I introduced similar legislation last Congress, one community banker in Illinois, Greg Ohlendorf, with First Community Bank and Trust, shared with me: "The quarterly call report has increased to some 80 pages supported by almost 700 pages of instructions, and it represents a growing burden on community banks."

According to a survey that the Independent Community Bankers of America conducted of its members in 2014, over 60 percent of the annual cost to prepare the call report goes to personnel salaries. This survey shows that this is not a highly automated process for those institutions and that oftentimes senior executives such as the chief financial officer are responsible for this regulatory burden.

We also heard testimony in the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee hearing from Robert Fisher, president and CEO of Tioga State Bank, on behalf of the ICBA, who stated: "When I first started in banking in the mid-1980s, the report was 18 pages long. No change in our basic business model since that time

warrants the sharp growth in our quarterly reporting obligation."

The length of the call report has simply gotten out of hand. Washington needs to get out of the way so that community banks can focus on meeting the needs of their communities. The role of smaller financial institutions is especially important in more rural areas, such as in my district, where larger banks tend to not have as many branches.

The Community Bank Reporting Relief Act would require Federal banking regulators to permit for a short-form call report every other quarter for banks with less than \$5 billion in assets and that satisfy other criteria determined by bank regulators.

Federal banking regulators have not demonstrated there are statistically significant variations in this data quarter to quarter, and we heard testimony consistent with this from Tioga State Bank in the House Financial Services Committee. This means the banking regulators are simply collecting too much information too frequently. The Federal banking regulators would be required to take input from our neighborhood banks under consideration when making these changes. This cannot be simply check-the-box exercises, but real reform is necessary.

However, nothing in this legislation would prevent regulators from having access to the information that they need to adequately understand the health of the banking system. Regulators will still receive the most important information every quarter.

The Independent Community Bankers of America has suggested this short form call report include three schedules: schedules RI, an income statement; schedule RIA, changes in bank equity capital; and Schedule RC, the balance sheet.

Furthermore, in the event there is any reason for concern about the health of the bank, regulators would maintain their authority to make ad hoc information requests.

This legislation is supported by the American Bankers Association, the Independent Community Bankers of America, and the neighborhood banks in all of our districts who are looking for commonsense regulatory relief.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation. We must cut regulation for community banks.

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

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

Let me once again thank the gentleman from Illinois for his tireless advocacy on behalf of our community financial institutions and providing some commonsense, basic relief to those institutions so that, instead of dealing with paperwork, they could actually better serve their customers and grow our local economies.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. 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 this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I will just close by reiterating what I said earlier. From time to time, it is clear that we can come together on solutions to problems that we come across in any regulation, in any aspect of the Federal Government. Even in areas where we might find broad disagreement on the importance of many of the protections that were put in place after the financial crisis, across the aisle, we can often find common ground around particular solutions; and, when we do that, we should act.

I think that is why so many of us were pleased to see this legislation come forward to give us a chance to demonstrate that this is a step in the right direction, particularly supporting some of our smaller institutions. I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. 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 Kentucky (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4725.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING THE FINANCING OF TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS ACT

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4768) to require the President to develop a national strategy to combat the financial networks of transnational organized criminals, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4768

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 "National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Secretary of the Treasury, shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, the Director of the United

States Secret Service, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and the Federal functional regulators, develop a national strategy to combat the financial networks of transnational organized criminals.

(b) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees and make available to the relevant government agencies as defined in subsection (a), a comprehensive national strategy in accordance with subsection (a).

(2) UPDATES.—After the initial submission of the national strategy under paragraph (1), the President shall, not less often than every 2 years, update the national strategy and submit the updated strategy to the appropriate Congressional committees.

(c) SEPARATE PRESENTATION OF CLASSIFIED MATERIAL.—Any part of the national strategy that involves information that is properly classified under criteria established by the President shall be submitted to Congress separately in a classified annex and, if requested by the chairman or ranking member of one of the appropriate Congressional committees, as a briefing at an appropriate level of security.

SEC. 3. CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.

The national strategy described in section 2 shall contain the following:

(1) THREATS.—An identification and assessment of the most significant current transnational organized crime threats posed to the national security of the United States or to the U.S. and international financial system, including drug and human trafficking organizations, cyber criminals, kleptocrats, and other relevant state and non-state entities, including those threats identified in the President's "Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime" (published July 2011).

(2) ILLICIT FINANCE.—(A) An identification of individuals, entities, and networks (including terrorist organizations, if any) that provide financial support or financial facilitation to transnational organized crime groups, and an assessment of the scope and role of those providing financial support to transnational organized crime groups.

(B) An assessment of methods by which transnational organized crime groups launder illicit proceeds, including money laundering using real estate and other tangible goods such as art and antiquities, trade-based money laundering, bulk cash smuggling, exploitation of shell companies, and misuse of digital currencies and other cyber technologies, as well as an assessment of the risk to the financial system of the United States of such methods.

(3) GOALS, OBJECTIVES, PRIORITIES, AND ACTIONS.—(A) A comprehensive, research-based, discussion of short-term and long-term goals, objectives, priorities, and actions, listed for each department and agency described under section 2(a), for combating the financing of transnational organized crime groups and their facilitators.

(B) A description of how the strategy is integrated into, and supports, the national security strategy, drug control strategy, and counterterrorism strategy of the United States.

(4) REVIEWS AND PROPOSED CHANGES.—A review of current efforts to combat the financing or financial facilitation of transnational organized crime, including efforts to detect, deter, disrupt, and prosecute transnational organized crime groups and their supporters, and, if appropriate, proposed changes to any

law or regulation determined to be appropriate to ensure that the United States pursues coordinated and effective efforts within the jurisdiction of the United States, including efforts or actions that are being taken or can be taken by financial institutions, efforts in cooperation with international partners of the United States, and efforts that build partnerships and global capacity to combat transnational organized crime.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL REGULATOR.—The term "Federal functional regulator" has the meaning given that term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).

(3) TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME.—The term "transnational organized crime" refers to those self-perpetuating associations of individuals who operate transnationally for the purpose of obtaining power, influence, monetary or commercial gains, wholly or in part by illegal means, while—

(A) protecting their activities through a pattern of corruption or violence; or

(B) while protecting their illegal activities through a transnational organizational structure and the exploitation of transnational commerce or communication mechanisms.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. 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 this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4768, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

I want to, at the outset, applaud and thank my colleague Mr. KUSTOFF from Tennessee for his leadership on this important legislation and for bringing this solution to the Congress and this solution to the American people.

As Members of Congress, our number one responsibility is the national security and the well-being of the American people. Unfortunately, transnational criminal organizations threaten the safety of Americans, and we must do

everything in our power to stop them. Transnational criminal organizations, or TCOs as they are called for short, are engaged in illegal business ventures around the world such as money laundering, cybercrime, and the trafficking of drugs, weapons, endangered species, and even human beings.

While TCOs may not be motivated by a particular radical, political, or religious ideology, they are motivated by money, and they will stop at nothing to get it. According to a 2011 report published by the Obama administration, entitled, "Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime," TCOs have dramatically ramped up their size, scope, and influence, and are even teaming up with terrorist organizations and corrupt foreign officials to expand their networks and conceal their illicit financial assets.

These TCOs cost the Western Hemisphere about 3.5 percent of gross domestic product annually, and they generate for themselves around \$870 billion, which is roughly the value of the world's largest company, Apple.

President Trump, on February 9, 2017, issued Executive Order 13773 on "Enforcing Federal Law with Respect to Transnational Criminal Organizations and Preventing International Trafficking."

□ 1415

It states that TCOs in the form of transnational drug cartels have a stronghold in America and threaten the safety of the American people. From former President Obama to current President Trump, TCOs are recognized as a major risk to national security. That is why I am very pleased to see that my good friend from Tennessee, Congressman DAVID KUSTOFF, has introduced H.R. 4768, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

This legislation requires the President, the Treasury Secretary, financial regulators, and other appropriate officials to create a national strategy to combat TCOs and their illicit use of financial networks. Specifically, the legislation requires them to identify and assess the largest TCO threats to the United States. It also mandates that the strategy include the identification of the people or groups that facilitate access to financial networks for the TCOs through laundering assets, such as, real estate, art and antiquities, smuggling bulk cash, exploitation of shell companies, and the use of covert cryptocurrencies and other cyber technologies.

The legislation also requires the strategy to include long-term and short-term goals, an explanation of how goals will be integrated into existing national security apparatuses, and, if needed, suggest legislative and regulatory changes to better fight against TCOs.

This legislation passed the House Committee on Financial Services with

unanimous support in January, and it is my hope that it passes with unanimous support today on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to Congressman KUSTOFF, I thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for their hard work on this issue. Together we can, in a bipartisan way, empower our government to better fight transnational criminal organizations, making the American people safer and our economy stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 4768, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if ever there is a time for Democrats and Republicans to come together in a bipartisan fashion, it would be around this issue, around an issue to combat the financing of transnational criminal organizations. That is what H.R. 4768 would do. Specifically, it would require the Secretary of the Treasury to lead the effort, in consultation with other key agencies and departments, and update the strategy to fight these organizations at least every 2 years.

Additionally, the legislation requires the administration to assess the key threats, financial support networks, and methods used by criminal groups to launder the proceeds of illicit activities. In passing this legislation, we will not only build upon but also cement the importance of the interagency approach taken by the prior administration in combating the impact of global criminal enterprises.

Indeed, in 2010, the Obama administration conducted a comprehensive assessment of organized crime, the first such review that had taken place since the mid-1990s. The assessment came to the alarming conclusion that the threat of global criminal networks had become more complex, volatile, and destabilizing and that such groups were proliferating, striking new and powerful alliances, and engaging in a growing range of illicit activities such as we have never seen before.

To combat this growing threat and lessen its impact both domestically and on our foreign partners, the Obama administration, in 2011, issued a comprehensive interagency strategy that identified 56 priority actions across five strategic objectives. One of these key objectives included breaking the economic power of transnational criminal networks and protecting strategic markets and the U.S. financial system from penetration and abuse by transnational organized crime. This strategic objective, in particular, resonates with me, as I have always believed strongly that following the money and using our economic leverage is the best way to counter illicit activity. This is especially true in countering transnational criminal or-

ganizations, whose primary objective is economic gain.

In a number of ways, this legislation before us will ensure that the Treasury, as well as the intelligence and broader U.S. national security apparatus, remains focused on some of the emerging threats posed by transnational organized crime groups; including, kleptocrats, human traffickers, drug traffickers, and cybercriminals.

Additionally, the legislation explicitly requires the administration to examine how such groups exploit the use of shell companies, misuse digital currencies and other cyber technologies.

I am also pleased that, with the concurrence of the chairman and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), the committee agreed to adopt an amendment offered by Ranking Member WATERS that sharpens the bill's focus on the methods by which transnational organized crime groups launder illicit funds using real estate and other tangible goods, such as art and antiquities. These significant vulnerabilities have been identified as major threats to our national security and the integrity of our financial system by a broad range of bipartisan experts, including the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network and the Financial Action Task Force.

For example, just last year, FinCEN noted in a public advisory that: "Real estate transactions and the real estate market have certain characteristics that make them vulnerable to abuse by illicit actors. . . . For these reasons and others, drug traffickers, corrupt officials, and other criminals can and have used real estate to conceal the existence and origins of their illicit funds."

The entities and individuals that have sought to exploit real estate to conceal illicit funds includes Iranian banks subject to U.S. sanctions, Russian oligarchs and Russian-organized crime rings, as well as Venezuelan officials found to be engaged in narcotics trafficking.

The fact that these vulnerabilities are not merely theoretical and have been used by a wide range of criminal groups should disturb all of us. We also know that money laundering through the global art and antiquities market is another key method for washing illicit funds, and that is undoubtedly being exploited by well-organized transnational criminal groups. Indeed, we know that the looting and trafficking in cultural heritage is a source of revenue that has funded ISIS' heinous activities, and we know that the opaque characteristics of the high-end art market and its lack of basic anti-money-laundering requirements make it a target for illicit funds.

So I am pleased that the members of this committee were able to agree that real estate and art market vulnerabilities should be given due consideration when it comes to transnational organized crime. Again, this is one of those

subjects around which bipartisanship should be assumed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join in this bipartisan effort and to support this legislation.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), a member of the House Financial Services Committee and a former United States Attorney from the Western District of Tennessee, who has brought considerable prosecutorial experience in drafting and authoring this legislation.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

On February 9 of 2017, last year, President Trump issued an executive order directing the Federal Government to combat international drug trafficking. Now, before I go any further, I want to take note that this executive order was issued in the third week of the Trump administration. This early action gives us an idea of how seriously we must take this issue. The executive order recognizes that illegal drugs are pouring into our country and they are threatening American safety, primarily at the hands of cartels and other transnational criminal organizations.

These criminal organizations are responsible, in large part, for the rising opioid epidemic sweeping across our Nation. Take my district of west Tennessee, where we continue to see a rise in the deaths caused by opioid overdoses. From heroin to fentanyl, and the more potent synthetic opioid known as carfentanyl, we must continue to use every available resource to prevent the further destruction of our communities. We have got to say enough is enough.

The important legislation that we are discussing today will create a plan to track illicit money channels and cut them off at the source. Specifically, it directs the United States Treasury Department to develop a national strategy aimed at disrupting these financial crimes. The Treasury Department will work hand in hand with the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, the State Department, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to produce a yearly report outlining a strategy and detailing ways that the United States Government can continue to prevent these financial crimes.

For far too long, these criminal organizations have used illicit business ventures to further finance their activities, which range from money laundering and cybercrime to the trafficking of drugs, human trafficking, weapons trafficking, and trafficking in endangered species.

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime estimates that these cartel and transnational criminal organizations generate nearly \$870 billion a year. This money is used to directly threaten the security and the prosperity of the United States of America and other countries in the Western Hemisphere. Our legislation is a critical step in disrupting this illicit finance and putting an end to the need-less crimes committed by cartels.

As we have seen, these organizations have evolved in a continued effort to evade law enforcement. Therefore, in an effort to stay one step ahead of these bad actors, we have also got to evolve. These transnational organizations have developed interstate networks to and from the border in which drugs come up from Central America and the cash returns back to the country of origin. We simply cannot stand idly by as these activities continue. We must keep money out of the hands of those who intend to cause harm to our Nation.

I think this legislation does exactly that. I greatly appreciate the hard work done by my colleagues from the Financial Services Committee on this very important legislation. I urge all my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), a cosponsor of this legislation and a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4768, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Drug Enforcement Administration's Phoenix division, the Sinaloa cartel is the biggest, most violent, and nastiest organization threatening Arizonans, even bigger than MS-13. It is a dangerous and highly sophisticated organization. Sinaloa smuggles heroin and methamphetamine across the border into Arizona and, with it, a pattern of crime, intimidation, and addiction that rips at the very fabric of our communities.

Arizonans know we need to be tough, smart, and aggressive to confront Sinaloa and other cartels. Our bill cracks down on the drug cartels and other international crime syndicates that threaten Arizona families and our quality of life by hitting them where it hurts: their bank accounts.

Drug cartels like Sinaloa obtain wealth and power through money laundering; cybercrime; and human, drugs, and weapons smuggling. To stop the drug cartels and protect Arizona families, we need a comprehensive approach to cut off the money that fuels their operations.

□ 1430

That is why Congressman KUSTOFF from Tennessee and I introduced H.R. 4768. This bill requires the administration to develop and execute a strategy

that cuts off funding and other resources for transnational criminal organizations and to routinely report to Congress and the American people on the strategy's progress.

Our bill is a commonsense solution that protects Arizona families, communities, and businesses from the threats of transnational organized crime.

By focusing on the money, we take a meaningful step in combating cybercrime, money laundering, drug trafficking, and human trafficking, as well as other issues that transnational criminals bring to our communities.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for supporting this important legislation, and I will continue working with my colleagues across the aisle to keep Arizona families safe.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BARR for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act. I want to thank my colleague Representative KUSTOFF for his work on this important issue.

The Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance has been examining global criminal organizations and the threat they pose to the United States financial system.

These sophisticated and dangerous organizations, like drug cartels, increasingly pose a direct threat to the safety and security of all Americans. They have fueled the opioid crisis that continues to kill tens of thousands of Americans each year, including the spread of human trafficking, among a host of other illicit activities.

I want to remind my colleagues that entire communities are still plagued by this crisis, including hard-hit communities in western Pennsylvania.

Beyond the opioid crisis, though, I want to highlight an exceptionally dangerous situation in which the United States finds itself.

Some of the cartels are now working directly with organizations like Hezbollah, a terrorist organization, as reflected in a recent Politico article. Fortunately, the new administration is taking a tougher stance now with the announcement of a newly created Hezbollah Financing and Narcoterrorism Team.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time America fought back against this growing international threat, and this bill will help ensure the government has a strategy to stay in this fight. Lives depend on it.

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

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North

Carolina (Mr. BUDD), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Mr. KUSTOFF's bill, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for his leadership on this important issue, even if it does have a really, really long name.

I have seen firsthand how these transnational drug cartels can disrupt civil society. In my own district, the opioid epidemic has destroyed innocent people's lives, including kids, while transnational criminal organizations, or TCOs, profit on people's misery and their death.

TCOs have brought heroin to our streets and, along with it, increased crime, placing additional burdens on law enforcement in local communities.

We are in crisis mode, and targeted steps need to be taken to address this epidemic at all phases. We have to crack down on the pusher on the street. We have to crack down on the drug cartels. We have to crack down on the drug companies that have made a profit from overprescription and filling suspect orders.

Most of all, we have to crack down on the intricate faceless and unbelievably complex international criminal organizations that allow the profits from these activities into our economy.

We must eradicate the international illicit financing networks that are the linchpin of any criminal organization's operations. But we don't have a unified national plan.

Luckily, this committee has an opportunity to make a difference by coming up with a national strategy and plan to attack transnational criminal organizations' finances.

Mr. KUSTOFF's bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to provide that plan, a vital first step towards addressing the threat posed by the growing sophistication of illicit financing networks.

Passing this bill is a significant step toward an effective, sustained national strategy to attack the funding that makes these TCOs possible.

Therefore, it is critical that we continue to maximize cooperation among Federal departments to keep our policies ahead of these transnational criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of Mr. KUSTOFF's timely and important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I also thank the gentleman from Tennessee for introducing this responsible legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to circumstances where this administration will have additional tools to deal with

transnational criminal organizations, and I hope that we will use those tools to counter the threat posed by Hezbollah.

Hezbollah is not a political party. It is not a quaint reflection of history. It is a web of terrorists and criminals, and that web extends here to our hemisphere.

In fact, in 2009, there was an arrest made in Philadelphia, where Hezbollah operatives were looking to move 1,200 machine guns into Syria.

More recent arrests have been made in Latin America, where countries like Argentina, Peru, and Paraguay are dealing with an enhanced Hezbollah presence.

This important legislation will help us build a plan to leverage our allies, to leverage the Organization of American States and other assets so that we recognize the threat that Hezbollah and other terrorist organizations pose and so that we meet that threat head-on.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, obviously, as I said, we need a national strategy to combat the financing of transnational criminal organizations.

This legislation requires that such a strategy be put together. It is an issue that crosses virtually every partisan or ideological line. It is an example of legislation that we all can embrace and should support.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to do so, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I, once again, thank my colleagues for supporting this legislation. In particular, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF) for his leadership on this issue.

I would note, also, in addition to all of the many sound and persuasive arguments that have been offered for why we need this legislation, this National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act, the National Fraternal Order of Police has endorsed this legislation, and I include in the RECORD their letter.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL
ORDER OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, February 15, 2018.

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

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, PELOSI, AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 4768, the "National Strategy for Combatting the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act."

The Office of National Drug Control Policy was established to set out our strategy in

combatting our nation's drug problem. Similarly, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services has served as the cornerstone for our nation's crime-fighting efforts for more than two decades. With the growing threat posed by transnational criminal organizations, it is important that we adopt a comprehensive national approach.

President Donald J. Trump took the first step by issuing Executive Order #13773, the Enforcing Federal Law with Respect to Transnational Criminal Organizations and Preventing International Trafficking a year ago. The Threat Mitigation Working Group was set up to bring Federal agencies together a common goal of investigating, prosecuting and dismantling transnational gangs.

This bill would codify part of this Executive Order by developing a national strategy for combatting transnational criminal organizations. We need to attack their ability to profit from unlawful activity—whether it is money laundering, bulk cash smuggling, shell companies or digital currencies. Simply put, until we can stop the flow of criminal profits to these organized, unlawful enterprises, they will continue to survive no matter how many individuals we arrest and prosecute.

On behalf of the more than 335,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we believe this bill will make our country safe from these transnational criminal organizations. If I can provide any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Senior Advisor, Jim Pasco, in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress representing a State that has been ravaged by heroin and opioid addiction, I can't think of a more important thing for this Congress to do than to develop a national strategy for combating these transnational gangs that are preying on our communities.

Once again, I commend Mr. KUSTOFF for his leadership in this area and in this effort and in this fight. I applaud my colleagues for supporting the legislation on both sides of the aisle.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4768, 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.

REPACK AIRWAVES YIELDING BETTER ACCESS FOR USERS OF MODERN SERVICES ACT OF 2018

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4986) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reauthorize appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, to provide for certain procedural changes to the rules of the Commission to maximize opportunities for public participation and efficient decisionmaking, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4986

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018” or the “RAY BAUM’S Act of 2018”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Commission defined.

TITLE I—FCC REAUTHORIZATION

- Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 102. Application and regulatory fees.
- Sec. 103. Effective date.

TITLE II—APPLICATION OF ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT

- Sec. 201. Application of Antideficiency Act to Universal Service Program.

TITLE III—SECURING ACCESS TO NETWORKS IN DISASTERS

- Sec. 301. Study on network resiliency.
- Sec. 302. Access to essential service providers during federally declared emergencies.
- Sec. 303. Definitions.

TITLE IV—FCC CONSOLIDATED REPORTING

- Sec. 401. Communications marketplace report.
- Sec. 402. Consolidation of redundant reports; conforming amendments.
- Sec. 403. Effect on authority.
- Sec. 404. Other reports.

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 501. Independent Inspector General for FCC.
- Sec. 502. Authority of Chief Information Officer.
- Sec. 503. Spoofing prevention.
- Sec. 504. Report on promoting broadband Internet access service for veterans.
- Sec. 505. Methodology for collection of mobile service coverage data.
- Sec. 506. Accuracy of dispatchable location for 9-1-1 calls.
- Sec. 507. NTIA study on interagency process following cybersecurity incidents.
- Sec. 508. Tribal digital access.
- Sec. 509. Terms of office and vacancies.
- Sec. 510. Submission of copy of certain documents to Congress.
- Sec. 511. Joint board recommendation.
- Sec. 512. Disclaimer for press releases regarding notices of apparent liability.
- Sec. 513. Reports related to spectrum auctions.

TITLE VI—VIEWER PROTECTION

- Sec. 601. Reserve source for payment of TV broadcaster relocation costs.
- Sec. 602. Payment of relocation costs of television translator stations and low power television stations.
- Sec. 603. Payment of relocation costs of FM broadcast stations.
- Sec. 604. Consumer education payment.
- Sec. 605. Implementation and enforcement.
- Sec. 606. Rule of construction.

TITLE VII—MOBILE NOW

- Sec. 701. Short title.
- Sec. 702. Definitions.
- Sec. 703. Identifying 255 megahertz.
- Sec. 704. Millimeter wave spectrum.
- Sec. 705. 3 gigahertz spectrum.
- Sec. 706. Broadband infrastructure deployment.

- Sec. 707. Reallocation incentives.
- Sec. 708. Bidirectional sharing study.
- Sec. 709. Unlicensed services in guard bands.
- Sec. 710. Amendments to the Spectrum Pipeline Act of 2015.

- Sec. 711. GAO assessment of unlicensed spectrum and Wi-Fi use in low-income neighborhoods.

- Sec. 712. Rulemaking related to partitioning or disaggregating licenses.

- Sec. 713. Unlicensed spectrum policy.
- Sec. 714. National plan for unlicensed spectrum.

- Sec. 715. Spectrum challenge prize.
- Sec. 716. Wireless telecommunications tax and fee collection fairness.

- Sec. 717. Rules of construction.
- Sec. 718. Relationship to Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012.

- Sec. 719. No additional funds authorized.

SEC. 2. COMMISSION DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

TITLE I—FCC REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 156) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to carry out the functions of the Commission \$333,118,000 for fiscal year 2019 and \$339,610,000 for fiscal year 2020.

“(b) **OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.**—The sum appropriated in any fiscal year to carry out the activities described in subsection (a), to the extent and in the amounts provided for in Appropriations Acts, shall be derived from fees authorized by section 9.”

(b) **DEPOSITS OF BIDDERS TO BE DEPOSITED IN TREASURY.**—Section 309(j)(8)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(C)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “an interest bearing account” and all that follows and inserting “the Treasury.”;

(2) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “paid to the Treasury” and inserting “deposited in the general fund of the Treasury (where such deposits shall be used for the sole purpose of deficit reduction)”;

(B) by striking the semicolon and inserting “; and”;

(3) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting “, and payments representing the return of such deposits shall not be subject to administrative offset under section 3716(c) of title 31, United States Code.”;

(4) by striking clause (iii).

(c) **ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 710 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-104) is repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 2 of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 710.

(d) **TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—On the effective date described in section 103, any amounts in the account providing appropriations to carry out the functions of the Commission that were collected in excess of the amounts provided for in Appropriations Acts in any fiscal year prior to such date shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury of the United States for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

SEC. 102. APPLICATION AND REGULATORY FEES.

(a) **APPLICATION FEES.**—Section 8 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 158) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 8. APPLICATION FEES.

“(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY; ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHEDULE.**—The Commission shall assess

and collect application fees at such rates as the Commission shall establish in a schedule of application fees to recover the costs of the Commission to process applications.

“(b) **ADJUSTMENT OF SCHEDULE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In every even-numbered year, the Commission shall review the schedule of application fees established under this section and, except as provided in paragraph (2), set a new amount for each fee in the schedule that is equal to the amount of the fee on the date when the fee was established or the date when the fee was last amended under subsection (c), whichever is later—

“(A) increased or decreased by the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index during the period beginning on such date and ending on the date of the review; and

“(B) rounded to the nearest \$5 increment.

“(2) **THRESHOLD FOR ADJUSTMENT.**—The Commission may not adjust a fee under paragraph (1) if—

“(A) in the case of a fee the current amount of which is less than \$200, the adjustment would result in a change in the current amount of less than \$10; or

“(B) in the case of a fee the current amount of which is \$200 or more, the adjustment would result in a change in the current amount of less than 5 percent.

“(3) **CURRENT AMOUNT DEFINED.**—In paragraph (2), the term ‘current amount’ means, with respect to a fee, the amount of the fee on the date when the fee was established, the date when the fee was last adjusted under paragraph (1), or the date when the fee was last amended under subsection (c), whichever is latest.

“(c) **AMENDMENTS TO SCHEDULE.**—In addition to the adjustments required by subsection (b), the Commission shall by rule amend the schedule of application fees established under this section if the Commission determines that the schedule requires amendment—

“(1) so that such fees reflect increases or decreases in the costs of processing applications at the Commission; or

“(2) so that such schedule reflects the consolidation or addition of new categories of applications.

“(d) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

“(1) **PARTIES TO WHICH FEES ARE NOT APPLICABLE.**—The application fees established under this section shall not be applicable to—

“(A) a governmental entity;

“(B) a nonprofit entity licensed in the Local Government, Police, Fire, Highway Maintenance, Forestry-Conservation, Public Safety, or Special Emergency Radio radio services; or

“(C) a noncommercial radio station or noncommercial television station.

“(2) **COST OF COLLECTION.**—If, in the judgment of the Commission, the cost of collecting an application fee established under this section would exceed the amount collected, the Commission may by rule eliminate such fee.

“(e) **DEPOSIT OF COLLECTIONS.**—Moneys received from application fees established under this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.”

(b) **REGULATORY FEES.**—Section 9 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 159) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9. REGULATORY FEES.

“(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—The Commission shall assess and collect regulatory fees to recover the costs of carrying out the activities described in section 6(a) only to the extent, and in the total amounts, provided for in Appropriations Acts.

“(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHEDULE.**—The Commission shall assess and collect regulatory fees at such rates as the Commission

shall establish in a schedule of regulatory fees that will result in the collection, in each fiscal year, of an amount that can reasonably be expected to equal the amounts described in subsection (a) with respect to such fiscal year.

“(c) ADJUSTMENT OF SCHEDULE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, the Commission shall by rule adjust the schedule of regulatory fees established under this section to—

“(A) reflect unexpected increases or decreases in the number of units subject to the payment of such fees; and

“(B) result in the collection of the amount required by subsection (b).

“(2) ROUNDING.—In making adjustments under this subsection, the Commission may round fees to the nearest \$5 increment.

“(d) AMENDMENTS TO SCHEDULE.—In addition to the adjustments required by subsection (c), the Commission shall by rule amend the schedule of regulatory fees established under this section if the Commission determines that the schedule requires amendment so that such fees reflect the full-time equivalent number of employees within the bureaus and offices of the Commission, adjusted to take into account factors that are reasonably related to the benefits provided to the payor of the fee by the Commission's activities. In making an amendment under this subsection, the Commission may not change the total amount of regulatory fees required by subsection (b) to be collected in a fiscal year.

“(e) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) PARTIES TO WHICH FEES ARE NOT APPLICABLE.—The regulatory fees established under this section shall not be applicable to—

“(A) a governmental entity or nonprofit entity;

“(B) an amateur radio operator licensee under part 97 of the Commission's rules (47 C.F.R. part 97); or

“(C) a noncommercial radio station or noncommercial television station.

“(2) COST OF COLLECTION.—If, in the judgment of the Commission, the cost of collecting a regulatory fee established under this section from a party would exceed the amount collected from such party, the Commission may exempt such party from paying such fee.

“(f) DEPOSIT OF COLLECTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts received from fees authorized by this section shall be deposited as an offsetting collection in, and credited to, the account through which funds are made available to carry out the activities described in section 6(a).

“(2) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS COLLECTIONS.—Any regulatory fees collected in excess of the total amount of fees provided for in Appropriations Acts for a fiscal year shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.”

(c) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION AND REGULATORY FEES.—Title I of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 9 the following:

“SEC. 9A. PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION AND REGULATORY FEES.

“(a) JUDICIAL REVIEW PROHIBITED.—Any adjustment or amendment to a schedule of fees under subsection (b) or (c) of section 8 or subsection (c) or (d) of section 9 is not subject to judicial review.

“(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Commission shall transmit to Congress notification—

“(1) of any adjustment under section 8(b) or 9(c) immediately upon the adoption of such adjustment; and

“(2) of any amendment under section 8(c) or 9(d) not later than 90 days before the effective date of such amendment.

“(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) PENALTIES FOR LATE PAYMENT.—The Commission shall by rule prescribe an additional penalty for late payment of fees under section 8 or 9. Such additional penalty shall be 25 percent of the amount of the fee that was not paid in a timely manner.

“(2) INTEREST ON UNPAID FEES AND PENALTIES.—The Commission shall charge interest, at a rate determined under section 3717 of title 31, United States Code, on a fee under section 8 or 9 or an additional penalty under this subsection that is not paid in a timely manner. Such section 3717 shall not otherwise apply with respect to such a fee or penalty.

“(3) DISMISSAL OF APPLICATIONS OR FILINGS.—The Commission may dismiss any application or other filing for failure to pay in a timely manner any fee under section 8 or 9 or any interest or additional penalty under this subsection.

“(4) REVOCATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to or in lieu of the penalties and dismissals authorized by this subsection, the Commission may revoke any instrument of authorization held by any licensee that has not paid in a timely manner a regulatory fee assessed under section 9 or any related interest or penalty.

“(B) NOTICE.—Revocation action may be taken by the Commission under this paragraph after notice of the Commission's intent to take such action is sent to the licensee by registered mail, return receipt requested, at the licensee's last known address. The notice shall provide the licensee at least 30 days to either pay the fee, interest, and any penalty or show cause why the fee, interest, or penalty does not apply to the licensee or should otherwise be waived or payment deferred.

“(C) HEARING.—

“(i) GENERALLY NOT REQUIRED.—A hearing is not required under this paragraph unless the licensee's response presents a substantial and material question of fact.

“(ii) EVIDENCE AND BURDENS.—In any case where a hearing is conducted under this paragraph, the hearing shall be based on written evidence only, and the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence and the burden of proof shall be on the licensee.

“(iii) COSTS.—Unless the licensee substantially prevails in the hearing, the Commission may assess the licensee for the costs of such hearing.

“(D) OPPORTUNITY TO PAY PRIOR TO REVOCATION.—Any Commission order adopted under this paragraph shall determine the amount due, if any, and provide the licensee with at least 30 days to pay that amount or have its authorization revoked.

“(E) FINALITY.—No order of revocation under this paragraph shall become final until the licensee has exhausted its right to judicial review of such order under section 402(b)(5).

“(d) WAIVER, REDUCTION, AND DEFERMENT.—The Commission may waive, reduce, or defer payment of a fee under section 8 or 9 or an interest charge or penalty under this section in any specific instance for good cause shown, where such action would promote the public interest.

“(e) PAYMENT RULES.—The Commission shall by rule permit payment—

“(1) in the case of fees under section 8 or 9 in large amounts, by installments; and

“(2) in the case of fees under section 8 or 9 in small amounts, in advance for a number of years not to exceed the term of the license held by the payor.

“(f) ACCOUNTING SYSTEM.—The Commission shall develop accounting systems necessary to make the amendments authorized by sections 8(c) and 9(d).”

(d) TRANSITIONAL RULES.—

(1) APPLICATION FEES.—An application fee established under section 8 of the Communications Act of 1934, as such section is in effect on the day before the effective date described in section 103 of this Act, shall remain in effect under section 8 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, until such time as the Commission adjusts or amends such fee under subsection (b) or (c) of such section 8, as so amended.

(2) REGULATORY FEES.—A regulatory fee established under section 9 of the Communications Act of 1934, as such section is in effect on the day before the effective date described in section 103 of this Act, shall remain in effect under section 9 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (b) of this section, until such time as the Commission adjusts or amends such fee under subsection (c) or (d) of such section 9, as so amended.

(e) RULEMAKING TO AMEND SCHEDULE OF REGULATORY FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date described in section 103, the Commission shall complete a rulemaking proceeding under subsection (d) of section 9 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (b) of this section.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—If the Commission has not completed the rulemaking proceeding required by paragraph (1) by the date that is 6 months after the effective date described in section 103, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the progress of such rulemaking proceeding.

SEC. 103. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2018.

TITLE II—APPLICATION OF ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT

SEC. 201. APPLICATION OF ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT TO UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROGRAM.

Section 302 of Public Law 108–494 (118 Stat. 3998) is amended by striking “December 31, 2018” each place it appears and inserting “December 31, 2019”.

TITLE III—SECURING ACCESS TO NETWORKS IN DISASTERS

SEC. 301. STUDY ON NETWORK RESILIENCY.

Not later than 36 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress, and make publicly available on the Commission's website, a study on the public safety benefits and technical feasibility and cost of—

(1) making telecommunications service provider-owned WiFi access points, and other communications technologies operating on unlicensed spectrum, available to the general public for access to 9–1–1 services, without requiring any login credentials, during times of emergency when mobile service is unavailable;

(2) the provision by non-telecommunications service provider-owned WiFi access points of public access to 9–1–1 services during times of emergency when mobile service is unavailable; and

(3) other alternative means of providing the public with access to 9–1–1 services during times of emergency when mobile service is unavailable.

SEC. 302. ACCESS TO ESSENTIAL SERVICE PROVIDERS DURING FEDERALLY DECLARED EMERGENCIES.

Section 427(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5189e(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “telecommunications service” and inserting “wireline or mobile telephone service, Internet access service, radio or television broadcasting, cable service, or direct broadcast satellite service”;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as clauses (i) through (v), respectively; and

(2) by striking “(1) provides” and inserting “(1)(A) provides”.

SEC. 303. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title—

(1) the term “mobile service” means commercial mobile service (as defined in section 332 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332)) or commercial mobile data service (as defined in section 6001 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401));

(2) the term “WiFi access point” means wireless Internet access using the standard designated as 802.11 or any variant thereof; and

(3) the term “times of emergency” means either an emergency as defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122), or an emergency as declared by the governor of a State or territory of the United States.

TITLE IV—FCC CONSOLIDATED REPORTING

SEC. 401. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

Title I of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 13. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the last quarter of every even-numbered year, the Commission shall publish on its website and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the state of the telecommunications marketplace.

“(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall—

“(1) assess the state of competition in the communications marketplace, including competition to deliver voice, video, audio, and data services among providers of telecommunications, providers of commercial mobile service (as defined in section 332), multichannel video programming distributors (as defined in section 602), broadcast stations, providers of satellite communications, Internet service providers, and other providers of communications services;

“(2) assess the state of deployment of communications capabilities, including advanced telecommunications capability (as defined in section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302)), regardless of the technology used for such deployment;

“(3) assess whether laws, regulations, regulatory practices (whether those of the Federal Government, States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes or tribal organizations (as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)), or foreign governments), or demonstrated marketplace practices pose a barrier to competitive entry into the communications marketplace or to the competitive expansion of existing providers of communications services;

“(4) describe the agenda of the Commission for the next 2-year period for addressing the challenges and opportunities in the communications marketplace that were identified through the assessments under paragraphs (1) through (3); and

“(5) describe the actions that the Commission has taken in pursuit of the agenda de-

scribed pursuant to paragraph (4) in the previous report submitted under this section.

“(c) EXTENSION.—If the President designates a Commissioner as Chairman of the Commission during the last quarter of an even-numbered year, the portion of the report required by subsection (b)(4) may be published on the website of the Commission and submitted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate as an addendum during the first quarter of the following odd-numbered year.

“(d) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) ASSESSING COMPETITION.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1), the Commission shall consider all forms of competition, including the effect of intermodal competition, facilities-based competition, and competition from new and emergent communications services, including the provision of content and communications using the Internet.

“(2) ASSESSING DEPLOYMENT.—In assessing the state of deployment under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall compile a list of geographical areas that are not served by any provider of advanced telecommunications capability.

“(3) CONSIDERING SMALL BUSINESSES.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1) and regulatory barriers under subsection (b)(3), the Commission shall consider market entry barriers for entrepreneurs and other small businesses in the communications marketplace in accordance with the national policy under section 257(b).”.

SEC. 402. CONSOLIDATION OF REDUNDANT REPORTS; CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) ORBIT ACT REPORT.—Section 646 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 765e; 114 Stat. 57) is repealed.

(b) SATELLITE COMPETITION REPORT.—Section 4 of Public Law 109-34 (47 U.S.C. 703) is repealed.

(c) INTERNATIONAL BROADBAND DATA REPORT.—Section 103(b)(1) of the Broadband Data Improvement Act (47 U.S.C. 1303(b)(1)) is amended by striking “the assessment and report” and all that follows through “Federal Communications Commission” and inserting “its report under section 13 of the Communications Act of 1934, the Federal Communications Commission”.

(d) STATUS OF COMPETITION IN THE MARKET FOR THE DELIVERY OF VIDEO PROGRAMMING REPORT.—Section 628 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 548) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);

(2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (g); and

(3) by transferring subsection (g) (as redesignated) so that it appears after subsection (f).

(e) REPORT ON CABLE INDUSTRY PRICES.—Section 623(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 543(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “annually publish” and inserting “publish with its report under section 13”; and

(2) in the heading of paragraph (2), by striking “ANNUAL”.

(f) TRIENNIAL REPORT IDENTIFYING AND ELIMINATING MARKET ENTRY BARRIERS FOR ENTREPRENEURS AND OTHER SMALL BUSINESSES.—Section 257 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 257) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(g) STATE OF COMPETITIVE MARKET CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO COMMERCIAL MOBILE RADIO SERVICES.—Section 332(c)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(c)(1)(C)) is amended by striking the first and second sentences.

(h) PREVIOUSLY ELIMINATED ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 154) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (k); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (l) through (o) as subsections (k) through (n), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(i) ADDITIONAL OUTDATED REPORTS.—The Communications Act of 1934 is further amended—

(1) in section 4—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)(B)(ii), by striking “and shall furnish notice of such action” and all that follows through “subject of the waiver”; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking paragraph (2);

(2) in section 215—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b);

(3) in section 227(e), by striking paragraph (4);

(4) in section 309(j)—

(A) by striking paragraph (12); and

(B) in paragraph (15)(C), by striking clause (iv);

(5) in section 331(b), by striking the last sentence;

(6) in section 336(e), by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) REPORT.—The Commission shall annually advise the Congress on the amounts collected pursuant to the program required by this subsection.”;

(7) in section 339(c), by striking paragraph (1);

(8) in section 396—

(A) by striking subsection (i);

(B) in subsection (k)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (F); and

(ii) in paragraph (3)(B)(iii), by striking subclause (V);

(C) in subsection (l)(1)(B), by striking “shall be included” and all that follows through “The audit report”; and

(D) by striking subsection (m);

(9) in section 398(b)(4), by striking the third sentence;

(10) in section 624A(b)(1)—

(A) by striking “REPORT; REGULATIONS” and inserting “REGULATIONS”; and

(B) by striking “Within 1 year after” and all that follows through “on means of assuring” and inserting “The Commission shall issue such regulations as are necessary to assure”; and

(C) by striking “Within 180 days after” and all that follows through “to assure such compatibility.”;

(11) in section 713, by striking subsection (a).

SEC. 403. EFFECT ON AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to expand or contract the authority of the Commission.

SEC. 404. OTHER REPORTS.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise prevent the Commission from producing any additional reports otherwise within the authority of the Commission.

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. INDEPENDENT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR FCC.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 8G(a)(2), by striking “the Federal Communications Commission”; and

(2) in section 12—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, the Federal Communications Commission,” after “the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “the Federal Communications Commission,” after “the Environmental Protection Agency.”

(b) **TRANSITION RULE.**—An individual serving as Inspector General of the Commission on the date of the enactment of this Act pursuant to an appointment made under section 8G of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)—

(1) may continue so serving until the President makes an appointment under section 3(a) of such Act with respect to the Commission consistent with the amendments made by subsection (a); and

(2) shall, while serving under paragraph (1), remain subject to the provisions of section 8G of such Act which, immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act, applied with respect to the Inspector General of the Commission and suffer no reduction in pay.

SEC. 502. AUTHORITY OF CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the Commission has a significant role in—

(1) the decision-making process for annual and multi-year planning, programming, budgeting, and execution decisions, related reporting requirements, and reports related to information technology;

(2) the management, governance, and oversight processes related to information technology; and

(3) the hiring of personnel with information technology responsibilities.

(b) **CIO APPROVAL.**—The Chief Information Officer of the Commission, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the Commission and budget officials, shall specify and approve the allocation of amounts appropriated to the Commission for information technology, consistent with the provisions of appropriations Acts, budget guidelines, and recommendations from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 503. SPOOFING PREVENTION.

(a) **EXPANDING AND CLARIFYING PROHIBITION ON MISLEADING OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.**—

(1) **COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—Section 227(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(1)) is amended by striking “in connection with any telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service” and inserting “or any person outside the United States if the recipient is within the United States, in connection with any voice service or text messaging service”.

(2) **COVERAGE OF TEXT MESSAGES AND VOICE SERVICES.**—Section 227(e)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service” and inserting “voice service or a text message sent using a text messaging service”;

(B) in the first sentence of subparagraph (B), by striking “telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service” and inserting “voice service or a text message sent using a text messaging service”; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) **TEXT MESSAGE.**—The term ‘text message’—

“(i) means a message consisting of text, images, sounds, or other information that is transmitted to or from a device that is identified as the receiving or transmitting device by means of a 10-digit telephone number or N11 service code;

“(ii) includes a short message service (commonly referred to as ‘SMS’) message and a multimedia message service (commonly referred to as ‘MMS’) message; and

“(iii) does not include—

“(I) a real-time, two-way voice or video communication; or

“(II) a message sent over an IP-enabled messaging service to another user of the same messaging service, except a message described in clause (ii).

(D) **TEXT MESSAGING SERVICE.**—The term ‘text messaging service’ means a service that enables the transmission or receipt of a text message, including a service provided as part of or in connection with a voice service.

(E) **VOICE SERVICE.**—The term ‘voice service’—

“(i) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1); and

“(ii) includes transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine.”

(3) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Section 227(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)) is amended in the heading by inserting “MISLEADING OR” before “INACCURATE”.

(4) **REGULATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 227(e)(3)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009, the Commission” and inserting “The Commission”.

(B) **DEADLINE.**—The Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement the amendments made by this subsection not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date on which the Commission prescribes regulations under paragraph (4).

(b) **CONSUMER EDUCATION MATERIALS ON HOW TO AVOID SCAMS THAT RELY UPON MISLEADING OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.**—

(1) **DEVELOPMENT OF MATERIALS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission, in coordination with the Federal Trade Commission, shall develop consumer education materials that provide information about—

(A) ways for consumers to identify scams and other fraudulent activity that rely upon the use of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information; and

(B) existing technologies, if any, that a consumer can use to protect against such scams and other fraudulent activity.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—In developing the consumer education materials under paragraph (1), the Commission shall—

(A) identify existing technologies, if any, that can help consumers guard themselves against scams and other fraudulent activity that rely upon the use of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, including—

(i) descriptions of how a consumer can use the technologies to protect against such scams and other fraudulent activity; and

(ii) details on how consumers can access and use the technologies; and

(B) provide other information that may help consumers identify and avoid scams and other fraudulent activity that rely upon the use of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information.

(3) **UPDATES.**—The Commission shall ensure that the consumer education materials required under paragraph (1) are updated on a regular basis.

(4) **WEBSITE.**—The Commission shall include the consumer education materials developed under paragraph (1) on its website.

(c) **GAO REPORT ON COMBATING THE FRAUDULENT PROVISION OF MISLEADING OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the actions the Commission and the Federal Trade Commission have taken to combat the fraudulent provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and the additional measures that could be taken to combat such activity.

(2) **REQUIRED CONSIDERATIONS.**—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall examine—

(A) trends in the types of scams that rely on misleading or inaccurate caller identification information;

(B) previous and current enforcement actions by the Commission and the Federal Trade Commission to combat the practices prohibited by section 227(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(1));

(C) current efforts by industry groups and other entities to develop technical standards to deter or prevent the fraudulent provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and how such standards may help combat the current and future provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information; and

(D) whether there are additional actions the Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and Congress should take to combat the fraudulent provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information.

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the findings of the study under paragraph (1), including any recommendations regarding combating the fraudulent provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall be construed to modify, limit, or otherwise affect any rule or order adopted by the Commission in connection with—

(1) the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-243; 105 Stat. 2394) or the amendments made by that Act; or

(2) the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 (15 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.).

SEC. 504. REPORT ON PROMOTING BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE FOR VETERANS.

(a) **VETERAN DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “veteran” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on promoting broadband Internet access service for veterans, in particular low-income veterans and veterans residing in rural areas. In such report, the Commission shall—

(1) examine such access and how to promote such access; and

(2) provide findings and recommendations for Congress with respect to such access and how to promote such access.

(c) **PUBLIC NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT.**—In preparing the report required

by subsection (b), the Commission shall provide the public with notice and an opportunity to comment on broadband Internet access service for veterans, in particular low-income veterans and veterans residing in rural areas, and how to promote such access.

SEC. 505. METHODOLOGY FOR COLLECTION OF MOBILE SERVICE COVERAGE DATA.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “commercial mobile data service” has the meaning given the term in section 6001 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401);

(2) the term “commercial mobile service” has the meaning given the term in section 332(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(d));

(3) the term “coverage data” means, if commercial mobile service or commercial mobile data service is available, general information about the service, which may include available speed tiers, radio frequency signal levels, and network and performance characteristics; and

(4) the term “Universal Service program” means the universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254) and the regulations issued under that section.

(b) **METHODOLOGY ESTABLISHED.**—Not later than 180 days after the conclusion of the Mobility Fund Phase II Auction, the Commission shall promulgate regulations to establish a methodology that shall apply to the collection of coverage data by the Commission for the purposes of—

- (1) the Universal Service program; or
- (2) any other similar program.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The methodology established under subsection (b) shall—

(1) contain standard definitions for different available technologies such as 2G, 3G, 4G, and 4G LTE;

(2) enhance the consistency and robustness of how the data are collected by different parties;

(3) improve the validity and reliability of coverage data; and

(4) increase the efficiency of coverage data collection.

SEC. 506. ACCURACY OF DISPATCHABLE LOCATION FOR 9-1-1 CALLS.

(a) **PROCEEDING REQUIRED.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall conclude a proceeding to consider adopting rules to ensure that the dispatchable location is conveyed with a 9-1-1 call, regardless of the technological platform used and including with calls from multi-line telephone systems (as defined in section 6502 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1471)).

(b) **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROCEEDINGS.**—In conducting the proceeding required by subsection (a), the Commission may consider information and conclusions from other Commission proceedings regarding the accuracy of the dispatchable location for a 9-1-1 call, but nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Commission to reconsider any information or conclusion from a proceeding regarding the accuracy of the dispatchable location for a 9-1-1 call in which the Commission has adopted rules or issued an order before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **9-1-1 CALL.**—The term “9-1-1 call” means a voice call that is placed, or a message that is sent by other means of communication, to a public safety answering point (as defined in section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 222)) for the purpose of requesting emergency services.

(2) **DISPATCHABLE LOCATION.**—The term “dispatchable location” means the street ad-

dress of the calling party, and additional information such as room number, floor number, or similar information necessary to adequately identify the location of the calling party.

SEC. 507. NTIA STUDY ON INTERAGENCY PROCEEDINGS FOLLOWING CYBERSECURITY INCIDENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information shall complete a study on how the National Telecommunications and Information Administration can best coordinate the interagency process following cybersecurity incidents.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report detailing the findings and recommendations of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 508. TRIBAL DIGITAL ACCESS.

(a) **TRIBAL BROADBAND DATA REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report evaluating broadband coverage in Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code) and on land held by a Native Corporation pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

(2) **REQUIRED ASSESSMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of areas of Indian country (as so defined) and land held by a Native Corporation pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act that have adequate broadband coverage.

(B) An assessment of unserved areas of Indian country (as so defined) and land held by a Native Corporation pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

(b) **TRIBAL BROADBAND PROCEEDING.**—Not later than 30 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall complete a proceeding to address the unserved areas identified in the report under subsection (a).

SEC. 509. TERMS OF OFFICE AND VACANCIES.

Section 4(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 154(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c)(1) A commissioner—

“(A) shall be appointed for a term of 5 years;

“(B) except as provided in subparagraph (C), may continue to serve after the expiration of the fixed term of office of the commissioner until a successor is appointed and has been confirmed and taken the oath of office; and

“(C) may not continue to serve after the expiration of the session of Congress that begins after the expiration of the fixed term of office of the commissioner.

“(2) Any person chosen to fill a vacancy in the Commission—

“(A) shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the commissioner that the person succeeds;

“(B) except as provided in subparagraph (C), may continue to serve after the expiration of the fixed term of office of the commissioner that the person succeeds until a successor is appointed and has been confirmed and taken the oath of office; and

“(C) may not continue to serve after the expiration of the session of Congress that begins after the expiration of the fixed term of office of the commissioner that the person succeeds.

“(3) No vacancy in the Commission shall impair the right of the remaining commissioners to exercise all the powers of the Commission.”.

SEC. 510. SUBMISSION OF COPY OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by section 402(h), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) **BUDGET ESTIMATES AND REQUESTS; LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, TESTIMONY, AND COMMENTS ON LEGISLATION; SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.**—

“(1) **BUDGET ESTIMATES AND REQUESTS.**—If the Commission submits any budget estimate or request to the President or the Office of Management and Budget, the Commission shall concurrently transmit a copy of that estimate or request to Congress.

“(2) **LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, TESTIMONY, AND COMMENTS ON LEGISLATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Commission submits any legislative recommendations, testimony, or comments on legislation to the President or the Office of Management and Budget, the Commission shall concurrently transmit a copy thereof to Congress.

“(B) **PROHIBITION.**—No officer or agency of the United States may require the Commission to submit legislative recommendations, testimony, or comments on legislation to any officer or agency of the United States for approval, comments, or review prior to the submission of the recommendations, testimony, or comments to Congress.

“(3) **OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the Inspector General of the Commission shall concurrently submit each semiannual report required under such section 5(b) to the Commission and to the appropriate committees or subcommittees of Congress.

“(B) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to modify the requirement for the Commission to submit to the appropriate committees or subcommittees of Congress each such semiannual report together with a report by the Commission under such section 5(b).”.

SEC. 511. JOINT BOARD RECOMMENDATION.

The Commission may not modify, amend, or change its rules or regulations for universal service support payments to implement the February 27, 2004, recommendations of the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service regarding single connection or primary line restrictions on universal service support payments.

SEC. 512. DISCLAIMER FOR PRESS RELEASES REGARDING NOTICES OF APPARENT LIABILITY.

The Commission shall include in any press release regarding the issuance of a notice of apparent liability under section 503(b)(4) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 503(b)(4)) a disclaimer informing consumers that—

(1) the issuance of a notice of apparent liability should be treated only as allegations; and

(2) the amount of any forfeiture penalty proposed in a notice of apparent liability represents the maximum penalty that the Commission may impose for the violations alleged in the notice of apparent liability.

SEC. 513. REPORTS RELATED TO SPECTRUM AUCTIONS.

(a) **ESTIMATE OF UPCOMING AUCTIONS.**—Section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(18) **ESTIMATE OF UPCOMING AUCTIONS.**—

“(A) Not later than September 30, 2018, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall

make publicly available an estimate of what systems of competitive bidding authorized under this subsection may be initiated during the upcoming 12-month period.

“(B) The estimate under subparagraph (A) shall, to the extent possible, identify the bands of frequencies the Commission expects to be included in each such system of competitive bidding.”.

(b) AUCTION EXPENDITURE JUSTIFICATION REPORT.—Not later than April 1, 2019, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall provide to the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing a detailed justification for the use of proceeds retained by the Commission under section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)) for the costs of developing and implementing the program required by section 309(j) of that Act.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

TITLE VI—VIEWER PROTECTION

SEC. 601. RESERVE SOURCE FOR PAYMENT OF TV BROADCASTER RELOCATION COSTS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Broadcast Repack Fund.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission makes the certification described in paragraph (2), amounts in the Broadcast Repack Fund shall be available to the Commission to make reimbursements pursuant to subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) or (b)(4)(A)(ii) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The certification described in this paragraph is a certification from the Commission to the Secretary of the Treasury that the funds available in the TV Broadcaster Relocation Fund established under subsection (d) of such section are likely to be insufficient to reimburse reasonably incurred costs described in subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) or (b)(4)(A)(ii) of such section.

(3) AVAILABILITY FOR PAYMENTS AFTER APRIL 13, 2020.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(4)(D) of such section, the Commission may make payments pursuant to subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) or (b)(4)(A)(ii) of such section from the Broadcast Repack Fund after April 13, 2020, if, before making any such payments after such date, the Commission submits to Congress a certification that such payments are necessary to reimburse reasonably incurred costs described in such subsection.

(c) UNUSED FUNDS RESCINDED AND DEPOSITED INTO THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY.—

(1) RESCISSION AND DEPOSIT.—If any unobligated amounts remain in the Broadcast Repack Fund after the date described in paragraph (2), such amounts shall be rescinded and deposited into the general fund of the Treasury, where such amounts shall be dedicated for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

(2) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this paragraph is the earlier of—

(A) the date of a certification by the Commission under paragraph (3) that all reimbursements pursuant to subsections (b)(4)(A)(i) and (b)(4)(A)(ii) of such section 6403 have been made; or

(B) July 3, 2022.

(3) CERTIFICATION.—If all reimbursements pursuant to subsections (b)(4)(A)(i) and

(b)(4)(A)(ii) of such section 6403 have been made before July 3, 2022, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury a certification that all such reimbursements have been made.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The amount of auction proceeds that the salaries and expenses account of the Commission is required to retain under section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)), including from the proceeds of the forward auction under section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452), shall be sufficient to cover the administrative costs incurred by the Commission in making any reimbursements out of the Broadcast Repack Fund.

SEC. 602. PAYMENT OF RELOCATION COSTS OF TELEVISION TRANSLATOR STATIONS AND LOW POWER TELEVISION STATIONS.

(a) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall reimburse costs reasonably incurred by a television translator station or low power television station on or after January 1, 2017, in order for such station to relocate its television service from one channel to another channel or otherwise modify its facility as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum under subsection (b) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452). Only stations that are eligible to file and do file an application in the Commission's Special Displacement Window are eligible to seek reimbursement under this paragraph.

(2) LIMITATION.—The Commission may not make reimbursements under paragraph (1) for lost revenues.

(3) DUPLICATIVE PAYMENTS PROHIBITED.—In the case of a low power television station that has been accorded primary status as a Class A television licensee under section 73.6001(a) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations—

(A) if the licensee of such station has received reimbursement with respect to such station under subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) of such section 6403 (including from amounts made available under section 601 of this title), or from any other source, such station may not receive reimbursement under paragraph (1); and

(B) if such station has received reimbursement under paragraph (1), the licensee of such station may not receive reimbursement with respect to such station under subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) of such section 6403.

(4) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.—The Commission may not make reimbursement under paragraph (1) for costs incurred to resolve mutually exclusive applications, including costs incurred in any auction of available channels.

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Translator and Low Power Station Relocation Fund.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Translator and Low Power Station Relocation Fund shall be available to the Commission to make payments required by subsection (a)(1).

(B) AVAILABILITY AFTER APRIL 13, 2020.—Amounts in the Translator and Low Power Station Relocation Fund shall not be available to the Commission to make payments required by subsection (a)(1) after April 13, 2020, unless, before making any such payments after such date, the Commission submits to Congress a certification that such payments are necessary to reimburse costs reasonably incurred by a television trans-

lator station or low power television station on or after January 1, 2017, in order for such station to relocate its television service from one channel to another channel or otherwise modify its facility as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum under subsection (b) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452).

(3) UNUSED FUNDS RESCINDED AND DEPOSITED INTO THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY.—

(A) RESCISSION AND DEPOSIT.—If any unobligated amounts remain in the Translator and Low Power Station Relocation Fund after the date described in subparagraph (B), such amounts shall be rescinded and deposited into the general fund of the Treasury, where such amounts shall be dedicated for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

(B) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this subparagraph is the earlier of—

(i) the date of a certification by the Commission under subparagraph (C) that all reimbursements pursuant to subsection (a)(1) have been made; or

(ii) July 3, 2023.

(C) CERTIFICATION.—If all reimbursements pursuant to subsection (a)(1) have been made before July 3, 2023, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury a certification that all such reimbursements have been made.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The amount of auction proceeds that the salaries and expenses account of the Commission is required to retain under section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)), including from the proceeds of the forward auction under section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452), shall be sufficient to cover the administrative costs incurred by the Commission in making any reimbursements out of the Translator and Low Power Station Relocation Fund.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LOW POWER TELEVISION STATION.—The term “low power television station” means a low power TV station (as defined in section 74.701 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) that was licensed and transmitting for at least 9 of the 12 months prior to April 13, 2017. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the operation of analog and digital companion facilities may be combined.

(2) TELEVISION TRANSLATOR STATION.—The term “television translator station” means a television broadcast translator station (as defined in section 74.701 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) that was licensed and transmitting for at least 9 of the 12 months prior to April 13, 2017. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the operation of analog and digital companion facilities may be combined.

SEC. 603. PAYMENT OF RELOCATION COSTS OF FM BROADCAST STATIONS.

(a) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall reimburse costs reasonably incurred by an FM broadcast station for facilities necessary for such station to reasonably minimize disruption of service as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum under subsection (b) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452).

(2) LIMITATION.—The Commission may not make reimbursements under paragraph (1) for lost revenues.

(3) DUPLICATIVE PAYMENTS PROHIBITED.—If an FM broadcast station has received a payment for interim facilities from the licensee of a television broadcast station that was reimbursed for such payment under subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) of such section 6403 (including

from amounts made available under section 601 of this title), or from any other source, such FM broadcast station may not receive any reimbursements under paragraph (1).

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund shall be available to the Commission to make payments required by subsection (a)(1).

(B) AVAILABILITY AFTER APRIL 13, 2020.—Amounts in the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund shall not be available to the Commission to make payments required by subsection (a)(1) after April 13, 2020, unless, before making any such payments after such date, the Commission submits to Congress a certification that such payments are necessary to reimburse costs reasonably incurred by an FM broadcast station for facilities necessary for such station to reasonably minimize disruption of service as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum under subsection (b) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452).

(3) UNUSED FUNDS RESCINDED AND DEPOSITED INTO THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY.—

(A) RESCISSION AND DEPOSIT.—If any unobligated amounts remain in the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund after the date described in subparagraph (B), such amounts shall be rescinded and deposited into the general fund of the Treasury, where such amounts shall be dedicated for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

(B) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this subparagraph is the earlier of—

(1) the date of a certification by the Commission under subparagraph (C) that all reimbursements pursuant to subsection (a)(1) have been made; or

(ii) July 3, 2022.

(C) CERTIFICATION.—If all reimbursements pursuant to subsection (a)(1) have been made before July 3, 2022, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury a certification that all such reimbursements have been made.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The amount of auction proceeds that the salaries and expenses account of the Commission is required to retain under section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)), including from the proceeds of the forward auction under section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452), shall be sufficient to cover the administrative costs incurred by the Commission in making any reimbursements out of the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund.

(d) FM BROADCAST STATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “FM broadcast station” has the meaning given such term in section 73.310 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, and, for an FM translator, has the meaning given the term “FM translator” in section 74.1201 of such title.

SEC. 604. CONSUMER EDUCATION PAYMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Broadcast Station Relocation Consumer Education Fund.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Broadcast Station Relocation Consumer Education Fund shall be available to the Commission to make payments solely for the purposes of consumer education relating to the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum under subsection (b) of section 6403

of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452).

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The amount of auction proceeds that the salaries and expenses account of the Commission is required to retain under section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)), including from the proceeds of the forward auction under section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452), shall be sufficient to cover the administrative costs incurred by the Commission in making any payments out of the Broadcast Station Relocation Consumer Education Fund.

SEC. 605. IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

The Commission shall implement and enforce this title as if this title is a part of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.). A violation of this title, or a regulation promulgated under this title, shall be considered to be a violation of the Communications Act of 1934, or a regulation promulgated under such Act, respectively.

SEC. 606. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall alter the final transition phase completion date established by the Commission for full power and Class A television stations.

TITLE VII—MOBILE NOW

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Making Opportunities for Broadband Investment and Limiting Excessive and Needless Obstacles to Wireless Act” or the “MOBILE NOW Act”.

SEC. 702. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(C) each committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over a Federal entity affected by the applicable section in which the term appears.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

(3) FEDERAL ENTITY.—The term “Federal entity” has the meaning given the term in section 113(1) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(1)).

(4) NTIA.—The term “NTIA” means the National Telecommunications and Information Administration of the Department of Commerce.

(5) OMB.—The term “OMB” means the Office of Management and Budget.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 703. IDENTIFYING 255 MEGAHERTZ.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2022, the Secretary, working through the NTIA, and the Commission shall identify a total of at least 255 megahertz of Federal and non-Federal spectrum for mobile and fixed wireless broadband use.

(2) UNLICENSED AND LICENSED USE.—Of the spectrum identified under paragraph (1), not less than—

(A) 100 megahertz below the frequency of 8000 megahertz shall be identified for use on an unlicensed basis;

(B) 100 megahertz below the frequency of 6000 megahertz shall be identified for use on an exclusive, licensed basis for commercial mobile use, pursuant to the Commission’s authority to implement such licensing in a flexible manner, and subject to potential continued use of such spectrum by incum-

bent Federal entities in designated geographic areas indefinitely or for such length of time stipulated in transition plans approved by the Technical Panel under section 113(h) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(h)) for those incumbent entities to be relocated to alternate spectrum; and

(C) 55 megahertz below the frequency of 8000 megahertz shall be identified for use on either a licensed or unlicensed basis, or a combination of licensed and unlicensed.

(3) NON-ELIGIBLE SPECTRUM.—For purposes of satisfying the requirement under paragraph (1), the following spectrum shall not be counted:

(A) The frequencies between 1695 and 1710 megahertz.

(B) The frequencies between 1755 and 1780 megahertz.

(C) The frequencies between 2155 and 2180 megahertz.

(D) The frequencies between 3550 and 3700 megahertz.

(E) Spectrum that the Commission determines had more than de minimis mobile or fixed wireless broadband operations within the band on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN OTHER SPECTRUM.—Spectrum identified pursuant to this section may include eligible spectrum, if any, identified after the date of enactment of this Act pursuant to title X of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-74).

(5) SPECTRUM MADE AVAILABLE ON AND AFTER FEBRUARY 11, 2016.—Any spectrum that has been made available for licensed or unlicensed use on and after February 11, 2016, and that otherwise satisfies the requirements of this section may be counted towards the requirements of this subsection.

(6) RELOCATION PRIORITIZED OVER SHARING.—This section shall be carried out in accordance with section 113(j) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(j)).

(7) CONSIDERATIONS.—In identifying spectrum for use under this section, the Secretary, working through the NTIA, and Commission shall consider—

(A) the need to preserve critical existing and planned Federal Government capabilities;

(B) the impact on existing State, local, and tribal government capabilities;

(C) the international implications;

(D) the need for appropriate enforcement mechanisms and authorities; and

(E) the importance of the deployment of wireless broadband services in rural areas of the United States.

(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to impair or otherwise affect the functions of the Director of OMB relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals;

(2) to require the disclosure of classified information, law enforcement sensitive information, or other information that must be protected in the interest of national security; or

(3) to affect any requirement under section 156 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 921 note), as added by section 1062(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, or any other relevant statutory requirement applicable to the reallocation of Federal spectrum.

SEC. 704. MILLIMETER WAVE SPECTRUM.

(a) FCC PROCEEDING.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish a notice

of proposed rulemaking to consider service rules to authorize mobile or fixed terrestrial wireless operations, including for advanced mobile service operations, in the radio frequency band between 42000 and 42500 megahertz.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting a rulemaking under subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) consider how the band described in subsection (a) may be used to provide commercial wireless broadband service, including whether—

(A) such spectrum may be best used for licensed or unlicensed services, or some combination thereof; and

(B) to permit additional licensed operations in such band on a shared basis; and

(2) include technical characteristics under which the band described in subsection (a) may be employed for mobile or fixed terrestrial wireless operations, including any appropriate coexistence requirements.

(c) SPECTRUM MADE AVAILABLE ON AND AFTER FEBRUARY 11, 2016.—Any spectrum that has been made available for licensed or unlicensed use on or after February 11, 2016, and that otherwise satisfies the requirements of section 703 may be counted towards the requirements of section 703(a).

SEC. 705. 3 GIGAHERTZ SPECTRUM.

(a) BETWEEN 3100 MEGAHERTZ AND 3550 MEGAHERTZ.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and in consultation with the Commission and the head of each affected Federal agency (or a designee thereof), the Secretary, working through the NTIA, shall submit to the Commission and the appropriate committees of Congress a report evaluating the feasibility of allowing commercial wireless services, licensed or unlicensed, to share use of the frequencies between 3100 megahertz and 3550 megahertz.

(b) BETWEEN 3700 MEGAHERTZ AND 4200 MEGAHERTZ.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, after notice and an opportunity for public comment, and in consultation with the Secretary, working through the NTIA, and the head of each affected Federal agency (or a designee thereof), the Commission shall submit to the Secretary and the appropriate committees of Congress a report evaluating the feasibility of allowing commercial wireless services, licensed or unlicensed, to use or share use of the frequencies between 3700 megahertz and 4200 megahertz.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—A report under subsection (a) or (b) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the operations of Federal entities that operate Federal Government stations authorized to use the frequencies described in that subsection.

(2) An assessment of the possible impacts of such sharing on Federal and non-Federal users already operating on the frequencies described in that subsection.

(3) The criteria that may be necessary to ensure shared licensed or unlicensed services would not cause harmful interference to Federal or non-Federal users already operating in the frequencies described in that subsection.

(4) If such sharing is feasible, an identification of which of the frequencies described in that subsection are most suitable for sharing with commercial wireless services through the assignment of new licenses by competitive bidding, for sharing with unlicensed operations, or through a combination of licensing and unlicensed operations.

(d) COMMISSION ACTION.—The Commission, in consultation with the NTIA, shall seek public comment on the reports required under subsections (a) and (b), including regarding the bands identified in such report as feasible pursuant to subsection (c)(4).

SEC. 706. BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPLOYMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE STATE AGENCY.—The term “appropriate State agency” means a State governmental agency that is recognized by the executive branch of the State as having the experience necessary to evaluate and carry out projects relating to the proper and effective installation and operation of broadband infrastructure.

(2) BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term “broadband infrastructure” means any buried, underground, or aerial facility, and any wireless or wireline connection, that enables users to send and receive voice, video, data, graphics, or any combination thereof.

(3) BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE ENTITY.—The term “broadband infrastructure entity” means any entity that—

(A) installs, owns, or operates broadband infrastructure; and

(B) provides broadband services in a manner consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity, as determined by the State.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia; and

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPLOYMENT.—To facilitate the installation of broadband infrastructure, the Secretary of Transportation shall promulgate regulations to ensure that each State that receives funds under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, meets the following requirements:

(1) BROADBAND CONSULTATION.—The State department of transportation, in consultation with appropriate State agencies, shall—

(A) identify a broadband utility coordinator, that may have additional responsibilities, whether in the State department of transportation or in another State agency, that is responsible for facilitating the broadband infrastructure right-of-way efforts within the State;

(B) establish a process for the registration of broadband infrastructure entities that seek to be included in those broadband infrastructure right-of-way facilitation efforts within the State;

(C) establish a process to electronically notify broadband infrastructure entities identified under subparagraph (B) of the State transportation improvement program on an annual basis and provide additional notifications as necessary to achieve the goals of this section; and

(D) coordinate initiatives carried out under this section with other statewide telecommunication and broadband plans and State and local transportation and land use plans, including strategies to minimize repeated excavations that involve the installation of broadband infrastructure in a right-of-way.

(2) PRIORITY.—If a State chooses to provide for the installation of broadband infrastructure in the right-of-way of an applicable Federal-aid highway project under this subsection, the State department of transportation shall carry out any appropriate measures to ensure that any existing broadband infrastructure entities are not disadvantaged, as compared to other broadband infrastructure entities, with respect to the program under this subsection.

(c) EFFECT OF SECTION.—This section applies only to activities for which Federal obligations or expenditures are initially approved on or after the date regulations under subsection (b) become effective. Nothing in this section establishes a mandate or requirement that a State install or allow the installation of broadband infrastructure in a highway right-of-way. Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary of Transpor-

tation to withhold or reserve funds or approval of a project under title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 707. REALLOCATION INCENTIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, in consultation with the Commission, the Director of OMB, and the head of each affected Federal agency (or a designee thereof), after notice and an opportunity for public comment, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes legislative or regulatory recommendations to incentivize a Federal entity to relinquish, or share with Federal or non-Federal users, Federal spectrum for the purpose of allowing commercial wireless broadband services to operate on that Federal spectrum.

(b) POST-AUCTION PAYMENTS.—

(1) REPORT.—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information shall—

(A) consider whether permitting eligible Federal entities that are implementing a transition plan submitted under section 113(h) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(h)) to accept payments could result in access to the eligible frequencies that are being reallocated for exclusive non-Federal use or shared use sooner than would otherwise occur without such payments; and

(B) include the findings under subparagraph (A), including the analysis under paragraph (2) and any recommendations for legislation, in the report.

(2) ANALYSIS.—In considering payments under paragraph (1)(A), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information shall conduct an analysis of whether and how such payments would affect—

(A) bidding in auctions conducted under section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) of such eligible frequencies; and

(B) receipts collected from the auctions described in subparagraph (A).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) PAYMENT.—The term “payment” means a payment in cash or in-kind by any auction winner, or any person affiliated with an auction winner, of eligible frequencies during the period after eligible frequencies have been reallocated by competitive bidding under section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) but prior to the completion of relocation or sharing transition of such eligible frequencies per transition plans approved by the Technical Panel.

(B) ELIGIBLE FREQUENCIES.—The term “eligible frequencies” has the meaning given the term in section 113(g)(2) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(g)(2)).

SEC. 708. BIDIRECTIONAL SHARING STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, including an opportunity for public comment, the Commission, in collaboration with the NTIA, shall—

(1) conduct a bidirectional sharing study to determine the best means of providing Federal entities flexible access to non-Federal spectrum on a shared basis across a range of short-, mid-, and long-range timeframes, including for intermittent purposes like emergency use; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the study under paragraph (1), including any recommendations for legislation or proposed regulations.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) consider the regulatory certainty that commercial spectrum users and Federal entities need to make longer-term investment decisions for shared access to be viable; and

(2) evaluate any barriers to voluntary commercial arrangements in which non-Federal users could provide access to Federal entities.

SEC. 709. UNLICENSED SERVICES IN GUARD BANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—After public notice and comment, and in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information and the head of each affected Federal agency (or a designee thereof), with respect to frequencies allocated for Federal use, the Commission shall adopt rules that permit unlicensed services where feasible to use any frequencies that are designated as guard bands to protect frequencies allocated after the date of enactment of this Act by competitive bidding under section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)), including spectrum that acts as a duplex gap between transmit and receive frequencies.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Commission may not permit any use of a guard band under this section that would cause harmful interference to a licensed service or a Federal service.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the Commission or the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information from otherwise making spectrum available for licensed or unlicensed use in any frequency band in addition to guard bands, including under section 703, consistent with their statutory jurisdictions.

SEC. 710. AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECTRUM PIPELINE ACT OF 2015.

Section 1008 of the Spectrum Pipeline Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-74; 129 Stat. 584) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “, after notice and an opportunity for public comment,” after “the Commission”.

SEC. 711. GAO ASSESSMENT OF UNLICENSED SPECTRUM AND WI-FI USE IN LOW-INCOME NEIGHBORHOODS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to evaluate the availability of broadband Internet access using unlicensed spectrum and wireless networks in low-income neighborhoods.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall consider and evaluate—

(A) the availability of wireless Internet hot spots and access to unlicensed spectrum in low-income neighborhoods, particularly for elementary and secondary school-aged children in such neighborhoods;

(B) any barriers preventing or limiting the deployment and use of wireless networks in low-income neighborhoods;

(C) how to overcome any barriers described in subparagraph (B), including through incentives, policies, or requirements that would increase the availability of unlicensed spectrum and related technologies in low-income neighborhoods; and

(D) how to encourage home broadband adoption by households with elementary and secondary school-age children that are in low-income neighborhoods.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on

Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) summarizes the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a); and

(2) makes recommendations with respect to potential incentives, policies, and requirements that could help achieve the goals described in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 712. RULEMAKING RELATED TO PARTITIONING OR DISAGGREGATING LICENSES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED SMALL CARRIER.—The term “covered small carrier” means a carrier (as defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153)) that—

(A) has not more than 1,500 employees (as determined under section 121.106 of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto); and

(B) offers services using the facilities of the carrier.

(2) RURAL AREA.—The term “rural area” means any area other than—

(A) a city, town, or incorporated area that has a population of more than 20,000 inhabitants; or

(B) an urbanized area contiguous and adjacent to a city or town that has a population of more than 50,000 inhabitants.

(b) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding to assess whether to establish a program, or modify existing programs, under which a licensee that receives a license for the exclusive use of spectrum in a specific geographic area under section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301) may partition or disaggregate the license by sale or long-term lease—

(A) in order to—

(i) provide services consistent with the license; and

(ii) make unused spectrum available to—

(I) an unaffiliated covered small carrier; or

(II) an unaffiliated carrier to serve a rural area; and

(B) if the Commission finds that such a program would promote—

(i) the availability of advanced telecommunications services in rural areas; or

(ii) spectrum availability for covered small carriers.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the rulemaking proceeding under paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider, with respect to the program proposed to be established under that paragraph—

(A) whether reduced performance requirements with respect to spectrum obtained through the program would facilitate deployment of advanced telecommunications services in the areas covered by the program;

(B) what conditions may be needed on transfers of spectrum under the program to allow covered small carriers that obtain spectrum under the program to build out the spectrum in a reasonable period of time;

(C) what incentives may be appropriate to encourage licensees to lease or sell spectrum, including—

(i) extending the term of a license granted under section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301); or

(ii) modifying performance requirements of the license relating to the leased or sold spectrum; and

(D) the administrative feasibility of—

(i) the incentives described in subparagraph (C); and

(ii) other incentives considered by the Commission that further the goals of this section.

(3) FORFEITURE OF SPECTRUM.—If a party fails to meet any build out requirements set

by the Commission for any spectrum sold or leased under this section, the right to the spectrum shall be forfeited to the Commission unless the Commission finds that there is good cause for the failure of the party.

(4) REQUIREMENT.—The Commission may offer a licensee incentives or reduced performance requirements under this section only if the Commission finds that doing so would likely result in increased availability of advanced telecommunications services in a rural area.

SEC. 713. UNLICENSED SPECTRUM POLICY.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to maximize the benefit to the people of the United States of the spectrum resources of the United States;

(2) to advance innovation and investment in wireless broadband services; and

(3) to promote spectrum policy that makes available on an unlicensed basis radio frequency bands to address consumer demand for unlicensed wireless broadband operations.

(b) COMMISSION RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Commission shall ensure that the efforts of the Commission related to spectrum allocation and assignment made available on an unlicensed basis radio frequency bands to address demand for unlicensed wireless broadband operations if doing so is, after taking into account the future needs of homeland security, national security, and other spectrum users—

(1) reasonable; and

(2) in the public interest.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section confers any additional rights on unlicensed users or users licensed by rule under part 96 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, to protection from harmful interference.

SEC. 714. NATIONAL PLAN FOR UNLICENSED SPECTRUM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SPECTRUM RELOCATION FUND.—The term “Spectrum Relocation Fund” means the Fund established under section 118 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 928).

(2) UNLICENSED OR LICENSED BY RULE OPERATIONS.—The term “unlicensed or licensed by rule operations” means the use of spectrum on a non-exclusive basis under—

(A) part 15 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(B) licensing by rule under part 96 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) NATIONAL PLAN.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission, in consultation with the NTIA, shall develop a national plan for making additional radio frequency bands available for unlicensed or licensed by rule operations.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The plan developed under this section shall—

(1) identify an approach that ensures that consumers have access to additional spectrum to conduct unlicensed or licensed by rule operations in a range of radio frequencies to meet consumer demand;

(2) recommend specific actions by the Commission and the NTIA to permit unlicensed or licensed by rule operations in additional radio frequency ranges that the Commission finds—

(A) are consistent with the statement of policy under section 713(a);

(B) will—

(i) expand opportunities for unlicensed or licensed by rule operations in a spectrum band; or

(ii) otherwise improve spectrum utilization and intensity of use of bands where unlicensed or licensed by rule operations are already permitted;

(C) will not cause harmful interference to Federal or non-Federal users of such bands; and

(D) will not significantly impact homeland security or national security communications systems; and

(3) examine additional ways, with respect to existing and planned databases or spectrum access systems designed to promote spectrum sharing and access to spectrum for unlicensed or licensed by rule operations—

(A) to improve accuracy and efficacy;

(B) to reduce burdens on consumers, manufacturers, and service providers; and

(C) to protect sensitive Government information.

(d) **SPECTRUM RELOCATION FUND.**—To be included as an appendix as part of the plan developed under this section, the NTIA, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall share with the Commission recommendations about how to reform the Spectrum Relocation Fund—

(1) to address costs incurred by Federal entities related to sharing radio frequency bands with radio technologies conducting unlicensed or licensed by rule operations; and

(2) to ensure the Spectrum Relocation Fund has sufficient funds to cover—

(A) the costs described in paragraph (1); and

(B) other expenditures allowed of the Spectrum Relocation Fund under section 118 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 928).

(e) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes the plan developed under this section, including any recommendations for legislative change.

(2) **PUBLICATION ON COMMISSION WEBSITE.**—Not later than the date on which the Commission submits the report under paragraph (1), the Commission shall make the report publicly available on the website of the Commission.

(f) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section confers any additional rights on unlicensed users or users licensed by rule under part 96 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, to protection from harmful interference.

SEC. 715. SPECTRUM CHALLENGE PRIZE.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Spectrum Challenge Prize Act”.

(b) **DEFINITION OF PRIZE COMPETITION.**—In this section, the term “prize competition” means a prize competition conducted by the Secretary under subsection (c)(1).

(c) **SPECTRUM CHALLENGE PRIZE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information and the Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology, shall, subject to the availability of funds for prize competitions under this section—

(A) conduct prize competitions to dramatically accelerate the development and commercialization of technology that improves spectrum efficiency and is capable of cost-effective deployment; and

(B) define a measurable set of performance goals for participants in the prize competitions to demonstrate their solutions on a level playing field while making a signifi-

cant advancement over the current state of the art.

(2) **AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary may—

(A) enter into a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other agreement with a private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity to administer the prize competitions;

(B) invite the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, or any other Federal agency to provide advice and assistance in the design or administration of the prize competitions; and

(C) award not more than \$5,000,000, in the aggregate, to the winner or winners of the prize competitions.

(d) **CRITERIA.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which funds for prize competitions are made available pursuant to this section, the Commission shall publish a technical paper on spectrum efficiency providing criteria that may be used for the design of the prize competitions.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 716. WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS TAX AND FEE COLLECTION FAIRNESS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Wireless Telecommunications Tax and Fee Collection Fairness Act”.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FINANCIAL TRANSACTION.**—The term “financial transaction” means a transaction in which the purchaser or user of a wireless telecommunications service upon whom a tax, fee, or surcharge is imposed gives cash, credit, or any other exchange of monetary value or consideration to the person who is required to collect or remit the tax, fee, or surcharge.

(2) **LOCAL JURISDICTION.**—The term “local jurisdiction” means a political subdivision of a State.

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(4) **STATE OR LOCAL JURISDICTION.**—The term “State or local jurisdiction” includes any governmental entity or person acting on behalf of a State or local jurisdiction that has the authority to assess, impose, levy, or collect taxes or fees.

(5) **WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE.**—The term “wireless telecommunications service” means a commercial mobile radio service, as defined in section 20.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

(c) **FINANCIAL TRANSACTION REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A State, or a local jurisdiction of a State, may not require a person who is neither a resident of such State or local jurisdiction nor an entity having its principal place of business in such State or local jurisdiction to collect from, or remit on behalf of, any other person a State or local tax, fee, or surcharge imposed on a purchaser or user with respect to the purchase or use of any wireless telecommunications service within the State unless the collection or remittance is in connection with a financial transaction.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the right of a State or local jurisdiction to require the collection of any tax, fee, or surcharge in connection with a financial transaction.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.**—Any person aggrieved by a violation of subsection (c) may bring a civil action in an appropriate

district court of the United States for equitable relief in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) **JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURTS.**—Notwithstanding section 1341 of title 28, United States Code, or the constitution or laws of any State, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy or citizenship of the parties, to grant such mandatory or prohibitive injunctive relief, interim equitable relief, and declaratory judgments as may be necessary to prevent, restrain, or terminate any acts in violation of subsection (c).

SEC. 717. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **RANGES OF FREQUENCIES.**—Each range of frequencies described in this title shall be construed to be inclusive of the upper and lower frequencies in the range.

(b) **ASSESSMENT OF ELECTROMAGNETIC SPECTRUM REALLOCATION.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect any requirement under section 156 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 921 note), as added by section 1062(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

SEC. 718. RELATIONSHIP TO MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2012.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit, restrict, or circumvent in any way the implementation of the nationwide public safety broadband network defined in section 6001 of title VI of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401) or any rules implementing that network under title VI of that Act (47 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.).

SEC. 719. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, or the amendment made by this title. This title, and the amendment made by this title, shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. 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 bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today that the House of Representatives is taking up an important bill from the House Energy and Commerce Committee. It is titled the Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018, or RAY BAUM'S Act.

I thank our subcommittee chairman, MARSHA BLACKBURN, for her hard work in introducing and moving this legislation forward.

Before I get into the policy side, I want to touch on the meaning behind this bill's title.

H.R. 4986 is a nod to our dear friend, and mine of 30 years, the former staff director of our Energy and Commerce Committee, who recently lost his battle with cancer.

It is a testament of not just Ray's dedication to telecom policy—as you know, he served as public utility commissioner, he chaired the Joint Board with the FCC on communications issues, and was such a policy brain for our committee—but also his ability to work across the aisle and with all levels of government officials. He got good things done for America.

Years ago, when I became chairman of what was then called the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet, Ray, at my invitation, finally agreed to come back to Washington and work on the committee.

He had served as a State representative and as majority leader of the Oregon House. He had been chairman of the public utility commission in Oregon and brought a lot to our process as senior policy adviser.

In the years that followed, these issues remained both a priority and a passion for Ray, and I believe and I hope our bipartisan work today reflects admirably the kind of commitment he wanted all of us to share in making good public policy.

By the way, that is Ray right there, for those who didn't know.

The RAY BAUM'S Act reauthorizes the Federal Communications Commission. It includes efficiency and transparency reforms for the FCC, and it spurs the development of next generation 5G technologies.

It is good for consumers, and it is good for our Nation's critical telecommunications services.

Importantly, the bill before us today is the product of a bipartisan and bicameral agreement, House and Senate, Republicans and Democrats, including my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), Senate Commerce Committee chairman Mr. THUNE, and the ranking member in the Senate, BILL NELSON.

Mr. Speaker, we bring you a good product today of sound policy named for a wonderful individual, and I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN WALDEN: I write concerning H.R. 4986, RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego action on the bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that foregoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional

claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Further, this is conditional on our understanding that mutually agreed upon changes to the legislation will be incorporated into the bill prior to floor consideration. Lastly, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

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

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

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 4986, RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018, which includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I appreciate your Committee's willingness to forego action on H.R. 4986 so that this legislation may be brought before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner.

I agree that foregoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Further, I agree that mutually agreed upon changes to the legislation will be incorporated into the bill prior to floor consideration. Lastly, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I will support the appropriate appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy & Commerce, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in H.R. 4986, the "RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018." As a result of your having consulted with me concerning the provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forego further consideration by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 4986 at this time we do not

waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Energy & Commerce, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOWDY: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 4986, RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018, and I appreciate your willingness to forego further consideration by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

I agree that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 4986 at this time, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Further, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter will be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act. This bill is the product of extensive bipartisan collaboration. After exhaustive negotiations, we were able to reach a deal that includes bills introduced by Democrats and Republicans in both the House and in the Senate. That does not happen often, and I would like to thank my colleagues for working with me so closely.

This bill is a real tribute to its namesake, Ray Baum. Ray had a passion for telecommunications policy and a special place in his heart for broadcasting. Ray was also an eternal optimist. He never faltered in his belief that we could find a way to work together to find a solution, and he was right.

We were able to incorporate proposals from Members on both sides of the aisle, just the way Ray would have liked it, and we were able to produce this legislation that will reauthorize the FCC for the first time in 28 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly mention some aspects of this bill that I am most proud of. First, we were able to include the SANDY Act, which is named to honor those affected by Superstorm Sandy, a storm that ripped through the Northeast, including my district, over 5 years ago. During that

superstorm, we saw firsthand how important communications were for survival. From television and radio broadcasters to wireless providers and cable networks, each played its own role in making sure people knew how to find help, look for loved ones, and stay out of harm's way.

□ 1445

I used the lessons we learned from Sandy in writing this legislation. When this bill is signed into law, our networks will be stronger, more resilient, and more capable to serve in an emergency.

This FCC reauthorization bill also includes the Viewer Protection Act. I introduced the Viewer Protection Act to make sure no viewer loses signal as a result of the FCC's incentive auction. Access to local information has become even more important as the number of natural disasters has increased over the past few years.

Not only does this bill help ensure consumers' broadcast stations don't go dark, as part of this bipartisan, bicameral deal, we have agreed to provide \$50 million in funding to help educate consumers about the transition. This funding is critical to make sure that people have access to information about how to get their televisions to work.

My colleagues will discuss other important aspects of this deal. But before they do, I would like to point out two important provisions that we included as part of the reauthorization. First, we included a provision that makes the FCC's inspector general independent of the Commission's chairman. The IG is currently conducting a number of critical investigations, including one into whether the chairman of the agency has been improperly favoring Sinclair Broadcast Group. But under current law, these investigations are being conducted under a cloud—the very chairman who is under investigation can obstruct the review by firing the inspector general or his or her staff at any time. So by passing this bill, we are ensuring that these important investigations can conclude without any interference.

Finally, I do not normally support unnecessarily cutting the budget of our agencies. But in this case, I would like to thank my colleagues for agreeing to limit this cut to the length of this administration. The current leadership of the FCC, in my opinion, has proven that it cannot be trusted to serve the public interest. Most notably, the agency has ignored its statutory duty and the call of the American people by destroying our net neutrality protections. Net neutrality safeguards our American values by empowering small businesses, creating new jobs, and ensuring free speech online.

By limiting the resources that we provide for the next 3 years, this reauthorization will limit this Commission's power, in my opinion, to do more harm.

For these reasons and many more, I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan and bicameral agreement embodied by the RAY BAUM'S Act.

I would like to also thank the Democratic committee staff—David Goldman, Gerald Leverich, and Dan Miller—for all of their hard work in getting this bill to the floor today.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the chair of the subcommittee, who has been an incredible leader on our communications issues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for some time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the recognition, and I thank him for his efforts on this.

Mr. Speaker, it really is a pleasure to come here today to talk about the RAY BAUM'S Act. We have, for so long, talked about the need to push this through to completion, and Ray served as our staff director and really helped the committee and our subcommittee push this forward to the point that we could say: Yes, we have the FCC reauthorization done.

As Mr. PALLONE said, it has been 28 years since this agency has been reauthorized. It is certainly an honor to say we have done this in Ray's name, and we have done it in a bipartisan way.

There are so many things that are included in this bill, and one of the provisions that is in here is Chairman WALDEN's FCC reform. Many times you will hear us talk about needing to bring sunlight to these agencies, bringing order, and the ability for constituents and citizens to know what is happening. We have that included in this bill.

We also have provisions that our whip, STEVE SCALISE—the Consolidated Reporting Act—has included in this bill. We have provisions from Ms. ESHOO and from Representative ENGEL. These are all bipartisan provisions that you will see included in this legislation. Mr. JOHNSON has a provision that is included that will change the way the inspector general works in this agency so that he truly is an inspector general who is independent.

So we have worked together in a bipartisan way to do our repack which deals with our broadcasters and our spectrum to handle MobileNOW, which has been a priority of the Senate. They could not get it finished. We have finished that process, and then also the FCC reauthorization.

So I express my gratitude to the committee members, both Democrats and Republicans, and the staff members from both sides of the dais to say thank you for the work that is done to bring this bipartisan effort together to reauthorize this agency to deal with our spectrum repack and to address the MobileNOW concerns.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE), who is the ranking member of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to speak in memorial to the late Ray Baum. He was a dedicated husband and father, the staff director for the majority on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and a trusted adviser and friend to Chairman WALDEN. We were all saddened by his passing, and I would like to express our condolences to his friends and family.

The legislation before us today is the product of bipartisan and bicameral compromise. While it is not perfect, it represents a good faith effort by Ranking Member PALLONE, Chairman WALDEN, Senator NELSON, and Senator THUNE.

This compromise incorporates a number of Democratic priorities, including Ranking Member PALLONE's Viewer Protection Act and SANDY Act, and Congresswoman ESHOO's RESPONSE Act and "Dig Once" bill, and a number of provisions from other members of our committee on cybersecurity, Tribal broadband, broadband access for veterans, and others.

Like Ranking Member PALLONE, I am also happy to see bipartisan language included in the bill which makes the FCC inspector general an independent entity.

This sends a strong bipartisan and bicameral message to Chairman Pai that he cannot end the FCC inspector general's investigation into collusion between his office and Sinclair Broadcast Group simply by firing the current inspector general. These allegations also require congressional oversight and investigation.

I am also happy to see that we have an agreement to provide the remainder of the funds necessary to transition broadcasters as part of the FCC's incentive auction—keeping a promise that we made to them that they would be held harmless.

The agreement also includes funds for consumer education about the transition. It is critical that the public be educated about the upcoming television repack and understand the what, when, and where of how it will work.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing to work on this legislation with my colleagues as it moves forward.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), who is a talented member of our committee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the RAY BAUM'S Act, which reauthorizes the Federal Communications Commission for the first time in 28 years.

How appropriate that this critical legislation is named for Ray Baum, who dedicated his tremendous public service to these issues, and whom we all admired.

I commend the leadership. The Energy and Commerce Committee puts more bipartisan bills on the President's desk than any other committee here on Capitol Hill. This is important legislation strengthening the FCC, protecting consumers, and, most important of all, expanding the information channels our lives and the economy need.

I am pleased that this legislation includes the Anti-Spoofing Act, a bill I have worked on with Congresswoman MENG and Chairman Emeritus BARTON for several years. Spoofing is an insidious practice used by scammers to call consumers using a faked phone number, often pretending to be a bank or government agency. Millions of Americans continue to be defrauded by con artists and scammers who perpetrate this despicable crime. This disgraceful practice must end, and it will be ended in large part due to this legislation. I am pleased this FCC reauthorization enacts consumer protections like those in the Anti-Spoofing Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that today we are reauthorizing the Federal Communications Commission through the RAY BAUM'S Act, which, among other things, ensures our local broadcasters have the resources they need and will deliver additional spectrum into the commercial marketplace. Spectrum is the invisible infrastructure that supports our wireless economy.

As the way we do business continues to depend on connectivity and mobility, spectrum will be a part of everything from remote health monitoring to precision agriculture, to public safety communications and connected devices.

That is why I am pleased that this package includes several of my priorities, including my Spectrum Auction Deposits Act, which I coauthored with Congressman GUTHRIE. This legislation will enable the FCC to continue to conduct auctions that will unlock the spectrum necessary to deploy next generation broadband networks. Without this fix, auctions to deliver more spectrum into the commercial marketplace may be put on hold indefinitely.

This package also includes my legislation to create a Federal spectrum challenge prize, which would accelerate the development and commercialization of innovative technologies to make spectrum use more efficient.

It could also facilitate the application of existing technologies, such as blockchain, to develop spectrum sharing mechanisms that will allow providers to access spectrum on a real-time basis.

This bipartisan legislation will promote the expansion of current and next generation broadband networks across America. It is an important step forward, and I am proud to support its passage.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), who is a great member of our committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the RAY BAUM'S Act. It is fitting that this bill be named for him, a shining example of public service and a great friend. My heart goes out to his wife and all his family and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation reauthorizes the FCC for the first time in 28 years. I am proud of the inclusion of two of my bipartisan bills.

First is the Rural Spectrum Accessibility Act, which Mr. LOEBSACK and I introduced. It expands access to coverage in rural communities by allowing licensed, unused spectrum to be sub-allocated to carriers serving rural populations.

The second is the Improving Broadband Access for Veterans Act, which Mr. MCNERNEY and I introduced. It requires the FCC to thoroughly examine veterans' access to broadband and provide recommendations to increase access, especially for rural and low-income veterans.

Again, this legislation is one more example to show the majority of the work done in Congress is bipartisan and sometimes even bicameral.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and everybody for working together to get this done, and I urge my colleagues to support the RAY BAUM'S Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member and the chairman for yielding. I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their bipartisan efforts here.

I rise in support of H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act. In the first place, this bill will help ensure that the incentive auction repack can move forward in a timely fashion and that Americans can have access to their local broadcasting stations during this period of time.

On the other hand, I am very proud that this bill includes a bipartisan provision that Congressman KINZINGER and I worked on.

This provision will move us forward in closing the digital divide for our Nation's veterans. Access to broadband internet service is critical for the more than 20 million veterans across our country, with the highest population of veterans residing in California.

Having a broadband internet connection helps veterans apply for jobs more easily, obtain necessary vocational training, communicate with family and friends, keep up with current events, access healthcare services, and get important information about their benefits and military records.

Without broadband internet access, it is difficult to fully participate in today's society. Veterans face many challenges when they return home, and not

having internet access makes what is already an incredibly tough transition process even harder. This is particularly likely to be the case for low-income veterans and veterans living in rural areas.

Although we lack specific data on the number of veterans with broadband internet access, we know that Americans who live in rural areas are less likely to be connected. This is also the case for Americans who live at or below the Federal poverty level.

We must find ways to ensure that veterans, especially the more than 1.4 million veterans living below the Federal poverty level and the 5.3 million residing in rural areas, are not left behind.

This is why my provision directs the Federal Communications Commission to examine the current state of broadband access for veterans and what can be done to increase access, with a focus on low-income veterans and veterans residing in rural areas.

The findings and recommendations from this report will be important for paving the way to get more veterans connected. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) to speak on this important legislation.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, named in memory of a hardworking and honorable man, the RAY BAUM'S Act reauthorizes the Federal Communications Commission for the first time in 28 years.

This bill is the result of a wholly bipartisan process that includes important provisions that will benefit all our constituents.

□ 1500

This includes further prohibitions on spoofing calls, reports on promoting internet access for low-income veterans, and improving 911 caller information.

The bill also provides additional funding for the repack process and fosters technology growth by authorizing studies on spectrum available for future auctions.

I applaud the work of the subcommittee on getting this done. This bill will truly benefit innovation and our constituents, and I support its passage.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair and ranking member for working to bring this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the RAY BAUM'S Act moving forward. This bill really is a good example of compromise. No one got everything that they wanted, but we worked together to find common ground. I think it represents what we need to be doing more of in Washington and in this body and what people and I want to see happen more often, namely, that Members

of Congress come together in a bipartisan manner to reach a commonsense agreement.

But today I come to the floor to talk about a piece of legislation, the Rural Wireless Access Act, which I was pleased to help introduce and incorporate into the larger FCC Reauthorization Act.

I want to thank, in particular, my friend Mr. COSTELLO for working with me on this bipartisan bill. I also want to thank Mrs. BLACKBURN, chair of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, for helping to move this forward.

This bill, which I introduced last year, would require the FCC to establish standards for collecting wireless coverage data. Everyone at some point has been driving through places in rural America that don't get wireless coverage. Unfortunately, the maps that the FCC uses to fix coverage gaps are often inadequate.

Currently, the standards that define how wireless coverage is determined are not sufficient, meaning the coverage maps can be incomplete or inaccurate. Without accurate coverage maps, resources needed to improve wireless access will not be directed to the areas that need the most help, including rural areas.

I am pleased that the Energy and Commerce Committee agreed to include this legislation, the Rural Wireless Access Act, as part of the larger package so that we can improve wireless voice and mobile internet services and ensure the resources go to the areas that need it the most.

In order to fix the problem, we have to get the data right. I am hopeful that the passage of the FCC Reauthorization Act will help folks in rural areas get the wireless coverage they need.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who has been a real leader on telecommunications issues.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my strongest, deepest sympathies and condolences to Ray Baum's family on his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act, to reauthorize the FCC for the first time in 28 years. This important legislation also provides transparency and efficiency reforms, including language from my bill, H.R. 2636, to create an independent inspector general for the FCC.

Currently, the IG is not only appointed by the chairman, but also reports to and is under general supervision of the Chairman of the Commission. This legislation would require the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint the inspector general. It is simply good governance and a matter of transparency and accountability to have an independent IG.

Importantly, this legislation also creates and authorizes a broadcast repack fund to address the anticipated

shortfall in funding available to relocate broadcasters who are displaced from the most recent spectrum auction. It is important that we provide the funding necessary to successfully relocate these broadcasters and ensure an efficient and timely transition.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to reauthorize the FCC.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WALDEN, Ranking Member PALLONE, and the committee for their hard work on this bipartisan bill.

This legislation includes my bill, H.R. 5007, the Tribal Broadband Deployment Act, which will direct the FCC to improve broadband access on Tribal lands within 30 months.

For the communities in my congressional district, California's 36th District, and throughout our Nation, this will be a game changer. Throughout the Coachella Valley, the San Jacinto Mountain communities, and the Pass regions of California, rural, underdeveloped Tribal lands are spread out among non-Tribal communities, both of which are often lacking broadband internet and both of which will benefit.

My bill will bring real resources and opportunities to these areas, improving connectivity and helping to close the digital divide in these historically underserved communities. With expanding access to the internet, families, students, workers, and businesses will be able to harness the power of their ideas and information to achieve their dreams and grow our local economies.

I want to thank Chairman BLACKBURN for honoring her commitment to work with me on this issue.

I urge the House to pass this important bipartisan bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), a very important member of our committee.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4986, RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018, named after the late Ray Baum, who dedicated his life to public service.

Mr. Speaker, this bill includes important provisions to modernize our telecommunications agencies and to craft policies that will fuel next generation services like gigabit service and 5G networks. We are going to increase access to information and services for millions of Americans with this bill, Mr. Speaker.

5G networks mean doctors can more effectively treat patients that live hours away from the closest hospital, automated vehicles can offer mobility to our Nation's most vulnerable, small or rural businesses can compete beyond their local markets, and it means that first responders can more quickly reopen critical lines of communications in the aftermath of a natural disaster.

By passing this bill, we can fully realize the benefits of an interconnected

and increasingly wireless world. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4986.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

This bill, I think, is an example of the politics and legislation that Ray Baum would be particularly proud of, characterizing his work as a policymaker and a policy adviser.

I had a chance to work with Ray in his other hats: chairing the Public Utilities Commission, as a distinguished legislator and majority leader, and, of course, his role here in Congress.

I appreciate the product we have before us today. I have enjoyed listening to people reaffirm areas that they are proud of, making a difference for people.

I appreciate, in particular, the authorization of new spending to help broadcasters' expenses relating to spectrum reallocation. This is very important, especially for public broadcasting stations.

But I want to raise one item of concern, and I hope the chairman and ranking member would work with us to look at the bill's study of spectrum for commercial uses dealing with the mid-band, or C-band, to consider public broadcasting.

I fear that if we are thrust into competitive bidding with public broadcasting, they are likely to not be able to compete effectively. But it will affect millions of people across the country.

I applaud the committee's bipartisanship and work with the Senate, but I hope that future consideration of the impact of C-band reallocation on public broadcasting would be something that the committee could look at to make sure that we are protecting those vital interests.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would concur with my friend's comments. I am happy to work on these issues involving spectrum. I know there are multiple uses around, and we want to make sure that those using these frequencies are not disadvantaged. I look forward to working with the gentleman on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. He also happens to have a pretty important title around here as the whip of the House. He has been very involved in telecommunications policies since he first came on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his leadership working together in a very bipartisan way to bring forward RAY BAUM'S Act. Not only is this piece of legislation important to reauthorize the FCC and the important work that they do, but it also is a fitting tribute

to Ray Baum himself and, in so many ways, to all of the work that our great staffs do to allow this Capitol to work properly and to allow Congress to work for the American people.

It doesn't just take Members of Congress, but an incredibly dedicated and talented staff, and each of us are blessed to have wonderful staffs—I am surely no exception—who allow us to do our jobs so well. The fact that we are using this legislation to pay tribute to Ray Baum and all of the staff of the Capitol, I think, is equally important that we do just this.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump challenged Congress to make the Federal Government more accountable to the American people and to eliminate red tape that hurts job creation and economic growth. The RAY BAUM'S Act does just that.

First of all, we meet those two goals by doing a number of things. The legislation will reauthorize the Federal Communications Commission for the first time in 28 years.

The FCC does important work for our country, especially in the telecommunications arena. I am proud to continue to serve on the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, which is one of the great examples of United States dominance—America is the dominant force in technology—and it is important that we have fair rules of the game. The FCC is that arbiter. The fact that they haven't been reauthorized for 28 years, I think, it is long past due that we get this done. We also make critical reforms that will modernize the agencies with tools that it needs to meet the demands of consumers for the 21st century.

This legislation creates an important backstop for our local radio and TV broadcasters who have been completing the final stage of the incentive auction. This keeps America on track to be the global leader on 5G communications by implementing new spectrum policy.

This is something our committee has led on. The country needs more spectrum. We have been able to find creative ways to free up more spectrum so that billions of dollars of private sector investment can be used to build out these great networks in 3G, 4G, and, now, 5G so that we can continue to advance technology.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank Chairwoman BLACKBURN for including the FCC Consolidated Reporting Act that I worked so closely on with Senator HELLER for years to try to get this legislation passed. This is included as part of this legislation. This will provide relief to so many job creators and to the FCC by consolidating and eliminating so many outdated reporting requirements.

What do I mean by eliminating outdated reporting requirements, Mr. Speaker?

How often do we hear about things that are on the books, laws that are on the books that are so outdated and so unnecessary? This is one of the reports that we are outdating in this bill.

Right now, there is still, on the books, a requirement that the FCC report on the annual competition within the telegraph industry. Mr. Speaker, that is right.

Since Samuel Morse invented the telegraph back in the 1830s, that might have been important in the 1800s, even in the early 1900s; but the fact that today, in 2018, there is still a requirement that the FCC issue a report on competition within the telegraph industry is a glaring example of why it is so important for us to update our laws and eliminate outdated laws.

We are getting rid of this ridiculous requirement and a number of other unnecessary and ridiculous requirements like that so that we can free the FCC up to do the important work they need to do.

□ 1515

So, again, I commend the chairman for the work that he has done in a very bipartisan way to bring forth the RAY BAUM'S Act, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), who has been a very important member of our committee and active on these issues, and he had a provision in this legislation as well.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to start off by remembering Ray Baum, whom this legislation is named after, very appropriately, and I thank the chairman for sharing him with us. As was correctly stated by the whip, we appreciate the staff that does so much work for us. Leaders like Ray Baum are special. He will be missed, but we will carry on in his memory and in the quality of service that he supplied.

The RAY BAUM'S Act does something that hasn't been done in over 28 years: it reauthorized the Federal Communications Commission. It is amazing to think that we have a commission as important as that and it hasn't been authorized—or reauthorized, or reauthorized. It is time to do it and bring it up to this century, as well, and beyond. This bipartisan bill is good, forward-thinking policy that modernizes the FCC to ensure it is more transparent, efficient, and able to tackle the issues of the 21st century. It maintains the credibility of spectrum auctions and the promise the FCC made to Michigan broadcasters.

It paves the way for new spectrum auctions that will allow for the United States to maintain its leadership in developing and deploying technologies such as 5G and, ultimately, win the race to 5G.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Additionally, it requires the FCC to report to Congress on its efforts to promote broadband internet access for veterans, especially low-income and rural veterans.

I would love to have broadband to my home, as well.

This bill is critical for consumers and our Nation's telecommunications infrastructure, and I urge its passage today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to say, again, that this bill is a bipartisan bill. There has been a lot of work done on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate the fact that we are able to accomplish this and also include a lot of initiatives from Members on both sides of the aisle. And, again, as a tribute to Ray Baum and all that he did for us over the many years, I am proud to say that we enthusiastically support the bill and urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from New Jersey for his good work on this legislation and his kind words in memory of our mutual friend, Ray Baum.

I think it would be appropriate, as well, to thank the staff who put so much work into this, including Robin Colwell, Tim Kurth, Sean Farrell, Lauren McCarty, Evan Viau, and Elena Hernandez on the Republican side, and David Goldman, Gerald Leverich, and Dan Miller on the minority side. We thank all of them for working both here and on the Senate side.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to quickly go through the provisions again, because this really is important.

For more than a quarter of a century, the FCC has not been reauthorized. We do that here, thanks to Chairwoman BLACKBURN's legislation.

Second, we take care of our broadcasters, both public and private, and their translators, including FM translators as well as public broadcasting.

Mr. PALLONE has been a long champion of the repack effort and, of course, his SANDY legislation.

You heard from Mr. SCALISE on the legislation to consolidate redundant and outdated FCC reports: get rid of the ones we don't need, streamline the rest, and bring efficiency.

Mr. JOHNSON's legislation to establish an independent inspector general at the FCC, this is just good government we can all embrace.

Congresswoman MIMI WALTERS' legislation gives the chief information officer of the FCC the authority to play a significant role in planning, budgeting, and programming.

Congresswoman GRACE MENG's bill to prohibit spoofing calls or texts originating outside the U.S., plus an 18-month shot clock, is put on the FCC to

conduct rulemaking in this matter. I think we are all kind of getting tired of those spoofs we get on our phones. It looks like they are coming from our hometowns, and it turns out they are not. We are going to try to get to the bottom of this and have the FCC work to do that.

Congressman GUTHRIE and Congresswoman MATSUI's bill to include a spectrum auction deposit fix, this will actually allow future actions to go forward legally. They couldn't do that under existing law because of an interpretation, and so we fixed that. That was very, very important.

Congressmen MCNERNEY and KINZINGER's legislation to require the FCC to report to Congress on promoting internet excess for veterans, we all know how important that is, especially those low-income veterans in our rural communities.

Congressman LOEBSACK's legislation to improve mapping methodology for mobile coverage, we need to know where we have service in America and where we don't and have numbers we can trust.

Representative RUIZ's legislation is very, very important, dealing with broadband in Tribal areas and carrying out rulemaking to address unserved Tribal areas. We have lots of Tribal areas in our country that lack service.

ANNA ESHOO's legislation to provide further improvements on 911 caller information that builds on Kari's Law that we have already approved, that is really, really important.

And, again, ELIOT ENGEL's legislation requires the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, the NTIA, to study and consider how the agency can best coordinate the interagency process following cybersecurity incidents.

It just goes on and on, including Senator THUNE's MOBILE NOW Act that will help us move forward on 5G.

So, as you can see, this is comprehensive, thoughtful, well-written legislation on telecommunications, moves our country forward, reauthorizes the FCC, and is a fitting tribute to my friend and our policy leader, Mr. Ray Baum from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act, the first FCC reauthorization in 28 years, named for our dear friend, the late Ray Baum.

This bill is the product of many long hours of hard work to achieve a bipartisan, bicameral compromise. While no bill is perfect, this legislation contains many solid policy advancements for digital communications in the 21st century.

I'm especially glad to see two bills I've championed for many years included in this package, 'Dig Once' which I first introduced in 2009, and the RESPONSE Act, which I first introduced in 2010. Broadband is essential for every community in our country to function today, just as the physical roads and bridges we travel on are. For nearly a decade, I've

been pushing for a 'Dig Once' policy, a commonsense proposal to ensure broadband conduit is included in the buildout of roads and highways when they're being built and where there's a demonstrated need for broadband access, rather than tearing up roads later. Dig Once will enable states to make it easier for broadband providers to enter new and underserved markets by laying the broadband conduit during construction.

H.R. 4986 also includes the RESPONSE Act that ensures that multi-line telephones commonly found in office buildings and hotels are equipped with location accuracy technologies. This is essential for responders to locate a 911 caller in a large building as quickly as possible because lives are literally on the line and every second counts. This provision will help save lives.

I'm disappointed that the FCC Collaboration Act was excluded from the final version of H.R. 4986. This is another bipartisan, commonsense proposal that I have consistently introduced since 2009. It passed out of the Communications and Technology subcommittee, the full Energy and Commerce committee, and previously passed the full House, all with bipartisan support. All of the former Democratic and Republican FCC members have supported this policy one hundred percent. It's unfortunate that despite such broad support, this provision was stripped from the final bill despite our work in Committee.

I also want to express my concerns about some parts of the bill which consolidate the FCC's reporting on issues like price hikes, competition, and program diversity, and the scaling back of provisions on critical unlicensed spectrum. I worry that we'll regret weakening these public interest policies. Nonetheless, I support H.R. 4986 as a set of largely positive developments for consumers, policymakers, and many other stakeholders in the communications marketplace. I want to thank Chairman Walden for his hard work on this, and urge my colleagues to vote YES on H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4986, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reauthorize appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLITICAL APPOINTEE BURROWING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1132) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a 2-year prohibition on employment in a career civil service position for any former political appointee, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1132

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 "Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act".

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON EMPLOYMENT OF POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN CAREER CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 3115. Employment of political appointees

"(a) APPOINTMENT APPROVAL REQUIRED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not appoint any individual described in paragraph (5) to a career position within the agency without receiving prior written approval from the Associate Director of Merit Systems Accountability and Compliance, consistent with the requirements of this subsection.

"(2) REQUEST.—The head of an agency shall submit a request to the Associate Director to approve the appointment of any individual described in paragraph (5) to a career position. Any such request shall include certification by the head of the agency to the Associate Director that the appointment is necessary for the agency to meet its mission.

"(3) REVIEW AND DETERMINATION.—The Associate Director shall review any request received pursuant to paragraph (2) and deny any such request unless the Associate Director determines that the appointment process with respect to the request was fair, open, and free from political influence. If the Associate Director makes that determination, the Associate Director may approve the request.

"(4) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—With respect to any request approved under paragraph (3), the Associate Director shall, not less than five days before the date the Associate Director provides approval to the head of the requesting agency, provide to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate the agency certification under paragraph (2) and the agency head's rationale for that certification.

"(5) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—An individual described in this paragraph is—

"(A) a political appointee;

"(B) a former political appointee who held any political position during the five-year period before the date of the request described in paragraph (2); or

"(C) at the discretion of the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, a former political appointee who held any political position before the five-year period described in subparagraph (B).

"(b) RESTRICTION ON APPOINTMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other law, rule, or regulation, during the 2-year period following the date a political appointee leaves or departs from a political position, such appointee may not be appointed to any career position in the civil service.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a political appointee who has not personally and substantially participated in any particular matter while employed in a political position.

"(c) APPLICATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to restrict the appointment of an individual who is—

"(1) entitled to reinstatement under section 3593(b); or

"(2) eligible for reinstatement under section 3593(a).

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency’ has the meaning given the term ‘Executive agency’ in section 105;

“(2) the term ‘Associate Director’ means the Associate Director of Merit Systems Accountability and Compliance at the Office of Personnel Management;

“(3) the term ‘political appointee’ means an individual serving in an appointment of any duration to a political position;

“(4) the term ‘political position’ means—

“(A) a position with respect to which appointment is made—

“(i) by the President; or

“(ii) by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

“(B) a position which has been excepted from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character;

“(C) a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 (relating to the Executive Schedule); and

“(D) a general position in the Senior Executive Service during such time as it is filled by—

“(i) a noncareer appointee, as defined in paragraph (7) of section 3132(a); or

“(ii) a limited term appointee or limited emergency appointee, as defined in paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 3132(a), who is serving under a political appointment.

“(5) the term ‘career position’ means—

“(A) a position in the competitive service filled by career or career-conditional appointment;

“(B) a position in the excepted service filled by an appointment of equivalent tenure as a position described in subparagraph (A);

“(C) a career reserved position, as defined in paragraph (8) of section 3132(a), in the Senior Executive Service; or

“(D) a general position in the Senior Executive Service when filled by a career appointee, as defined in section 3132(a)(4);

“(6) the term ‘participated’ means an action taken as an officer or employee through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or other such action; and

“(7) the term ‘particular matter’ includes any investigation, application, request for a ruling or determination, rulemaking, contract, controversy, claim, charge, accusation, arrest, or judicial or other proceeding.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 3114 the following:

“3115. Employment of political appointees.”.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) APPOINTMENT REQUESTS.—Section 3115(a) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to any appointment or request for appointment described in such section submitted to the Associate Director of Merit Systems Accountability and Compliance after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENTS.—Section 3115(b) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to any individual who leaves or departs from a political position (as that term is defined in section 3115(c)(2) of such title, as added by such subsection) after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue regulations necessary to carry out this Act. Such regulations shall include guidance on the definition of the term “personally and substantially participated in a particular matter” in section 3115(b)(2) of title 5, United

States Code, as added by subsection (a), consistent with section 2641.201 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1132, the Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, Representative BUCK.

This important bill will protect the integrity of the civil service and ensure the American people are served by a competent, nonpolitical career workforce.

Under current law, each administration appoints a political staff to help advance the administration's political goals. These political employees leave at the end of the administration to make way for the next administration's appointees.

In contrast, the career civil service is designed to carry over from administration to administration. These employees should be hired based on their qualifications and promoted based on their performance. Despite the significant differences between the two types of positions, however, political appointees are currently allowed to convert to career positions. This practice is known as “burrowing.”

As the Government Accountability Office explained: “Circumstances surrounding conversions can raise questions as to whether the individuals selected experienced favoritism or enjoyed an unfair advantage in the selection process.”

GAO went on to say: “Any appearance of this could compromise the merit system's integrity.”

H.R. 1132, the Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act, will enact in law the requirement for OPM to review political conversions.

The bill also raises the bar for political conversions, requiring an agency certify the conversion is necessary to meet its mission. To ensure Congress can continue to monitor for abuse, the certification must be provided to Congress before it is approved.

Finally, the bill prohibits political conversions within 2 years of leaving a political appointment. This ensures sufficient time has passed between when political appointees finish their appointment and when they may become a career employee.

In closing, this bill protects the integrity of the merit-based system so career politicians stay free of politics. The American people deserve nothing less.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is H.R. 1132, the Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act, as amended.

I want to thank my friends on the majority for working with us to improve this bill since its consideration by the committee. Because of the improvements we have been able to make, I support moving this bill forward in the legislative process; however, I continue to believe that some further changes may be needed.

The bill would make it very difficult to hire former political appointees into career positions in the Federal Government. It would prohibit hiring a former political appointee into a career position for 2 years after that individual held a political position.

It would also add significant hurdles for agencies seeking to hire an applicant to a career position who separated from a political appointment in the last 5 years. The agency would be required to certify to the Office of Personnel Management that the appointment is “necessary to the agency's ability to meet its mission.”

There are several controls already in place to ensure that the process used to hire former political appointees into career positions is fair, open, and based on merit. For example, the Office of Personnel Management must ensure, right now, that the appointment process was free from political influence and report the results of its reviews to Congress.

A February 2017 report found that OPM reviewed just 16 requests by agencies to hire former political appointees from October 1, 2016, through January 20, 2017, and did not find any reason to deny any of those requests.

We all want the best people in the Federal service, and there should be no undue favoritism in the hiring process.

In comments on this bill, OPM suggested that certain provisions may conflict with the merit system principles that have formed the basis of the Federal civil service for over a century. That issue should be clarified before this bill becomes enacted into law.

Nonetheless, we support the spirit with which the bill is offered us today, and we have no objections to the legislation in front of us.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK), the sponsor of the bill and my esteemed colleague.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for the time today to talk about this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on behalf of the Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act. This important legislation addresses a problem affecting our Federal workforce.

Our Federal civil service hiring process is supposed to be a competitive, merit-based system where the best and brightest individuals are considered based on their qualifications and ability to do their job, not because of their political connections. However, we have seen a concerning trend where expected service employees, specifically political appointees, are converted into high-paying, lifelong civil service positions, bypassing the normal competitive hiring process.

This process, also known as “burrowing,” defeats the purpose of having a nonpartisan, merit-based civil service. In fact, the Government Accountability Office reports that the Obama administration converted 78 political appointments into career positions, while the Bush administration allowed 135 political appointees to burrow into career positions.

This trend raises significant concerns that individuals who were not chosen based solely on their merits may, at best, not be the most qualified candidate for the job, or, at worst, may not be willing to properly execute the law under a new administration.

□ 1530

Political appointees are supposed to serve their appointing President's agenda for a temporary period of time. Part of their duty to the Nation is to know when it is time to step down from their position of power.

Congress must act to ensure this principle is upheld and to protect the independence of our merit-based civil service. That is why I, along with my friend and colleague, Representative TED LIEU, have offered an equitable solution to ensure this problem is stopped in its tracks.

Our bill, the Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act, places a 2-year ban on political appointees being hired for any job in the civil service after they depart a political position.

Additionally, the bill ensures that after the 2-year ban is completed, the head of the agency seeking to employ the individual must submit a written request to OPM detailing why hiring a former appointee is necessary to the agency's mission.

Furthermore, OPM is instructed to deny the application unless the agency head can prove why it is necessary to hire this individual instead of an applicant from the merit-based hiring pool.

This commonsense bill ensures that our Federal workforce is filled with career civil servants who are the most qualified, not the most politically connected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation that ensures our Federal workforce is being selected by merit, not by political patronage.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do support the bill in the spirit in which this bill is offered. I think we want to make sure we preserve the integrity of the civil service system that we have worked so hard to build in this country, where we build in integrity and we avoid nepotism and favoritism and political connections over merit.

One caveat, though, as I mentioned: once in a while, there may be a political appointee who is the best thing since sliced bread, who brings a level of expertise that we need, and we don't want to make it harder to look at those credentials on their merits. I know that is not the intention of the bill, but it may be one of the unintended consequences, and that is what we want to just make sure we are not doing as we move forward, but with that, I support the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1132, 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.

SOCIAL MEDIA USE IN CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS ACT OF 2017

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3737) to provide for a study on the use of social media in security clearance investigations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3737

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 “Social Media Use in Clearance Investigations Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. STUDY ON USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA IN SECURITY CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report on the examination of social media activity during security clearance investigations, including—

(1) the current use of publicly available social media in security clearance background investigations;

(2) any legal impediments to examining publicly available social media activity, and whether those impediments are statutory or regulatory in nature;

(3) the results of any pilot programs to incorporate social media checks in such investigations, including the effectiveness and cost of such programs;

(4) options for widespread implementation of the examination of social media activity during such investigations; and

(5) estimates on the cost for such options as part of—

(A) all Top Secret investigations; or

(B) all Secret and Top Secret investigations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3737, the Social Media Use in Clearance Investigations Act of 2017, introduced by the gentleman from Florida, Representative DESANTIS.

According to the Pew Research Center, 7 in 10 Americans use social media today. A significant portion of those Americans' personal and professional interactions occur online. It is just common sense that the government should check the social media of individuals who apply for security clearances, but it doesn't.

H.R. 3737 will move the government toward implementing checks of social media for individuals we trust with our country's most sensitive information.

The bill requires a study of the use of social media in security clearance investigations to inform government-wide implementation of social media checks. The study will provide comprehensive information on existing pilot programs, lessons learned, and costs.

We must begin the process of strengthening the system now, and that starts with determining best practices for moving forward.

H.R. 3737 will help ensure that government checks social media before issuing security clearances.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is long overdue and recognizes the internet world in which we live and operate.

This bill would require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to issue a report to Congress on the use of social media checks in background investigations for security clearances.

In recent years, a number of agencies have begun pilot programs to help develop the best methods of incorporating social media into those background checks. For example, the Army initiated a pilot program that found that while checking social media is a

valuable tool, it can be costly and may raise some legal issues.

This bill would require that OPM conduct a comprehensive study on those issues and report back to the Congress. This one-time report would describe the current uses of social media postings for investigative purposes and any legal concerns or impediments that may arise. In addition, the report would summarize the results of any pilot programs on the use of social media conducted to date and provide cost estimates for implementing their widespread use in background investigative processes.

The report would greatly assist Congress, I believe, in determining whether further legislative action is needed when it comes to the Federal Government's use of social media in background investigations.

This bill was approved without opposition by our committee, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, last year, and I certainly commend it to our colleagues today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. LYNCH for their leadership on what I think is a common-sense measure that will actually improve the process.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the private sector, if an employer is going to hire somebody, a lot of times they will do a Google search, they will check social media postings to try to learn a little bit more about this prospective employee.

It may be hard to believe, but the Federal Government often fails to conduct a simple internet search on individuals before they are trusted with a security clearance.

Publicly available social media is one of the best ways to understand an individual's interests and intentions, but our investigatory process still focuses on interviewing the applicant's family, friends, and neighbors. For over a decade, various agencies, including the Office of Personnel Management, have conducted studies and pilot programs to assess the effectiveness of social media checks in security clearance investigations. Congress has not been provided those results.

What this bill will do is it will require these agencies to identify best practices so that we can use this going forward to make sure that the people who are employed by this government, armed with a security clearance, who have access to sensitive information that puts the security of the country at risk, that these are people whom we want to have there and they are not folks who have ulterior designs.

A lot of times it is going to be much more informative to look at their publicly available writings than to talk to somebody who may have lived next

door to them in an apartment 10 years ago.

I think that this bill is overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) for co-sponsoring it for me, and I am proud to be here today as the sponsor. I think this should have bipartisan support. I think it will give us some good answers and we can move forward and modernize this process.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, we think this is a commonsense bill. I agree with the sentiments just expressed by our friend from Florida that, in today's day and age, we can't not take cognizance of social media, and it can be a useful tool in evaluating someone's security clearance application.

We also understand it could be a tool that is used to invade people's privacy, and we want to avoid that. That is why what this bill does is call for a report looking at all of the legal ramifications and the practicality of utilizing this tool to get to a better outcome in the process of security clearances.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and commend it to our colleagues.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3737.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4043) to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to reauthorize the whistleblower protection program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4043

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 "Whistleblower Protection Extension Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) by striking "Ombudsman who shall educate agency employees—" and inserting the following: "Coordinator who shall—

"(i) educate agency employees—";

(C) in subclause (I), as so redesignated, by striking "on retaliation" and inserting "against retaliation";

(D) in subclause (II), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: "; including—

"(aa) the means by which employees may seek review of any allegation of reprisal, including the roles of the Office of the Inspector General, the Office of Special Counsel, the Merit Systems Protection Board, and any other relevant entities; and

"(bb) general information about the timeliness of such cases, the availability of any alternative dispute mechanisms, and avenues for potential relief.""; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) assist the Inspector General in promoting the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures and allegations of reprisal, to the extent practicable, by the Inspector General; and

"(iii) assist the Inspector General in facilitating communication and coordination with the Special Counsel, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, the agency, Congress, and any other relevant entity regarding the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures, allegations of reprisal, and general matters regarding the implementation and administration of whistleblower protection laws, rules, and regulations."";

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "Ombudsman" and inserting "Coordinator";

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

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

"(3) The Whistleblower Protection Coordinator shall have direct access to the Inspector General as needed to accomplish the requirements of this subsection."

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CIGIE.—Section 11(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.—The Council shall—

"(A) facilitate the work of the Whistleblower Protection Coordinators designated under section 3(d)(C); and

"(B) in consultation with the Office of Special Counsel and Whistleblower Protection Coordinators from the member offices of the Inspector General, develop best practices for coordination and communication in promoting the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures, allegations of reprisal, and general matters regarding the implementation and administration of whistleblower protection laws, in accordance with Federal law."

(c) REPORTING.—Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by amending paragraph (20) to read as follows:

"(20)(A) a detailed description of any instance of whistleblower retaliation, including information about the official found to have engaged in retaliation; and

"(B) what, if any, consequences the establishment actually imposed to hold the official described in subparagraph (A) accountable;" and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(D), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

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

"(4) whether the establishment entered into a settlement agreement with the official described in subsection (a)(20)(A), which shall be reported regardless of any confidentiality agreement relating to the settlement agreement; and"

(d) REPEAL OF SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 117 of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-199; 126 Stat. 1475) is repealed.

(2) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on November 26, 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4043, the Whistleblower Protection Extension Act, a bill I introduced with Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

The Whistleblower Protection Extension Act reauthorizes the whistleblower ombudsman program.

Whistleblowers are the front line of defense against waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government, but too many Federal employees are unaware of the laws that protect them and the options available for dealing with retaliation and other actions intended to silence them.

To address this problem, Congress created the ombudsman program in 2012. The program directs agency inspectors general to designate an ombudsman for whistleblower protections at the agency. They provide information to employees on whistleblower protections and remedies in the event of retaliation.

This program was originally a component of the 2012 Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act and was set to expire after 5 years. Over the past 5 years, the ombudsman program has received high marks from the inspector general community. This benefits the country as a whole and makes the Federal Government more efficient. For that reason, it is imperative that we pass H.R. 4043 and make the ombudsman program permanent.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the need for this bill comes into recent focus just today with reports, maybe unconfirmed, that one of the Trump Cabinet members is engaged in a witch hunt against a whistleblower. We need this kind of protection.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4043, the Whistleblower Protection Extension Act.

Representative BLUM and Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS introduced this bill to extend the pilot program that requires every inspector general's office to have a liaison dedicated to assisting whistleblowers.

Under this legislation, the whistleblower protection coordinator would help educate agency employees about whistleblower protection laws. This bill would help employees who want to blow the whistle know their rights, and it would put agency management on notice that it is against the law to retaliate against whistleblowers.

This bill would require whistleblower protection coordinators to provide whistleblowers who have suffered retaliation information about options available to them to have their allegations evaluated.

□ 1545

No matter how strong we make our whistleblower protection laws, they will not help if whistleblowers do not know how to exercise their rights under those laws.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bipartisan measure to strengthen whistleblower protections. I urge passage of this commonsense bill, this good government bill coming out of our committee. I thank my friend from Iowa for collaborating with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) on this commonsense piece of legislation, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4043, 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.

ELIMINATING GOVERNMENT-FUNDED OIL-PAINTING ACT

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 188) to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 188

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 "Eliminating Government-funded Oil-painting Act" or the "EGO Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PORTRAITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1355. Prohibition on use of funds for portraits"

"(a) No funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Federal Government may be used to pay for the painting of a portrait of an officer or employee of the Federal Government, including the President, the Vice President, a Member of Congress, the head of an executive agency, or the head of an office of the legislative branch.

"(b) In this section—

"(1) the term 'executive agency' has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41; and

"(2) the term 'Member of Congress' includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter III of chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1354 the following new item:

"1355. Prohibition on use of funds for portraits."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration, including an exchange of letters on the House companion bill, H.R. 1701, between the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on House Administration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 188, the Eliminating Government-Funded Oil-Painting Act, a bill introduced by Senator BILL CASSIDY. In years past, the Federal Government spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on portraits of government officials. Taxpayer funds should be invested in programs that benefit taxpayers and our country, not oil paintings of Cabinet members to boost their egos.

That is why today we consider S. 188, the Eliminating Government-Funded Oil-Painting Act, otherwise known as the "EGO Act." The EGO Act makes clear, once and for all, that government agencies cannot spend taxpayer dollars on oil paintings.

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

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, December 6, 2017.

Hon. GREGG HARPER, Chairman, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On September 13, 2017, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 1701,

the “Eliminating Government-funded Oil-painting Act” with an amendment, by voice vote. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on House Administration.

I ask that you allow the Committee on House Administration to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on House Administration represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, December 6, 2017.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1701. As you know, the bill was received in the House of Representatives on March 23, 2017, and referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and in addition to the Committee on the Committee on House Administration. The bill seeks to restrict funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Federal Government from being used to pay for the painting of a portrait of an officer or employee of the Federal Government, including the President, the Vice President, a Member of Congress, the head of an executive agency, or the head of an office of the legislative branch. On September 13, 2017, your Committee ordered H.R. 1701 to be reported with an amendment by voice vote.

I realize that discharging the Committee on House Administration from further consideration of H.R. 1701 will serve in the best interest of the House of Representatives and agree to do so. It is the understanding of the Committee on House Administration that forgoing action on H.R. 1701 will not prejudice the Committee with respect to appointment of conferees or any future jurisdictional claim. I request that your letter and this response be included in the bill report filed by your Committee, as well as in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

GREGG HARPER,
Chairman.

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

This is a sad day in the swamp, to eliminate oil paintings of men and women who consider themselves very important, to make sure that taxpayer funds are never used for such a thing; sad day for the swamp in Washington.

One can come to the Capitol and look at oil paintings that bestride every corridor and wall, in hearing rooms here in the Capitol, and not know most of these people. We haven't got a clue who most of them are. We recognize John Adams, but when we go to committee hearing rooms, one or two chairmen past, we often don't know who they are.

I guess it was an attempt to achieve immortality, but it really is an act of ego that is a little embarrassing, even for Washington, D.C.

This is an important bill, a common-sense bill, that brings us all back to Earth; that none of us is expendable and that, frankly, we make our contribution and we move on.

This bill strikes at the uncontrolled egos and, I hope, sends a message to those narcissists among us that they can stay that way if they wish, but the taxpayer is not going to pay for their oil painting.

I thank my friend from Iowa for bringing up the bill. I support the bill, and urge its passage.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the gentleman from Virginia aware that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close. I enjoy my colleague from Virginia's rather dry sense of wit and humor.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Iowa, with whom I share a dry sense of humor. I will remind him, being Irish, that leprechauns are always on the shoulder, especially this time of year.

Mr. Speaker, I like this bill. I think most taxpayers are going to like this bill. I think it is high time we acted on this kind of improvement and injected a sense of humility and humanity into our enterprise here in the United States Capitol. I urge passage of this bill.

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

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 188, the Eliminating Government-funded Oil-painting Act, an acronym for the EGO Act.

S. 188 is the Senate companion to H.R. 1401, legislation that I introduced along with Representatives JIM BRIDENSTINE, CHERI BUSTOS, WALTER JONES, LEONARD LANCE, DAVID MCKINLEY, PETE OLSON, and TOM RICE.

My friend and former House colleague, Senator BILL CASSIDY, is the lead sponsor of S. 188 which passed the Senate unanimously on September 18, 2017.

The EGO Act would prohibit Federal funds from being used to pay for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government. Federal agencies have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on portraits that are displayed within agency buildings, often in secure locations that are not open to the public. Although this money is only a fraction of a percentage of the federal budget, it represents a failure to exercise fiscal restraint. Every dollar the government spends on vanity projects for federal officials is a dollar that is not spent improving the lives of everyday Americans.

Congress has the responsibility to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being used efficiently and effectively. For these reasons, I am proud to sponsor the EGO Act, and urge the House

to pass S. 188, sending it to the President's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 188, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “An Act to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 4607; and

Passage of H.R. 4607, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on 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, offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 228, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—182

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

Davis, Danny	Kind	Quigley	Meadows	Rohrabacher	Tenney	Davidson	Kelly (MS)	Roby
DeGette	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin	Meehan	Rokita	Thompson (PA)	Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Delaney	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)	Messer	Rooney, Francis	Thornberry	Delaney	Kilmer	Rogers (AL)
DeLauro	Langevin	Richmond	Mitchell	Rooney, Thomas J.	Tipton	Denham	Kind	Rogers (KY)
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Rosen	Moolenaar	Ros-Lehtinen	Trott	Dent	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Demings	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard	Mooney (WV)	Roskam	Turner	DeSantis	King (NY)	Rokita
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Ruiz	Mullin	Ross	Upton	DesJarlais	Kinzinger	Rooney, Francis
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Ruppersberger	Newhouse	Rothfus	Valadao	Diaz-Balart	Knight	Rooney, Thomas J.
Dingell	Lee	Rush	Noem	Rouzer	Wagner	Donovan	Kustoff (TN)	Ros-Lehtinen
Doggett	Levin	Ryan (OH)	Norman	Royce (CA)	Walberg	Duffy	Labrador	Rosen
Doyle, Michael F.	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez	Nunes	Russell	Walden	Duncan (SC)	LaHood	Roskam
Ellison	Lipinski	Sarbanes	Palazzo	Rutherford	Walker	Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Ross
Engel	Loeb	Schakowsky	Palmer	Sanford	Walorski	Dunn	Lamborn	Rothfus
Eshoo	Lofgren	Schiff	Paulsen	Schweikert	Walters, Mimi	Emmer	Lance	Rouzer
Espallat	Lowenthal	Schneider	Perry	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)	Estes (KS)	Latta	Royce (CA)
Esty (CT)	Lowe	Schrader	Peterson	Sensenbrenner	Webster (FL)	Esty (CT)	Lewis (MN)	Ruppersberger
Evans	Lujan Grisham, M.	Scott (VA)	Pittenger	Sessions	Wenstrup	Farenthold	LoBiondo	Russell
Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray	Scott, David	Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Westerman	Faso	LoBiondo	Rutherford
Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Serrano	Poliquin	Shuster	Williams	Ferguson	Loeb	Sanford
Fudge	Maloney	Sewell (AL)	Posey	Simpson	Wilson (SC)	Fitzpatrick	Long	Schneider
Gabbard	Carolyn B.	Sherman	Ratcliffe	Smith (MO)	Wittman	Fleischmann	Loudermilk	Schneider
Gallo	Maloney, Sean	Sinema	Reed	Smith (NE)	Womack	Flores	Love	Schweikert
Garamendi	Matsui	Sires	Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Woodall	Fortenberry	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Gomez	McCollum	Slaughter	Renacci	Smith (TX)	Yoder	Fox	Luetkemeyer	Scott, David
Gonzalez (TX)	McEachin	Smith (WA)	Rice (SC)	Smucker	Yoho	Frelinghuysen	Lujan Grisham, M.	Sensenbrenner
Gottheimer	McGovern	Soto	Roe (TN)	Stefanik	Young (AK)	Gaetz	MacArthur	Sessions
Green, Al	McNerney	Speier	Rogers (AL)	Stewart	Young (IA)	Gallagher	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Grijalva	Meeks	Suozi	Rogers (KY)	Taylor	Zeldin	Garrett	Marino	Shimkus
Gutiérrez	Meng	Swalwell (CA)				Gianforte	Marshall	Shuster
Hanabusa	Moore	Takano				Gibbs	Massie	Simpson
Hastings	Moulton	Thompson (CA)	Burgess	Jackson Lee	Polis	Gonzalez (TX)	Mast	Sinema
Heck	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)	Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Scalise	Goodlatte	McCarthy	Smith (MO)
Higgins (NY)	Nadler	Titus	Cramer	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter	Gosar	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Himes	Napolitano	Tonko	Cummings	Marchant	Stivers	Gottheimer	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Hoyer	Neal	Torres	DeFazio	Nolan	Veasey	Gowdy	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Huffman	Norcross	Tsongas	Gohmert	Olson	Walz	Granger	McKinley	Smucker
Jayapal	O'Halleran	Vargas	Green, Gene	Pearce		Graves (GA)	McMorris	Stefanik
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Vela				Graves (LA)	Rodgers	Stewart
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Velázquez				Graves (MO)	McSally	Suozi
Jones	Panetta	Visclosky				Griffith	Meadows	Taylor
Kaptur	Pascrell	Wasserman				Grothman	Meehan	Tenney
Keating	Payne	Schultz				Guthrie	Handel	Thompson (PA)
Kelly (IL)	Pelosi	Waters, Maxine				Harper	Messer	Thornberry
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Watson Coleman				Harris	Mitchell	Tipton
Khanna	Peters	Welch				Hartzler	Moolenaar	Trott
Kihuen	Pingree	Wilson (FL)				Heck	Mooney (WV)	Turner
Kildee	Pocan	Yarmuth				Hensarling	Moulton	Upton
Kilmer	Price (NC)					Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Valadao
						Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (FL)	Vela
						Higgins (LA)	Newhouse	Wagner
						Hill	Noem	Walberg
						Himes	Norman	Walden
						Holding	Nunes	Walker
						Hollingsworth	O'Halleran	Walorski
						Hudson	Palazzo	Walters, Mimi
						Huizenga	Palmer	Weber (TX)
						Hultgren	Paulsen	Webster (FL)
						Hunter	Perlmutter	Wenstrup
						Hurd	Perry	Westerman
						Issa	Peters	Williams
						Jenkins (KS)	Peterson	Wilson (SC)
						Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger	Wittman
						Johnson (LA)	Poliquin	Womack
						Johnson (OH)	Posey	Woodall
						Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe	Yoder
						Jones	Reed	Yoho
						Jordan	Reichert	Young (AK)
						Joyce (OH)	Renacci	Young (IA)
						Katko	Rice (NY)	Zeldin
							Rice (SC)	

NOT VOTING—20

□ 1617

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, YOHO, RENACCI, BRIDENSTINE, COLLINS of New York, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. MULLIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. NORCROSS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

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. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 143, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—264

Abraham	Davidson	Hollingsworth	Abraham	Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Adams	Courtney	Green, Al
Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Hudson	Aderholt	Blackburn	Chabot	Barragán	Crist	Grijalva
Allen	Denham	Huizenga	Blum	Cheney	Bass	Beatty	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Amash	Dent	Hultgren	Allen	Coffman	Beyer	Davis (CA)	Davis, Danny	Hanabusa
Amodei	DeSantis	Hunter	Amash	Cole	Blumenauer	DeGette	DeLauro	Hastings
Arrington	DesJarlais	Hurd	Amodei	Collins (GA)	Bonamici	Demings	DelBene	Higgins (NY)
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Issa	Arrington	Collins (NY)	Boyle, Brendan F.	DeSaulnier	F.	Hoyer
Bacon	Donovan	Jenkins (KS)	Babin	Comstock	Brady (PA)	DeSaulnier	Demings	Jeffries
Banks (IN)	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)	Bacon	Conaway	Brown (MD)	DeSaulnier	DeSaulnier	Johnson (GA)
Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (LA)	Banks (IN)	Cook	Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	DeSaulnier	Keating
Barr	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)	Barletta	Cole	Butterfield	Dingell	Dingell	Kaptur
Barton	Dunn	Johnson, Sam	Barton	Cooper	Capuano	Doggett	Doggett	Keating
Bergman	Emmer	Jordan	Barton	Correa	Cárdenas	Doyle, Michael F.	Doyle, Michael F.	Kelly (IL)
Biggs	Estes (KS)	Joyce (OH)	Bera	Costa	Carson (IN)	Ellison	Ellison	Kennedy
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Katko	Bergman	Costello (PA)	Cartwright	Engel	Engel	Khanna
Bishop (MI)	Faso	Kelly (MS)	Biggs	Crawford	Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Eshoo	Kihuen
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	Kelly (PA)	Bilirakis	Cuellar	Castro (TX)	Espallat	Espallat	Kildee
Black	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)	Bishop (GA)	Culberson	Castro (TX)	Evans	Evans	Krishnamoorthi
Blackburn	Fleischmann	King (NY)	Bishop (MI)	Curtis	Chu, Judy	Foster	Foster	Langevin
Bost	Flores	Kinzinger			Cicilline	Frankel (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Knight			Clark (MA)	Fudge	Fudge	Lawrence
Brat	Fox	Kustoff (TN)			Clarke (NY)	Gabbard	Gabbard	Lawson (FL)
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Labrador			Clay	Gallo	Gallo	Lee
Brooks (AL)	Gaetz	LaHood			Cohen	Garamendi	Garamendi	Levin
Brooks (IN)	Gallagher	LaMalfa			Connolly	Gomez	Gomez	Lewis (GA)
Buchanan	Garrett	Lamborn						
Buck	Gianforte	Lance						
Bucshon	Gibbs	Latta						
Budd	Goodlatte	Lewis (MN)						
Byrne	Gosar	LoBiondo						
Calvert	Gowdy	Long						
Carter (GA)	Granger	Loudermilk						
Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Love						
Chabot	Graves (LA)	Lucas						
Cheney	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer						
Coffman	Griffith	MacArthur						
Cole	Grothman	Marino						
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	Marshall						
Collins (NY)	Handel	Massie						
Comer	Harper	Mast						
Comstock	Harris	McCarthy						
Conaway	Hartzer	McCaul						
Cook	Hensarling	McClintock						
Costello (PA)	Herrera Beutler	McHenry						
Crawford	Hice, Jody B.	McKinley						
Culberson	Higgins (LA)	McMorris						
Curbelo (FL)	Hill	Rodgers						
Curtis	Holding	McSally						

NAYS—143

Adams	Courtney	Green, Al
Barragán	Crist	Grijalva
Bass	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Hastings
Blumenauer	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Bonamici	DeLauro	Hoyer
Boyle, Brendan F.	DelBene	Huffman
Brady (PA)	Demings	Jayapal
Brown (MD)	DeSaulnier	Jeffries
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Keating
Capuano	Dingell	Kaptur
Cárdenas	Doggett	Keating
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael F.	Kelly (IL)
Cartwright	Ellison	Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Engel	Khanna
Castro (TX)	Eshoo	Kihuen
Chu, Judy	Espallat	Kildee
Cicilline	Evans	Krishnamoorthi
Clark (MA)	Foster	Langevin
Clarke (NY)	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Clay	Fudge	Lawrence
Clyburn	Gabbard	Lawson (FL)
Cohen	Gallo	Lee
Connolly	Garamendi	Levin
	Gomez	Lewis (GA)

Lipinski	Panetta	Slaughter
Lofgren	Pascarell	Smith (WA)
Lowenthal	Payne	Soto
Lowey	Pelosi	Speier
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pingree	Swalwell (CA)
Lynch	Pocan	Takano
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Carolyn B.	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Matsui	Raskin	Titus
McCollum	Richmond	Tonko
McEachin	Roybal-Allard	Torres
McGovern	Ruiz	Tsongas
McNerney	Rush	Vargas
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez
Meng	Sanchez	Visclosky
Moore	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Nadler	Schakowsky	Schultz
Napolitano	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Neal	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Norcross	Serrano	Welch
O'Rourke	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Sires	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Black	Green, Gene	Poe (TX)
Burgess	Jackson Lee	Polis
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Scalise
Cramer	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Marchant	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Nolan	Veasey
DeFazio	Olson	Waltz
Gohmert	Pearce	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1625

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. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 95.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 94 and "yea" on rollcall No. 95.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

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

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I, Val Butler Demings, am submitting my resignation from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in compliance with the Rules of the Democratic Caucus. It has been a privilege and honor to have served on this Committee.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

VAL BUTLER DEMINGS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 764

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Gomez (to rank immediately after Mr. Raskin), Mr. Welch, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. DeSaulnier, Ms. Plaskett, and Mr. Sarbanes.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

HONORING MARVIN KAHN, FLORIDA CITRUS GROWER

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when you drive through Florida's heartland in Highlands County, you will probably see signs that say "Kahn Groves," and then you will drive through miles of citrus groves.

Marvin Kahn has been a passionate advocate for citrus over the last five decades, leading his management company from managing 400 acres to over 5,500 acres at its peak.

Mr. Kahn is one of the State's most innovative growers, caretakers, and marketers. He served on the Florida Citrus Commission for 8 years and worked on the long-range planning committee for several years after that. His devotion to Florida citrus and agriculture was real, and he did everything he could to share his passion with others, especially with young people.

Each year, the Florida Citrus Hall of Fame honors the most distinguished leaders who have made significant contributions to the Florida citrus industry, and there is no one more deserving of a spot on that hall of fame than Mr. Marvin Kahn. When it comes to serving Florida's agriculture industry, his passion for Florida's citrus is unparalleled.

Florida is a better place because of Mr. Kahn, and it has been an honor to serve him in the House of Representatives.

COLORECTAL CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of death for men and women combined. It

is a silent killer because the disease often has no signs or symptoms. Each year, more than 50,000 Americans die from colorectal cancer even though it is mostly preventable and treatable if caught early.

Six years ago today, my father, the late Congressman Donald Payne, died from colorectal cancer. Colorectal cancer screening just wasn't something people of his generation did.

Mr. Speaker, my father might have lived had he gotten tested for colorectal cancer. That is why each year I sponsor a resolution to recognize March as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month, a time to educate the public about the disease and the need for screening.

By educating people, increasing research funding, and making Medicare coverage better for seniors, we can save tens of thousands of lives each year.

I would rather not have to make this 1-minute speech every year, to have my father still be a Member of Congress from the 10th Congressional District.

MILITARY SAVE ACT

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Military SAVE Act.

Last year, the Department of Defense reported there were an estimated 20,300 military members who indicated they had experienced a sexual assault the year prior. Many of these military sexual trauma survivors expressed concerns that services available within the VA healthcare system did not meet their post-trauma needs.

This bill will now require the Department of Veterans Affairs to establish a 3-year pilot program to allow these survivors treatment related to their injuries from the provider of their choice. Then the VA will compare the care received from outside providers with the VA so that they can find ways to provide better care for MST survivors.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who is sexually assaulted should be able to receive the care that they need, and that stands true for the men and women protecting our Nation. Members of the military should be confident in the quality of care they receive from the VA, and this new bill, when it becomes law, would help the VA to improve the services that they offer.

INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). 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 see my colleagues from the great South

are here, and they should be listening very carefully as we discuss infrastructure. I might like to draw the attention of the House to this, if I might, a fellow that we know etched in marble at the FDR Memorial: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much"—keep in mind the tax bill that passed here and was signed by the President in January. "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."

These are words to legislate by, wouldn't you say?

So I ask my colleagues to please keep this in mind and not leave right in the middle of a good discussion. If we are to pay attention to what is important here, keep in mind those who have little.

It turns out that the great tax cut was probably best described by the President. Shortly after he signed the bill, he went down to his Mar-a-Lago club and told his friends who had gathered there, all of whom were the great beneficiaries of that tax cut: I have made you so much more wealthy.

Indeed, that is exactly what the tax cut did. It made the wealthy in America even more wealthy to the tune of several hundred billion dollars. The American corporations saw their tax rate fall from 35 to 20 percent, and the top income earners in America saw their tax rate go down by 2½ percent. It was marvelous if you have a great deal of money, because 80 percent-plus of the \$1.5 trillion—perhaps more—of the benefits went to the top 10 percent: American corporations and the super-wealthy.

Is there such a thing as trickle-down economics? Is there really a probability that the superwealthy are going to buy more cars and build new homes—palatial palaces—in America with all of the new money that they received? The answer is probably not in America but probably on some island somewhere where they can use the new tax breaks for foreign investment that are in this tax bill.

Oh, they were going to close the loopholes for corporations and individuals who wanted to go offshore. No, it didn't happen. Instead, new offshore tax advantages are created for American corporations.

Were inversions eliminated? No. Corporate inversions are not eliminated. They are, in fact, continued and increased.

How did this come to pass? It probably came to pass because there was not one substantive hearing in the Ways and Means Committee and in the Senate Finance Committee on the most important tax bill that has passed out of Congress in the last 25 years.

So now we live with this. Now we live with the situation where the Treasury Department announced a couple of weeks ago that the tax revenues for the

2018 fiscal year—that is now—are down by a couple of hundred billion dollars.

So what is going to happen? When the tax bill was moving along, all of the deficit hawks—and there used to be, I don't know, a couple hundred of them over here on my Republican colleagues' side—left town in December. There was not one word about the new \$1.5 trillion addition to the deficit. But like most migratory birds, they are going to come back when the weather warms up in Washington, and they are going to go after the deficit with a vengeance. I will bet they are not going to propose that we go back and clean up the tax mess that was created.

My guess is what they are going to do is go after programs. I think we know what programs they are, because the Speaker of this esteemed House has very clearly laid out in previous budgets that he wrote when he was head of the Budget Committee that he is going to go after Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—the programs of the social safety net.

I had a phone call just a few moments ago from a constituent in my district, saying:

You have got to understand that more and more of your constituents are getting elderly. They are getting Alzheimer's, and they need care. Their husband or their wife needs respite care. What about the programs for that?

I had the answer. It doesn't look good, because we know what the Speaker said he wanted when he was chairman of the Budget Committee, and unless he is having an epiphany, he is likely to want it again. In fact, I believe he already said they are looking at cutting Medicare and Medicaid.

So what does that mean for the working men and women who are taking care of their parents? It means there are tough times ahead. It means that the proposed discussion about the reduction in Medicaid is \$1,400,000,000,000 over the next decade. It means that \$500 billion will be cut from Medicare.

So, if you are a senior, you should worry. If you are among the working men and women of America whose father or mother is now a senior, you should worry.

The most expensive illness now and in the future is Alzheimer's. So what of Alzheimer's research? It is going to get reduced.

Oh, and that corporate tax cut for Pfizer? Do you remember how happy they were to have the extra \$12 billion? Are they going to spend it on Alzheimer's research? No, they are not. They stopped their Alzheimer's research. Instead, guess what they are going to do with the money that they were investing in Alzheimer's research. They are going to use it, together with their tax cut money, to buy back their stock which has the marvelous result of increasing the value of their stock because there are fewer shares out there.

It is brilliant for the managers and for the corporate officers because their

pay is based on the stock price. What a marvelous way to use the tax cut: end research on the most expensive illness in America, Alzheimer's and dementia, and instead use that money to buy back stock so that you can increase your pay as the corporate president.

Now, there is a good, American, capitalist idea. That is where we are.

So today we had a hearing on infrastructure in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, a great opportunity to understand the President's infrastructure plan. Wow. It is big and it is beautiful, he says, and it is going to provide a gazillion jobs.

We took a look at it, and we said: Where is the beef? Where is the money? \$200 billion over a 10-year period, \$20 billion a year, said to be new money.

And then you look at the President's budget proposal and you tee it up with the infrastructure proposal, and you say: Wait a minute. What kind of shell game are you playing here? Your budget removes over \$200 billion from infrastructure, and you come over here on your infrastructure plan and you say you have \$200 billion of new money.

No, you don't. You really don't have \$200 billion of new money. You have \$200 billion of repurposed money in programs that actually devolve the Nation's infrastructure back to the States and the counties so that we will have a disconnect between an interstate in one State and an interstate in another State that connect at the State lines, and one is repaired and the other is not.

□ 1645

So infrastructure and transportation is a national network. But in this case, what happens is that the States are said to be given the responsibility and the Federal Government will simply pick and choose among those programs that the administration happens to like.

I represent a rural area. Sure, it is nice to have an extra \$50 billion for rural infrastructure. That would be great.

But what is the definition of rural?

It is 55,000 people.

How much territory? Is it an entire State?

Well, there is no State that is rural, then.

In a county? In a multitude of counties? In a metropolitan statistical area?

We don't know.

But I will tell you that I do have a rural area. I have got two cities, Yuba City and Marysville together, with 100,000 people. Rural is 10 miles down the road.

So where is the line around this rural area?

I am concerned, particularly because the Federal Government will maintain control of that money. It doesn't go out by formula, at least as we now look at the language.

So it is a grand, a glorious, a wonderful, spectacular infrastructure plan. Incidentally, there is a small problem for

cities and counties. Presently, if the Federal Government is involved in a levee project to prevent floods, an interstate highway or one of the federally designated highways, or an airport, they will usually come up with somewhere between 70 and 80 percent of the money. That is all well.

Well, let's see. It is 70 to 80 percent Federal and another 20 to 30 percent local money. In the President's proposal, that flips. The State and the local government come up with 70 to 80 percent and the Federal Government comes up with 20 to 30 percent. The role of the Federal Government is diminished. It becomes the minor partner, and the State or local community becomes the major partner.

I had a meeting today with Hamilton City, a community of about 1,600 people right on the Sacramento River with a levee that is maybe good for a 10-year high water, but not for any extended amount of flood beyond what normally occurs. They have been trying for 30 years to raise the money locally to match the 80 percent by the Federal Government. They did it.

Are they going to be able, going into the future, to complete that flood project if this program goes into effect and they have got to come up with 80 percent of the money?

It won't happen.

I would dare say, all across this Nation, with the possible exception of Houston, Texas, no community is going to be able to come up with 70 to 80 percent of the money for a flood control project.

This is a role that has traditionally been the Army Corps of Engineers and the Federal Government. But, no. In their infrastructure proposal, this administration flips it over so that now the great burden lies with the local government.

"Oh, that is fine," you say. Well, I think not. All across this Nation, small communities, rural communities, and even urban communities do not have the resources.

So here we are. Here we are in a situation where we had a massive tax cut that benefits the superwealthy and American corporations. The American corporations clearly indicate—not from me; go look at the Wall Street folks that have done the analysis—clearly indicate that that tax reduction, which is now in the pockets of the corporations, is not being used for higher wages, is not being used for the plant and equipment and new jobs above the 16 percent. The rest of the money is used for acquisitions and buying back stock. So much for trickle down.

Of course, how much can the superwealthy possibly spend? How much can you possibly spend on your McMansion? How much can you possibly spend on a fleet of Mercedes?

The bottom line of it is, when it comes to infrastructure, there is no money. It is gone. It disappeared with the tax cut.

Think about what could have been done if that tax bill had actually had hearings in which the Democrats could have put forth proposals that we have introduced in bills—proposals to repatriate the offshore earnings of corporations with a lower tax and then use that money for infrastructure. We would have real dollars for an infrastructure program to the tune of maybe \$50 billion to \$100 billion over a period of time.

But, no. No hearings, no amendments from Democrats. No, not at all.

We could have used that tax bill to create infrastructure banks so that there would be a financing mechanism for those small communities around the Nation that needed to build a road, needed to build a levee, needed to build broadband infrastructure for their community.

But no, that didn't happen either. Not one hearing. Not one Democratic amendment to that tax bill. Therefore, we go into the great infrastructure program where we really need to do some things.

What do we need to do?

Some of you may have noticed just 12, 13 months ago the man-made creation of the biggest waterfall in the world, Oroville Dam, and the breakdown of the spillway. And 200,000 of my constituents had to evacuate within hours because that spillway, the emergency spillway next to it, was being overtopped by the river and eroded at the base and a 30-foot wall of water almost descended upon those 200,000 people. The number of deaths would be unknown, but it would have been in the thousands because they couldn't get out of town fast enough.

Thankfully, the rain stopped and the reservoir receded. Had it not, had it continued and the water continued to spill over the emergency spillway here, it would have been an unmitigated disaster.

Why did this fail?

This failed for lack of repair, for lack of maintenance. It is just one example of the thousands of dams in America that could fail. We saw this potential failure in Puerto Rico with one of the major reservoirs there. Fortunately, a third hurricane didn't occur.

Or maybe you are interested in bridges. This isn't a picture of a bridge to nowhere. This happens to be one of the main bridges on Interstate 5, an interstate highway system that goes from Vancouver to Tijuana, Mexico. It goes down through Oregon, Washington, and California. It is the major trade route on the West Coast. This is about 7 years ago. The bridge fell down.

I could put a picture up here showing another bridge that failed on the Mississippi River, in the Twin Cities area. We could put thousands of pictures up here of bridges that could fail and have failed.

This is an infrastructure structure issue. Where is the money to rebuild this?

Well, it is in the hands of the corporations who are spending it to buy

back their stock and to increase the stock price so that the corporate officers can have a higher paycheck.

Oh, did I forget to mention how generous they were in bonuses?

We are talking about one-time bonuses here. We are not talking about increasing the paycheck over time. We are talking about one-time bonuses.

I do like my San Francisco-based Wells Fargo, that so generously said: "We are going to increase the pay for the minimum wage workers."

Good for you. You are obeying the State laws that require minimum wage increases. Good for you, obeying the law. Take credit, if you will, but it is not out of the generosity.

Where is the money for all this?

It is gone.

What if we had a chance in that tax bill to talk about a program the Democrats have been putting forth for the last year?

It is A Better Deal for America, a tax policy that actually provides benefits to the working men and women of America and the families that are on the edge of poverty. It actually provides an infrastructure program that has real money—money that can be used to build the foundation for economic growth, money that can be used for employing people in high-paying construction jobs.

By the way, it is not at all clear—in fact, there are those of us who think this may actually be in the present infrastructure plan—all of the talk about Buy American, Build America. It appears that language in that infrastructure plan would do away with the Buy American provisions in highway infrastructure.

We can't let that happen. A Better Deal for America would be tax policy. It would be a program that would provide the education and training for the men and women who we need in our manufacturing sector.

Every 6 months, I do a manufacturing advisory organization meeting of manufacturers. Every time over the last 8 years we have met, they have come back with the very same concern. And that concern is: We need highly skilled workers.

How do you get highly skilled workers?

You train them. You provide the job training for those who have lost their jobs, for those who want to improve themselves.

Whatever happened in our high schools to technical training, vocational training?

It is critically important. The programs that are out there need this support. The programs where American unions have apprenticeship training are a critical way of building our economy. They are highly skilled men and women that earn a good, solid living as welders, plumbers, and technicians of all kinds. That is what we want. It takes money to do those things.

So what are we going to do?

I don't know how we are going to come back from this tax cut. It is not

going to be done anytime soon. But I know this: we are going to be really, really short of money. It has been estimated that in this current budget year, the deficit will reach \$1 trillion.

I know that we are just weeks away from the return of the deficit hawks on this floor who are going to say: "Oh, my goodness, the money is gone. We are going to have to make cuts. We can't have these kinds of deficits."

I can hear them already. I hear the voices of the past and I hear the voices of the future. I know they are going to come back. They are going to go after programs that are absolutely essential.

We have got work to do. We have got things we need to do in America.

The American Society of Civil Engineers points out where we need work.

Aviation. We got a D for how good our aviation system is.

Bridges, C; dams, D; drinking water, D.

Is anybody here from Michigan?

Is anybody here from the Central Valley of California?

Shall we talk about water supplies?

I remember when I was in college, you would never go outside the United States and drink the water from the tap. Now you don't go to the United States and drink water from a tap, because there is a high probability that it is contaminated. We have seen this story. We have seen this story in Flint, Michigan. We have seen this up and down the Central Valley of California.

So what are we spending our money on?

Not on drinking water, not on energy systems, hazardous waste, or inland waterways.

Oh, this is a good one. If you are on the Mississippi and the Ohio River and you have got your tugboat and a fleet of barges, you depend upon the Federal Government lock system so that you can travel up and down the river.

□ 1700

If you are out there in the maritime and you are an international shipper and you want to go into one of the harbors on the East Coast, where is the money for dredging?

Well, it disappeared with the tax cuts. It is not there.

So is your ship going to run aground?

No, you won't let that happen. What you do is you will go to some other port.

Cuba. We love to talk about Cuba, so let's talk about Cuba. At Mariel, they are building an international port for the purpose of taking the new ships that are able to go through the Panama Canal, bring them to Cuba, offload them, and put them on a smaller ship so they can get into American harbors. Now, there is an American success story. We don't have the money to dredge our harbors, but we have the money for a new Mercedes for the superwealthy.

Parks and recreation. Ports. Rail systems.

Rails are doing pretty good, but not Amtrak. The President's budget pro-

poses to cut Amtrak—to basically defund Amtrak. If you want to go on the East corridor here, if you want to go from Washington to Boston, if you want to take a plane, well, we know we have an aviation problem. If you want to take the train, I guess you are going to hop a freight train, because Amtrak isn't going to be around to run. That is the President's budget proposal.

Schools, D-plus.

Solid waste. Transit. Wastewater.

The American Society of Civil Engineers rate America in the D range. We should be so proud of the most advanced Nation in the world. No, I think not. I certainly wouldn't take pride in our infrastructure. But it takes money.

Where did the money go?

Well, it just happens I like charts.

The Trump infrastructure scam cuts more than \$168 billion from existing transportation and infrastructure programs.

I haven't talked about this one.

Do you remember I told you about the flip—80 percent Federal, 20 percent local flipped to 20 percent Federal, 80 percent local, unless you happen to be a private investor. Do you want to buy Dulles International Airport or maybe Reagan National—excuse me, I promise not to do that. Whatever the name of that airport here is. Okay, I will say Reagan. The Reagan National Airport. Do you want to buy it? It is up for sale, according to the Trump administration. And, by the way, the Federal Government will come up with 80 percent of the money. Not a bad deal.

Slashes Federal investments and passes the buck back to the local governments. We just talked about that.

We haven't talked about the environmental programs, the environmental protection programs that are significantly harmed, reduced, gutted in the proposal. The Senate is going to speed up projects. Hello? Does anybody around here know that over the last two transportation programs this Congress, with Democrat and Republican support, significantly reduced the time for an infrastructure program to be done? It is not 14 years.

The laws that have been in place now for the last almost decade significantly reduced the processing time for infrastructure projects in which the Federal Government is involved in, without harming the vital environmental protections that are out there: clean water, clean air, all of those things. Anyway, they are gone.

We have a task before us. I see my Republican colleagues anxious to get up and engage me in a debate. If they want to, I could yield to them, and we could debate the wisdom of what has happened here, but that is not happening.

What is happening is there is an alternative, an alternative that we put forth from our side that, unfortunately, was not considered in the tax legislation.

We are going to be working on the infrastructure bill. I dare say that the

President's infrastructure program is going nowhere in Congress. At least it shouldn't.

We are going to have to find the money as best we can. And I have an idea. Over the next 15 years, we are going to spend \$1 trillion rebuilding our entire nuclear armaments. All of the delivery system, all of the bombs, all of the satellites, all rebuilt. So will Russia and so will China, and we are in the midst of a nuclear arms race—well into the second quarter of a new nuclear arms race, exceedingly expensive and exceedingly dangerous, because the delivery systems are stealthy, designed not to be observed. That is a problem because that increases the risk.

Maybe we can use some of that money to build the infrastructure to educate our kids, to provide for seniors who have Alzheimer's, to care for the caregivers that are taking care of their parents, to build an infrastructure program that really gives America a solid foundation for economic growth, one in which the research facilities are the most modern and in which the most advantageous research is conducted. Maybe we could find, amongst our choices here, money to build a highway system that is worthy of this Nation, one in which there are not potholes every 100 yards, one in which bridges don't collapse; that we can build water systems in which you can take tap water from every fountain in this Nation and drink it, without a concern about contamination of lead or something else. We could do that. We could make some choices.

We can go back and revisit the tax scam in which there are specific inducements for offshoring American jobs. Maybe we can do that.

Maybe we can look at some of the military spending and say: Why does it cost \$1 billion to launch a satellite with one system and \$90 million with another system to do the same thing? There are things we can do.

And, most of all, it is time for a better deal for America: a better deal for the working men and women, a better deal for the elderly, and a better deal for the children. That is what we need to do.

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

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MITCHELL. 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 the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, this is the second week of the tax truth squad effort to share the facts, the real facts about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and the impact it has already had on the American economy and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here with my fellow colleagues representing Michigan and Illinois. These two States include diverse industries and diverse people, from farmers, to bankers, to manufacturers.

I am humbled to represent the hard-working people of the 10th Congressional District and the Midwest. This is exactly what the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has done: helped our constituents work every day supporting their family and helped their local economy.

My colleague before me proceeded to speak about we should pay attention to the needs of those close to and living in poverty. Well, I wish he had stayed. I grew up in poverty.

Like many in Michigan, I grew up in a large family. I have six brothers and sisters. My dad had a good job building trucks in a line at General Motors. My mom often had a full-time job to help make ends meet. That is why I committed to supporting policies that create real economic growth and economic opportunity for families like the one in which I grew up.

I was but a young pup in 1986, the last time our Tax Code was modernized. Since then, the Tax Code grew to 74,000 pages of rules and regulations that have only confused people. You would need to be a wizard to understand what is in the Tax Code as it stood at the end of the year. That is why I promised my constituents, when I came to office, when I ran for office, I would work hard to achieve meaningful tax cuts and reforms for the American people.

I believe Americans can, and should, make independent decisions about the use of their own money, the money they work for, not the government. The government shouldn't come first. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act allowed hardworking individuals and business owners to do just that.

Across the Nation and back home, we have already seen the direct impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. More than 400 companies have already announced pay raises, bonuses, and increased 401(k) contributions and benefits, or, in the case of utility companies, lowered rates.

Direct bonus announcements have already reached over \$3 billion across this Nation. Let me repeat that: \$3 billion. Companies in Michigan have already committed more than \$180 million in bonuses to employees.

A couple of examples: Fiat Chrysler, one of the State's largest employers, is reinvesting its tax savings to its employees in our community, in addition to giving a \$2,000 bonus to 60,000 employees. And that is in addition to profit sharing as part of their contract.

Fiat Chrysler announced it will move heavy-duty Ram truck production from Mexico to Macomb County: a \$1 billion investment that will create 2,500 jobs.

In my district, Michigan's 10th, Lakestone Bank & Trust, a small community bank, operating in Lake Lapeer, St. Clair, and Macomb Counties, gave hourly employees \$1 an hour raise. I know some consider that to be crumbs. Where I grew up, \$1 an hour more is real money. They gave all of their salaried employees a \$1,000 bonus saying: "We are very appreciative of all Lakestone Bank & Trust employees and certainly what they have accomplished over the years. . . . This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, and we know we want to reinvest much of the savings"—in the tax bill—"back into our bank, and the first place we are going to put it is into the hands of our employees. Employees are our most important asset."

Stories like this are not unique. From CVS to Chipotle, and AT&T to Wells Fargo, they are reinvesting tax reform savings in our hardworking employees in our communities throughout the country.

This is the second week of the tax reform truth squad—we are calling it—an initiative where Members from States across the Nation are invited to tell their stories about the benefits of tax reform. There are countless stories they are anxious to express.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), one of those Members, my colleague, serving on the Energy and Commerce Committee, a defender of a strong rural economy and a good friend, representing the Seventh Congressional District.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk about the truth.

We heard so much dismissal of the tax cut plan before we passed it. Now that we passed it, not only did we read it beforehand, but rereading it again we are seeing the truth is working out.

As I travel around, Mr. Speaker, the Seventh District of Michigan, optimism about the new tax cuts is hard to miss.

I have people coming up to me at the grocery store, at gas stations, even in church, saying: You know, Congressman, we heard a lot of reports that this wasn't for middle class people, but I saw my paycheck in February and, it is true, I got a raise because the government is taking less out of it.

I have heard from a number of workers excited about their bonuses and pay raises and from businesses that are looking to expand their operations.

Just last week, I toured Lowe's home center in Adrian, Michigan, to visit with their team. Because of the new tax law, their employees are receiving \$1,000 bonuses and expanded maternity and parental leave.

I toured Cintas' Lansing operations. The tax cut afforded their employees

\$1,000 bonuses, and they reported to me that day that they jumped now on a plan that they were holding off, but now they are going to build a \$17 million facility to add on to their operations.

We already heard about Fiat Chrysler giving out \$2,000 bonuses to all of their workers. They are also moving production of the Ram heavy-duty truck plant back from Mexico to Michigan—I wanted to reiterate that—that is coming home and creating 2,500 new good-paying jobs.

We have also seen announcements from DTE Energy and Consumers Energy, utilities in Michigan and in other States, that their customers can expect to see lower utility bills, thanks to the tax cuts. In fact, they have submitted a request to the PSC for almost \$400 million in rate reductions. That is real money.

As Vice President PENCE said last week when we welcomed him to the Motor City, tax reform is working for Michigan.

Here is even more good news: the benefits are just beginning to kick in.

This tax season is the last time taxpayers will have to file under the old and broken Tax Code.

Under the updated Code, individuals and families at every income level will see tax relief.

The standard deduction is nearly doubled to protect more of people's hard-earned income from taxation.

□ 1715

The child tax credit is expanded from \$1,000 to \$2,000 to help with the cost of raising kids.

With these new reforms, the typical middle-income family of four will receive a tax cut of more than \$2,000.

On top of that, the law will help small businesses thrive, boost job creation here at home, and make our economy stronger and more competitive, like it ought to be, in the United States and in Michigan.

For families across Michigan, the new tax cut law means bigger paychecks and more money in their pockets, not in the Federal Government's pockets. And that is where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity at any time to put forward truth, but, more importantly, truth that is optimistic, that builds on our people, that builds on letting them do for themselves with the resources they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I express appreciation to my colleague for holding this "truth squad" opportunity again tonight because people need more of that. They need more optimism that comes from truth that impacts them in a growing and positive way, and I am glad to be part of it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WALBERG for his comments. I failed to recognize that I serve with Mr. WALBERG on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, on which he is a subcommittee chair. So I thank him for joining us.

I made a notation that I want to share with everyone tonight as we move forward. With the changing of the standard deduction, with the nearly doubling of the standard deduction, about 90 percent of taxpayers will be able to file their taxes on a form about this size. They will be able to file their taxes like this, rather than the pile of paperwork they have dealt with for years. Here it is on a larger scale.

Most are going to be able to simply file their wage and compensation income and use the standard deduction. They will be done except for a few other tax credits we will talk about, the tax credit they can get, for example, on investment tax credit or family child credit. We will talk about that. But most Americans can file like this. That is one of the things we wanted to achieve, one of the great achievements of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Mr. Speaker, next I yield to Congressman FRED UPTON, who represents Michigan's Sixth Congressional District, the former chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, another colleague of mine from Michigan, the senior member of our delegation, experientially only, not age, with decades of experience in Congress focusing on job creation and economic opportunity for our State and for our Nation.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my good friend for yielding and for hosting this hour tonight. I look forward to the comments by all my colleagues from Michigan and Illinois.

Let me just start out by saying a couple of things. I had a great ninth grade teacher, Mr. Denekas. We learned about how the government worked. You pass a bill in the House and you pass a bill in the Senate. I learned later on that the House bill is always better than the Senate. But in this case, JOHN SHIMKUS and I—and he is going to be a speaker from Illinois a little bit later on this evening—were two conferees on this bill.

I have got to say that, as we debated this bill, there were some elements that were not so good. But at the end of the day, as this bill meshed together, we took the best elements of both the House and the Senate bill and we got a bill that the President was able to sign.

I can remember being trashed left and right back in November and December about what this bill was going to do or not going to do: it wasn't going to provide real tax relief to the working class; companies weren't really going to give bonuses; this was all just going to be bogus arguments.

Now, at the end of the day, 2-plus months since the bill was signed and became enacted, my constituents are finding out good things about the bill. Yes, they are getting real take-home pay increases from the jobs that they do. Yes, they are getting bonuses.

I was at a small, little almost farmers market, multigenerational market

down in Niles, Michigan, just north of Notre Dame, Shelton's Farm Market. They have 83 employees. The owners gave every employee there a bonus. I talked to one of them who literally stocks the shelves. He got \$600.

He said: You know, Mr. UPTON . . .

I said: Call me FRED.

He said: This wasn't just crumbs. This made a real difference.

I said: What are you going to do with that \$600?

He said: You know, my wife has cancer, and I bought her a new dress.

He was so excited that that increase in the take-home pay was actually going to do some real benefit for him and his family.

I was at a groundbreaking at Pfizer, my largest employer, in Portage, Michigan. Not only did they announce that they are going to, in the next couple of years, invest \$6 billion—that is B as in “big”—in new facilities here in North America, they also announced that they are going to give \$100 million in bonuses for all of their nonexecutive employees. That is real money, and that is thanks to tax reform.

Mr. WALBERG talked a little bit about some of the utilities in Michigan. A little bit earlier today, I was with the chair of Consumers Energy, a very important player; and the chair of DTE Energy as well. Yes, because of the reduction in the corporate tax rates, they are going to pass on those savings, as they want to, to the consumers. In the case of Consumers Energy, they are going to give back \$200 million in rate relief to virtually every one of their customers that they serve across the board. That is good news. It has to be approved by the Public Service Commission, but, in fact, that money is going to be there.

So whether it is a small business who is now going to get a lower rate in that passthrough rate, which means a lot, keeping your deductions on healthcare, seeing the highest corporate rate being reduced to 21 percent—and I remember well that debate that we had between Mitt Romney and Barack Obama back in 2012. In September of 2012, the question was on tax reform, and even Barack Obama said that he would support lowering that corporate tax rate to 25 percent, because we were already at the highest corporate tax rate in the world. That is what this bill did, and thank goodness.

The last point I would make is I was tired of economic growth being at .7 percent or 1 percent. We can do better than that. This bill is now starting to lead the way to see that happen. In fact, the report even this week, I think, is predicting a 3.5 percent growth rate for calendar year 2018.

That is a far cry from where we were just a few years ago. I dare say, in large part, it is due because workers are, in fact, getting more money from their paychecks. We have reduced the corporate rates so companies, instead of having an incentive to go overseas, as they did with my largest employer

in one of my counties a few years ago, they now have a reason to come home and invest that money here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for hosting this hour. I look forward to the other folks' comments tonight.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. UPTON for joining us. I appreciate him taking time out of his busy schedule to talk about how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has impacted his district and the State of Michigan.

Let me state, as we get our next speaker to come forward, that in my district alone, the average savings for the average filer in my district is \$2,700 a year.

Now, I know that some of the colleagues on the other side of the aisle refer to that as crumbs, as meaningless, but that is real money that allows people to make a difference in their lives, to move forward, make decisions about fixing their houses, go on vacation, put a downpayment on a new car, all things that wouldn't be possible.

More importantly, that is money they worked for. That is not money somebody gave them. That is their money to begin with, and they get to keep it. That is what is so important about it.

Mr. Speaker, our next speaker who wants to come forward and talk about his district is Representative SHIMKUS, who, as Mr. UPTON said, was a conferee on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman JOHN SHIMKUS, who represents the 15th Congressional District, a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, a conferee on the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and who has been an advocate for smaller government for years.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. It is great to be here with my friends from the State of Michigan.

As a Republican, sometimes people ask: What is the difference?

I always say: Well, Republicans, we believe in less government, individual responsibility, lower taxes, more personal freedoms and liberties.

From my time here in Washington, I have always wanted a fairer, flatter, simpler Tax Code. We shouldn't have to fear filing our income taxes. We shouldn't have to fear whether we have the receipts.

I think the other thing that was always frustrating about the Tax Code is you never know if you have done enough of the itemizing that you are actually going to get anything or not. And then, have you forgotten something that you are not recouping?

So having said that, that is why—and I am glad Congressman MITCHELL raised this issue, the fairer, flatter, simpler Tax Code.

Before we passed the bill, 80 percent of my constituents did not itemize. Under this tax reform, 90 percent of all of my filers—90 percent—will be able to do it on this simple postcard. And it is easy to find. People can pull it up at fairandsimple.gov to check it out.

Congressman UPTON was correct: this process worked. We had a House bill and we had a Senate bill, and then the two sides merged to keep some of the deductions that people really thought were important, and a great compromise that was working.

So the question is: Is the proof in the pudding?

In other words, is it operating as advertised for either side?

I think we are down here to say it is operating as advertised and we can proudly stand down here and tell some of these stories.

What we did is we posted a question on our newsletter to ask people to respond, and I want to share some of these responses. These are on the individual side. I will talk about the corporate side in a minute.

Ken and Pam from St. Joseph—we call it St. Joe—they say: “Personally we have seen an increase in our net wages each week. With our business, we seem to have an increase in other companies starting new things.”

Gregg from Charleston says: “More money in my take-home check.”

A pretty simple statement.

James from Marine says: “My retirement check just went up. Thanks.”

Jeff from Carlyle says: “Positive results only so far, just as expected with a commonsense tax cut.”

Carl from Collinsville, which is my hometown. I am glad Carl is happy. He says: “I am seeing more on my paycheck each week. Keep up the good work.”

So that is just on the individual side.

Then we briefly want to talk about what is going on from business. You know, these are great announcements. I had the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, my good friend, KEVIN BRADY, tell me 50 percent of all manufacturers in this country are planning expansion. Not 50 percent of the manufacturers in Illinois or Michigan; across the country. That is pretty awesome.

So what is going on in my district?

Griffith Trucking, Broadway Express, Heartland Peterbilt, and Heartland Classics—which are in Effingham and Newton—gave \$1,000 bonuses to 65 full-time employees.

FedEx has a big distribution hub in my district, same place, in Effingham. FedEx has committed to more than \$3 billion in wage increases, bonuses, pension funding, and expanded U.S. capital investment.

Charter Communications is raising their minimum wage to \$15 an hour as a result of this tax cut plan.

It is great to see Congressman ROSKAM on the floor. He will get a chance to speak later. He was a major architect of this. I am very proud that he comes from Illinois. These stories are attributed to Peter's great work.

The other one I wanted to mention—of course, I live in the metro St. Louis area. Boeing has a big presence in St. Louis, but a lot of their great workers, probably their best workers, live on the

Illinois side. Boeing has announced employee-related and charitable investments of \$300 million as a result of the tax law.

So great things are happening.

I want to follow what FRED UPTON said, in that we as a body were tired of being in a malaise.

Is this all we can hope for?

We wanted an economy that would grow and create jobs and be vibrant, that people would be excited about going back to the workforce, working hard, taking home more of their pay, investing it into the market or in their retirement savings; and that is just what we are having.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of my colleagues here on the floor, so I could talk a long time on the benefits of the bill. I am very, very excited about it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MITCHELL for organizing this tonight.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SHIMKUS for the enthusiasm, the detail on the impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue on this conversation and talk a little bit about the trade States, because it has had a great impact not only on Illinois, but also on Michigan.

Joining us at this point is Congressman MIKE BISHOP, a neighbor of the 10th Congressional District, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means that had a direct impact on this bill. He has been a leading advocate for a fair and simple Tax Code. He represents the Eighth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman MIKE BISHOP.

□ 1730

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for leading in this effort.

It is very exciting back in the great State of Michigan, the comeback State of Michigan, our home State. After years of stagnant economic growth, our workforce is finally experiencing the benefits of a modernized Tax Code. So far, more than 4 million hard-working Michiganders have received bonuses, notices of increases in their take-home pay, and have benefited from higher wages.

Across Michigan, I have had the opportunity to travel not only in my district, but across this great State, and I have seen firsthand great things, so many great stories to tell, sitting down with folks, hearing about the new tax law and how it is impacting their community and how it is impacting their businesses. I take away from this a number of really excited testimonials from everyone that I sat down with.

For example, Dan, a small-business owner from Rochester Hills, Michigan, shared with me that, as a result of tax reform, he was able to invest in his new car wash by buying new equipment.

Erwin, a constituent from Oxford, Michigan, is seeing extra money in his monthly take-home pay.

I stopped by the Fiat Chrysler truck assembly plant to talk with workers

about the new Ram truck production line that is relocating from Mexico all the way back to Michigan, where it belongs, bringing with it 2,500 new jobs. As you can imagine, there is extreme excitement within the four walls of that beautiful plant.

Michigan is the auto capital of the world. We produce more than 2.2 million cars and trucks. We produce more cars and trucks than any other State in the Union, and we are excited and proud to be the auto capital of the world, the State that put the world on wheels.

The Fiat Chrysler decision will provide more than \$1 billion in U.S. investment and \$2,000 bonuses, \$2,000 for each employee, all as a result of tax reform.

In Lake Orion, Michigan, Complete Automation, they employ about 250 employees. I visited their operation to talk with the employees about the new benefits they will soon be seeing. As a result of tax reform, employees will see in their 401(k) contribution a match of 50 percent, up to 4 percent of their investment in their 401(k).

That is a big deal for a lot of people. It is a great deal for their family. It is a great deal for them individually, but it is a great deal for their family.

And I also say this. With the average tax cut in my district of about \$2,500 per family, average family, that is not crumbs. That is real, real relief for families that could really use it right now.

The takeaway from all these conversations that I have had across my district is that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is working. America's optimism is rising, and the workforce is taking notice. We are finally creating an environment that fosters economic growth and brings jobs back to the United States and back to my home State and the comeback State of Michigan. And this is just the beginning.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his feedback on the impact of the Tax Cuts bill, and I thank him for taking time out of his schedule.

Next, I have the privilege of recognizing a key player in the effort to reform our Tax Code and cut taxes, the chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tax Policy. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this and, hopefully, continued success on our tax laws.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Sixth District of Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

You know, I think it is so interesting. We are all coming together, various States, to celebrate these accomplishments and to take a step back: how far we have come in the past year or the past several months where you look back and, basically, there was a national consensus that had developed, and the consensus was nobody

liked our Tax Code—I mean nobody. Nobody could defend it because it was absurd. It was so complicated.

Those of us who are from the Chicago area, we know that the last time the Tax Code was updated was when the Bears won the Super Bowl, so that is 30 years ago. And yet we have got this Tax Code that had been a complete throwback. The Tax Code was such a throwback that the last time it was updated, 1986, the internet didn't exist, basically, as a commercial enterprise.

There was no shared economy, per se. Airbnb, Uber, Lyft, all those things, they didn't exist. Global supply chains were nowhere nearly as connected as they are today, which all begged the question that we needed a Tax Code to update things.

Now, here is what was interesting: The hyperbole that surrounded the debate on the tax reform bill as H.R. 1 kept moving in and, ultimately, came to a crescendo, passed through the House, passed through the Senate, and was signed into law, it was described by, God bless them, our friends on the other side of the aisle as the worst bill ever. Armageddon, and, obviously, now, the famous line that the result of these things were crumbs. Well, none of that turned out to be true. This was a terrific bill.

Let me just give you a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker, of people in my constituency who have written publicly or they have written to me privately about this bill.

Here is Mary from Wheaton, Illinois, my hometown. She said: "Our family is already feeling the positive impact of the changes made in the Tax Code. Our daughter and her husband just had their first baby and will be able to take advantage of the doubled child tax credit next year. Throughout our extended family, those who work for big and small businesses alike are witnessing immediate effects. Companies are investing the anticipated benefits of the new tax law in the form of bonuses, pay raises, capital improvements, and new hires. And that's just the beginning. The true value of this Tax Code will become even more evident in the months and years ahead."

Mary is absolutely right.

Or another person, Nicole, from Elgin. She says: "Thanks to the new tax bill, my family will be saving an estimated \$4,000 on our taxes next year. Not only that, but I'm getting a \$1,000 bonus and an extra \$1,500 in my employee pension account from my employer as a result of the changes."

Or how about an enrolled agent, Stephen, from Wayne. He prepares people's taxes. He says: "As an enrolled agent entering my 35th tax season, I am anxiously awaiting the smiles I will be getting from my clients when I inform them how much they will be saving on their 2018 tax return . . . the clear majority of my clients will be paying lower tax rates in 2018 due to the recently passed Tax Cuts and Jobs Act."

And then I will go to the end of his note. He says: "I haven't been able to

say this very often over the past 35 years, but I am actually looking forward to this tax season."

So we know that these things are true. We know that they are manifesting themselves.

I have got a constituency where there are about 30,000 people who get hit hard by the alternative minimum tax, and they are not going to be hit by the alternative minimum tax. They are going to be spared that tax.

There are many other examples in the State of Illinois where you see real progress being made.

Up by me in Chicagoland, MK Incorporation, a fleet management company, is giving \$1,000 bonuses to 150 employees.

Ameren Illinois, the customers are using both electricity and natural gas. They will see a combined savings of lower utility rates.

We have talked about AT&T already today: \$1,000 bonuses to 10,000 Illinois-based employees and, nationwide, over \$1 billion increase in capital expenditures.

There is example after example after example after example.

Look, if all the critics can do is basically say, well, this isn't enough or this is crumbs, they have not been to my constituency. To tell a family that I represent, Mr. Speaker, that \$1,000 is crumbs is just patently obtuse. \$1,000 is real money: \$1,000 is getting ahead on a car payment; \$1,000 is the ability to move forward and say we are going to go on a little extra special vacation, we are going to put a little bit more money toward our college fund, we are going to put a little bit more money toward our retirement. And that is just one particular example.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for organizing this, and I very much appreciate his bringing us together to celebrate these things.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to stay for just a moment for a real quick question.

First, I would say that the Bears is his example—and my example is Steve Yzerman was a rookie in the NHL and captain of the Detroit Red Wings. If you ask a young hockey fan now who Steve Yzerman is, they would look at you blankly. That is how long ago tax was tackled.

I have a question for the gentleman. Ninety percent of our taxpayers, we believe, are going to file a standard deduction, but we kept—we talked about it a great deal. We kept some key tax cuts in the Tax Code to actually help families.

Can the gentleman briefly talk about, maybe, the family and child tax credit and what we did with that and why we think that is important.

Mr. ROSKAM. What we did with it is we doubled it so that the family tax credit is now doubled. So, you know, when folks say, "Well, I don't like this tax plan," really? You don't like doubling the child tax credit?

So there was very much an intentionality, as you know, to say we

value family, we value children, we value domestic life, and, toward that end, we are going to support it through the Tax Code. So there was a very specific design not just to keep it, but to enhance it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to be clear with folks. There is a child and family tax cut, the earned income credit, and the higher education credit, and those are all credits against your tax liability. This is not simply a deduction. After taxes are determined, those are credits back, not a tax deduction.

Mr. ROSKAM. Right.

Mr. MITCHELL. People don't understand the difference some days.

Mr. ROSKAM. That is right.

So, to the gentleman's point, a deduction is a decrease in a taxable liability; a credit is a credit. Once the tax is calculated, the credit is an amount that comes off of that tax liability, so it is a very significant thing. Said another way, credits are more valuable than deductions.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for clarifying that, and I certainly hope people listen to the difference because some people don't understand that. I appreciate the gentleman taking time to join us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman representing the 12th District of Illinois (Mr. BOST), a small family business owner himself.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order tonight. And I also say, just because we are following a theme, if we put in perspective how long ago it was that we did tax reform in this Nation, I was running for my first political office for county board. I had a mullet, and it looked good—at least my wife told me it did.

But let me tell you that, after we passed this tax reform—I come from deep southern Illinois, nowhere near Chicago, a very rural district, a little bit of metropolitan—a typical family of four will receive a break of over \$2,000 per year.

Now, folks, I don't know how it would be in your district or in your hometown if you are listening to this tonight, but that is not crumbs where I come from. Some of the folks here in Washington may think that that is the case, but that is not.

Let me tell you that I have been around my district talking to people; and you go to barber shops and coffee shops, and my wife and I own a beauty salon, and you hear from the people how much they are saving, so much so that we actually asked for people to start replying on our Facebook and to tell us what their story was.

I am just going to give you a few of these. I know that we are on limited time, but I am going to tell you that Bobby from Makanda, here is what he writes:

I am a police officer and my wife is a high school teacher. Combined, the new tax rates save us over \$300 a month. We have two teenage children. The additional income will help us save for upcoming college expenses.

Terry from Royalton writes:

My wife is an educator and I am in healthcare. Since these changes have affected my pay about the same as hers, we know how much it changes our monthly income. About \$300.

His statement is:

Hey, Nancy, if that is crumbs in your world, it's not in mine.

Tracy from Wood River writes:

Tax reform allows more money for college, more money to be put towards paying off our home, provides more activities for our children, and allows us to save more money for the future.

These are just three stories of countless that we have heard. Countless have come in not only from individuals on the individual tax rate, but the business tax rate as well: expansion of business, growing of business, using it to expand the 401(k)s of their employees, giving increases in pay to their employees.

The bottom line is this: The tax reform allows people to keep more money of their paycheck. It allows them the opportunity to use that money in the way they see fit, not how the government wants to use it. They earned that money. It is theirs. They should be able to keep more of it to spend and save as they please. This new tax reform does just that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining us this evening.

Next is Congressman ADAM KINZINGER, who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee as well as on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Like many Members around here, he is a very busy man.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman representing the 16th District of Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) to talk about tax cuts in his district.

□ 1745

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This was a great thing we did. It had been—I was 8 years old the last time the Tax Code was reformed, and I think this is something we, frankly, ought to do every decade; at the worst case, every two decades; definitely not every 30 years. So it is about time to get it done.

I wish this could have been bipartisan. I think there are a lot of fantastic things in here, and I think it is quite obvious that the economy is showing some really big benefit as a result. I think it is hard to hide that. It is hard to pretend that that is not the case, even though some of our friends try to do that, but it is quite obvious it has worked.

I just want to tell a few stories of my district, the 16th District of Illinois. I was at a tax reform roundtable last month at the Illinois Valley Chamber of Commerce, and I heard from my local business community about how this bill affects them and what they would like to see moving forward. One gentleman from Walnut, Illinois, in

Bureau County, was really excited about the tax cuts his small business would receive. He plans to increase hourly wages and hire 7 to 10 new employees over the next 2 years. That, my friends, is not crumbs. That is important.

The tax relief for businesses, large and small, is being shared with employees all over. Over the last few months, more than 300 companies, and counting, have announced plans to add people, add bonuses, add to retirement benefits, and give back to the U.S. economy.

Employees at UPS in my district, Home Depot, Bank of America, Ryder, AT&T, U-Haul, and many others with Illinois locations will receive these bonuses and benefits.

A few weeks ago, I went to the Fiat Chrysler plant in Belvidere, Illinois, and I met with employees who were excited and encouraged by the \$2,000 bonus they will receive in the second quarter of this year.

According to the nonpartisan Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, 85 percent of Illinoisans will see a tax cut next year, and the nonpartisan Tax Foundation has estimated that the State of Illinois stands to gain tens of thousands of jobs from this reform.

This is great news. By bringing the Tax Code into the 21st century to reflect current day is real and tangible in terms of the benefits it will put into our economy.

Our future is bright, our economy is growing stronger, and, with tax relief, the American Dream is once again on the horizon for folks in my district and across the country. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. KINZINGER for joining us this evening. I appreciate the detail in his district.

We are going to continue with Illinois for a bit here. I guess it is Illinois' night for awhile.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the Representative from the 14th District of Illinois, Congressman RANDY HULTGREN, who has consistently been a voice of business owners across America through his work on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MITCHELL for yielding.

Illinois is a high-tax State. We have seen Illinois State taxes continue to go up, so it is a welcome relief that Congress has brought Federal tax relief to the people of Illinois, and especially I am grateful for the residents of the 14th Congressional District, the suburbs of Chicago, who are seeing great relief and especially the benefits that come to small businesses, truly the energy and the engine behind Illinois' economy.

They are going to receive immediate benefits from a reduced tax burden and more flexible accounting rules. I am also pleased that the final version of the legislation included this portion of

my bill, which was to lower taxes on Illinois' largest employers, which is small businesses, and it is called the Bring Small Businesses Back Tax Reform Act.

Further, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act reduced corporate tax rates to 21 percent and includes provisions to deter U.S. companies from moving their headquarters and investments abroad and encouraging them to bring income and jobs back home again. Again, this is welcome news for Illinois residents.

Numerous companies who employ residents of the 14th Congressional District have announced new investments and new hiring and giving more money to their employees, wages, bonuses, trainings, and more. Just a sampling of these are: AbbVie, American Community Bank, First Midwest Bank, EMKAY, Boeing, U.S. Bank, Wells Fargo, Wintrust Financial, Home Depot, Walmart, CVS, and Starbucks.

American manufacturers are hiring more workers. In my district, a Geneva manufacturer has already brought on two new employees to manage the equipment the company invested in under the new expensing rules. A Will County food distributor plans to hire two new employees in 2018, with the money the company saved through tax reform, and the list goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, it is time Americans were given the truth about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Eighty percent of U.S. households will see a tax cut in 2018, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, but only 17 percent of Americans actually think they will.

In fact, the bill lowers individual rates for low-and middle-income Americans across the board and doubles the standard deduction for both individuals and families. If you are one of the 70 percent of Americans who currently take the standard deduction, getting an immediate rate cut and a doubling of the earnings you can keep tax free will make a big difference to you and to your family.

This bill does not cut Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security, period. This bill does not get rid of the medical expense deduction or the charitable deduction. Those are protected and expanded. The bill did not take away healthcare from Americans. Eighty percent of the people who pay for the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate tax are families making less than \$50,000 a year. This bill gets rid of the individual mandate penalty so struggling families aren't burdened by yet another tax.

It is clear: the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is already delivering positive results to Illinois individuals, families, and small businesses; and to Americans everywhere. It is good news, and more good news is coming.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HULTGREN for joining us. I appreciate him taking the time to explain the importance of this in his district.

My next speaker has extensive experience on economic development and creating a better business climate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman DARIN LAHOOD, representing the 18th District of Illinois, a member to both the Joint Economic Committee and Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MITCHELL for yielding. I thank him and Congresswoman MIMI WALTERS for putting together and organizing this Special Order in order to highlight the effects of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act on families in Illinois and across the country.

Thirty-one years is way too long. That is what it took before we passed comprehensive tax reform at the end of last year. And in my 2½ years here, I couldn't be more proud to support the bill. And when I went in to looking at the legislation in the bill, I really looked at two things as we looked at comprehensive tax reform. One is, how do we help middle class and lower middle class people across this country and in my district? And secondly, how do we get the economy roaring again?

We, for almost 9 years, had a very sluggish economy and stagnant wages. How do we get the economy healthy, robust, vibrant again? We succeeded on both those counts with this bill, and I am very proud to support it.

This historic tax reform law is making a real difference for our families and our workers. But you don't have to take my word for it. Take it from the hardworking people I have spoken with across Illinois' 18th District. The workers I have spoken with are already seeing the results of the new withholding tables, which is no surprise.

In fact, the median family of four in my district will save \$2,593—again, let me repeat that, \$2,593 every year from this new law. This figure is certainly not crumbs, as some people would describe it.

When half of Americans say they are living paycheck to paycheck, this is real money for them. The benefits have already gone beyond lowering the rates, with more bonuses and pay raises being announced every single day.

One example from my district is the Five Senses Spa in Peoria, Illinois. This is a small business. And for over a decade, the owner, Paola Hinton, has provided clients with relief from the stresses of their life at her spa. With the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Five Senses Spa is now providing tax relief to their employees. After calculating the savings from her business that she saw through the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Paola handed out \$500 bonuses to all of her employees as a "thank you" for their hard work. This is real money that the employees can put towards expenses, new purchases, or even saving up for things like education or a home or a new car.

But tax reform also has positive effects beyond larger paychecks. Last month, I spoke with a constituent

named Chris, who is a small-business owner, and also the fire marshal for Springfield and Sangamon Counties. Chris attended a roundtable discussion I hosted in Springfield and talked about how the new depreciation rules, as a part of the tax reform law, have already incentivized building owners to upgrade their sprinkler and safety equipment, which has benefitted his small business. Safer buildings and up-to-date fire prevention are a win-win for everyone.

I was glad to hear that even our local fire marshal was seeing the real effects of commonsense tax reform and reforming our Tax Code. Stories like these are coming from every district across this great country, and the benefits of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act show no sign of slowing down, and that is good news for all Americans.

It should be clear by now that letting workers keep more of their hard-earned paychecks is a recipe for a healthy economy, and I am excited to see how this bill continues to improve the lives and security of all American families.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, could the Congressman stay one moment for a quick question?

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, sure.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, he was talking a little bit about the depreciation allowance and what that depreciation means for small business—especially small business.

One of the important things we did was to change how the taxes are structured for a path we call pass-through to small businesses. Maybe he could explain that briefly, what was done to help small business be viable and grow in this country.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think we acknowledge that small businesses are the lifeblood of our economy. They create the most jobs in our economy. So when we looked at comprehensive tax reform, we obviously talked to those small businesses, those independent folks, and said: What can we do to help you in terms of lowering the rates, depreciation, expensing?

We took that into account, and now you are seeing the results of that. So when you talk to small businesses on the real effect, what does that mean? What do they do with those savings?

Well, they are hiring more people, they are investing in higher wages, they are investing back into their companies, which has a downstream effect throughout this country, and those are real results; and, again, that is a positive nature, which will continue into the future, and we are awful proud of those provisions.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LAHOOD for detailing that, and I appreciate him taking time this evening.

We now will rotate back to Michigan, a fellow freshman, good friend of mine, also a proud Yooper. I am proud to introduce my fellow colleague in the freshman class from the northern regions of Michigan, who, throughout

this process, served on the Budget Committee and had input into what this bill is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman JACK BERGMAN from the First District of Michigan.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, what a great opportunity to really stand up here and smile and talk to the American public with the words of constituents from Michigan's First District, because these are not my words. These are their words over the last 2½ months or so since we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

You know, in November 2016, the great people of Michigan's First District sent me to Washington with a direct, yet simple, mandate: Get Washington, D.C., out of our pockets and off our backs. For a marine, that is a pretty simple mission-oriented instruction.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was the first major step to accomplishing that goal. Since we passed tax reform, I have travelled throughout many of the First District's 32 counties talking with constituents, business owners, and hearing their individual stories. Farmers, businesses, both large and small, and families are already seeing the benefits that tax reform brings, and we are just getting started.

Many of these small companies said: Well, I don't know yet, but I have got to meet with my accountant around the middle of April, and then we will really see.

But now they are starting to see wage increases and bonuses, and business expansions are all beginning to roll in and take effect, and it is long overdue in our neck of the woods. And when I say, "our neck of the woods," that is not a figurative statement. That is a literal statement.

You know, many families in our district live paycheck to paycheck, and even a small crisis could send them into a tailspin. An extra \$100 or \$150 in a paycheck in my district is not crumbs. It is not Armageddon. It is a big plus. It gives that family flexibility to live their life and to raise their kids and be a proud community—wage-earning members of that community.

That \$1,000 a year may mean a new set of snow tires. And by the way, we only have, roughly, a little over 2 weeks of winter left, but we use our snow tires up there through about mid-May. That is just the way it works.

That money might go for the kids to play on a sports team. Hockey is not a cheap sport to put your son or daughter in. Or it could be, possibly, just saving up in that family rainy day fund for an emergency.

We hear of businesses from Boyne City to Marquette expanding, growing their staff, raising wages, all a result of a fairer and simpler Tax Code.

You know, when I talk to some folks, they say: You know what, I don't mind working. I am proud to work. The dignity of work is what makes me strong as an individual, what makes me strong as a mother or a father.

They just think, in some ways, it is just not fair if you don't earn your wage. So there is a certain sense of pride that goes along with that.

□ 1800

We all know that if you are looking for thanks, running for office probably isn't the field of work you should get into. Yet everywhere I go in the district these last couple of months, constituents have been coming up to me saying: Thank you.

They don't know who I am. We get to talking, and they say: You are the guy on TV. Yeah. Well, thank you for what you did. Thank you for passing tax reform.

Just a few weeks ago, I was at the Home Depot in Petoskey, and a gentleman who was working there pulled me aside and thanked me for getting tax reform done. That allowed him to keep more of his check plus a sizable bonus that was paid by Home Depot.

In the Upper Peninsula, U.S. Special Delivery gave all 200 employees \$1,000 bonuses after tax reform passed because of the money that they will save as a company on their taxes this year.

A couple of weeks back, when I was in Traverse City, Traverse City State Bank announced that they are giving out new bonuses.

So many more businesses in the First District are raising wages, adding workers, giving bonuses, and expanding.

We know that this is just the beginning, and Americans can expect much more in the days ahead because of the energy that we have put into the growth of our American economy.

Mr. Speaker, this confirms the very core beliefs that I have and conservatives all throughout the country believe in. If we get the Federal Government off our back, where it is not supposed to be, and out of our pockets, we will unleash unprecedented economic potential for the citizens of our great country.

I would just close with one note, and that is I am Scandinavian, and there is a wonderful delicacy that you can only afford at the holidays, and I think more people are able to afford it now, and it is called a crumb cake, and it is great.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BERGMAN, and we are wishing for spring in northern Michigan sooner than mid-May.

Mr. Speaker, I want to wrap up this evening by talking a little bit about what all my colleagues spoke about: our principles.

Our principles were that people who worked hard should keep more of their money, that their families and their pocketbooks should come first and not government come first. We have achieved that with the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

How did we achieve that?

We almost doubled the standard deduction. For a married couple, the standard deduction is \$24,000 this tax year—\$24,000, and you pay no taxes.

We lowered the individual tax rates for all tax brackets.

We simplified the Tax Code so that taxpayers can file their taxes, 90 percent of them, on a form about this size. No, you don't have to mail a postcard. You put it in an envelope. But the good news is you don't need multiple pages. You don't have to hope that you have got a wizard to help you. Ninety percent of Americans can fill out a few items on here, include the W-2, and send it on in.

We expanded, as was discussed earlier, the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000 for single filers and married couples to help parents with the cost of raising their children. We made that fully refundable up to \$1,400. That is, even if your taxes are zero, you get a refund from the government for \$1,400 to help you with childcare and taking care of your dependents.

For taxpayers that the standard deduction did not work as well, we kept a number of important deductions, the three most popular ones: Charitable deduction, kept that; the home interest deduction, we kept that; and State and local taxes.

What that means is, for 95, 98 percent of my tax filers in the 10th Congressional District, even if they fill out their deductions rather than do the standard deduction, they are much better off.

Since the tax reform bill passed, as I stated earlier, 400 companies, in about 70 days, have given a pay raise or a bonus or both, increased benefits, 401(k) contributions.

In the case of utilities, you heard in Michigan, almost \$400 million a year in rate cuts, something we hadn't thought about, hadn't anticipated—real money saved by our consumers.

Four million people have received a special tax bonus, resulting in about \$3 billion injected into the economy. In Michigan, it is \$180 million already.

That is real money. It is not economic Armageddon. I am proud to have been part of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. We will continue with the Tax Truth Squad every week through the summer to send a message to the American people that we are looking out for their paychecks and the well-being of their family.

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

THE DREAM WILL SURVIVE

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise for the 92,000 Dreamers in the State of Florida. Tonight, I rise for the 3.6 million Dreamers across this Nation.

President Trump may have terminated the DACA program this week, but the dream will survive.

These Dreamers are serving in our military. They are our teachers. They are students and businessowners, lawyers, doctors, and engineers. They are an ambitious group of young people who are renewing our democracy and who are some of the very best of what the next generation has to offer.

I have no doubt, despite this termination this week, these young people will continue to fight, and we in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus will stand with them. We in the Democratic Caucus will continue to stand with them.

I hope some of my colleagues who have signed on to this bill in the Republican Conference will continue, but we need a vote on the floor.

Seventy percent of Americans already stand with our Dreamers.

It is true that the Federal courts this week have continued with their injunction enjoining the termination of the DACA program. This will help those who are already in the program, but that is a small fraction of the Dreamers in this country.

It is a sad state of affairs that Dreamers could only find justice in our courts. This is the people's House, and the people's business needs to be done. It is time to have a vote on the floor in a bipartisan fashion—a clean Dream Act now, or in November the voters will have their own vote regarding Dreamers.

HONORING SERETHA TINSLEY DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Seretha Tinsley.

Seretha Tinsley is a Winter Haven resident, trailblazer, and overachiever. She was the first African-American female to attend and graduate from Wesleyan College, in 1971.

In the early 1980s, Seretha became one of the first Black female general managers in radio.

In 2008, she became the first African-American president of the Winter Haven Chamber of Commerce board of directors.

She is an entrepreneur, civic leader, mother, and wife.

Desiring to become a missionary, she took a trip to West Africa, visited six countries, and studied with educators. Consequently, she became an educator so that she could have a greater impact empowering young lives with knowledge.

Tinsley served as executive director and cofounded Chain of Lakes Achievers, an achievement center devoted to empowering youth through tutoring, leadership, and life skills training. She maintains her passion for teaching by mentoring on a daily basis.

She is a businesswoman who takes pride in assisting others in reaching their phenomenal potential. Tinsley is the CFO/owner of several family businesses, KFC, Tinsley Family Concessions, where she oversees administrative and fiduciary responsibilities.

Seretha's community service and progressive leadership have earned her

numerous honors, recognitions, and media coverage.

Seretha is involved with multiple organizations in the community. She is a Winter Haven Chamber of Commerce business member; First Missionary Baptist Church trustee; life member of the NAACP; Polk Academies Advisory Board; Winter Haven Chamber; past president of the National Coalition of 100 Black Women, Polk County Chapter; among many other accomplishments.

Seretha Tinsley, we honor you.

HONORING LISA LANDERS DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Lisa Landers.

Lisa Landers has served in the executive director position of the Winter Haven Housing Authority since 2009. She leads in the overall operations of the agency's public housing Section 8, low-income tax credit, and multifamily housing programs.

Known for her tenacious spirit, Lisa has been recognized for successfully transforming a once nonperforming troubled agency into one now competitively recognized by Florida housing officials.

Prior to joining the WHHA in 2004 as a volunteer, Lisa championed research on infant mortality and neonatology for the late Florida Governor Lawton Chiles and wife, Rhea Chiles, at their Center for Healthy Mothers and Babies at the University of South Florida in Tampa.

Ms. Landers is also an award-winning journalist for The Tampa Tribune.

Her career includes leadership as director of public relations for The Spring of Tampa Bay, one of Florida's largest domestic violence centers.

A graduate of Florida A&M University with a B.S. in journalism, Ms. Landers has also pursued advanced studies in public administration at USF and holds the distinguished Executive Director's Education Certification from Rutgers University's Center for Government Studies.

Among her board and outside interests, Ms. Landers is a member of the Winter Haven Leadership Class of 35, currently serves as the Florida State public relations representative for the Florida Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials and its Southeastern Regional Council, and is currently a member of the Leadership Polk Class XI.

Lisa Landers, we honor you.

HONORING TWANNA DEWDNEY DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Twanna Dewdney.

Twanna Dewdney is a Winter Haven resident and proprietor of Salon Ashanti. She has proudly operated her salon in Winter Haven for over 13 years and considers it a vital resource to the community.

As a community activist, Twanna advocates for HIV and AIDS education

and prevention. Her salon is an HIV testing site for the Polk County Health Department.

Salon Ashanti also serves as a location for voter outreach, registration, and school supply drives. Children within the neighborhood utilize Salon Ashanti as a place of refuge, and she prides herself as a mentor to young women.

Her ministry extends beyond her local community, as she also organizes toiletry drives for women's and men's prison ministries.

Twanna began Project Park Bench as a drive where warm items and food could be brought to the salon for donations to the homeless. Items are then donated to the Mission of Winter Haven.

Further, she also uses her salon to promote other entrepreneurs.

In 2010, Twanna received the Community Service Award from the Jewett Alumni Association and the Bringing Your Business Back Award from the NAACP.

In 2011, she received her associate of arts degree from Polk State College and bachelor of applied science in supervision management in 2013.

Twanna is an usher, president of HIV/AIDS Ministry, and member of the Willing Workers Committee at Hurst Chapel AME Church.

She was the 2014 recipient of Girls Inc. She Knows Where She's Going "George Jenkins" Award.

In 2015, Twanna received the Outstanding Entrepreneur's Self-Determination Award, presented by presiding elder Jimmy Thompson and the Lakeland District African Methodist Episcopal Church.

She also received the Shining Star Award for outstanding ministry and community service and was the recipient of the Minerva Achievement Award from the Lakeland Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc.

Twanna Dewdney, we honor you.

HONORING GLENDA JONES DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Glenda Jones.

It has been said that humility is often found in those who serve others. Glenda Jones best personifies that statement.

For 45 years, Glenda has and continues to champion the elderly by seeking to empower them with knowledge, skill, and resources through the Winter Haven Neighborhood Service Center Inc.

As a registered nurse, she provides care and compassion for her community through civic engagement. Glenda actively serves her community and has been recognized for her participation with a number of organizations in our community.

Glenda won Woman of the Year, the highest honor in Winter Haven, in the 2008 Banker's Cup. She is involved with St. Joseph's school board, the Keep Winter Haven Clean and Beautiful or-

ganization, a charter member of the East Central Democratic Club, secretary for the Polk County Democratic Black Caucus, and the United Way of Central Florida board of directors.

She is also a current member of the Agricultural and Labor Program board of directors, PRIDE of Polk County, the Women's Club of Winter Haven, Silver Life member of the NAACP, and chair of the Winter Haven Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Commemorative Commission as well.

Glenda has been an official sponsor of the Winter Haven MLK Parade and other activities during King Week. She is current chair of the Florence Villa CRA in the city of Winter Haven and a past recipient of the Winter Haven Girls, Inc., She Knows Where She's Going Award.

Glenda Jones, we honor you.

□ 1815

HONORING LAKECIA GUNTER DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Lakecia Gunter.

Lakecia Gunter is a Haines City native. She is currently Intel's chief of staff and technical assistant of Intel. Prior to her current role, she was the general manager of the consumer desktop segment marketing team in the client computing group, where she was responsible for maximizing desktop profitability to grow the desktop P&L.

She is an active member of the Intel Black Leadership Council, Intel's network of Intel African Americans, and Women at Intel.

Lakecia started from humble beginnings, growing up in a single-parent household. Her late mom, Barbara Griffin, always described her as a curious child. She is a trailblazer who has never been afraid to be the only one.

"If they let me in the door, I'm going to make the entrance wider," she says. And she does just that by sharing her time and talents with several non-profits focused on improving educational outcomes for high school dropouts and underprepared college students. In her mentoring, she tries to impress upon kids that challenges are designed to help them grow.

Lakecia earned an MS in electrical engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology and a bachelor of science degree in computer engineering from the University of South Florida. She also earned her project management professional certification.

Her efforts in the engineering career field and the community have garnered her national recognition. She recently was named to Business Insider's list of the 26 most powerful female engineers in 2016. She was the recipient of the Society of Women Engineers' Prism Award for demonstrating outstanding career technology leadership as well as leadership in STEM and in the community.

Further, she was named to Diversity MBA Magazine's 2014 list of top 100

under 50 diverse executive leaders for her technology leadership and achievements at Intel and in the community.

For that, Lakecia Gunter, we honor you.

HONORING GLORIA NIEC DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Gloria Niec. Ms. Niec is the executive director of the Celebration Foundation and has tackled serious issues affecting Osceola County.

In 2012, the Celebration Foundation led the effort to increase awareness of those experiencing hunger in the county by creating Osceola Connected. The group became very involved in combating childhood hunger. Today, Osceola Connected provides food to over 1,000 Osceola County elementary students every week during the school year.

While handing out bags of food or taking children to summer camp, Gloria learned that many graduating seniors had no postsecondary plans. Once she learned that most students had never even visited a college campus before, Gloria and her committee began sponsoring campus tours of Technical Education Center Osceola and Valencia College Osceola Campus. The first year, just over 100 students toured the campuses. Since then, over 6,000 students have toured the campuses, which have helped improve the county's college-going rate.

Education is one of the cornerstones of Celebration Foundation's mission "to work hand in hand with our neighbors to build a strong and caring central Florida community."

Gloria was concerned about the effect of media on girls and young women. She convened a group of talented women, and they formed WINGS, Women's Initiative Nurturing Girls' Strength. The goal is to help girls and women create powerful life journeys.

Gloria also gathered a group of architects and urban planners who are committed to preserving, protecting, and advancing the principles upon which Celebration was based. They teach at Lifelong Learning, lead tours, and sponsor an annual speaker.

The Concert Series, in its 16th year, is enjoying robust attendance and sponsorship. Gloria has helped to grow the series, which offers a cultural opportunity for residents in Celebration, Osceola County, and central Florida. She has also been involved with Thriving in Place and Lifelong Learning, programs that enable seniors to live healthy, safe, independent, and have enriched lives.

And for that, Gloria Niec, we honor you.

HONORING HEATHER WILKIE DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Heather Wilkie.

Heather Wilkie is the executive director of the Zebra Coalition, a network of community organizations

which provide services to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and all youth. Following the tragic Pulse nightclub shooting, the Zebra Coalition evolved as a leading organization in the community's provision of services to victims and their families, and Wilkie continues to lead these efforts to ensure the LGBTQ-plus youth in central Florida have a safe space to turn.

Wilkie serves on the task force for the LGBTQ Alliance, a group of appointed LGBTQ organizations and community leaders formed to address our community's needs as a result of the Pulse shooting.

She is an experienced executive leader in the nonprofit sector with over 13 years of personal commitment and dedication to community service. A dynamic and energetic advocate for global change and equality, Wilkie contributes a strong passion for social justice.

Prior to joining the Zebra Coalition, Wilkie served as chief operating officer for the leading central Florida domestic violence organization Harbor House. During that time, she chaired the LGBTQ Caucus with the Coalition Against Domestic Violence, where she led the statewide initiative to enhance services for LGBTQ survivors of abuse.

Wilkie holds a master's degree in mental health counseling from Rollins College.

And for that, we honor you, Heather Wilkie.

HONORING MARY DOWNEY DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Mary Downey.

Reverend Mary Lee Downey is the executive director and founder of the nonprofit Community Hope Center. The Community Hope Center is a one-stop shop providing services to the homeless and disenfranchised in Osceola County. In 2016, the Community Hope Center was awarded the prestigious Bank of America Neighborhood Builders Award and, in 2015, the Bob Allen Award by Walt Disney World for innovative approaches to helping the homeless in the community.

In the last five years, the Community Hope Center has served over 25,000 individuals in the central Florida area. The Center focuses on a "housing first" model of care while also including a strong position regarding poverty alleviation.

Reverend Downey is a deacon in the United Methodist Church for the Florida Annual Conference. Her focus is on missional outreach through social justice in the nonprofit organizations. She is also a clergy at the Spring of Life United Methodist Church.

Previously, Mary served as the deputy director of Helping Others Make the Effort, HOME, a nonprofit committed to ending homelessness in Osceola County. She was also the program and evangelism director for the First United Methodist Church of Kissimmee, where she focused on spiritual formation, outreach, and missions.

Before moving to central Florida, Mary was a journalist. In 2004, Mary graduated cum laude from Henderson State University in Arkansas with a bachelor of art in mass media. In 2016, she graduated from Henderson State with a master of art in art history and liberal arts. In 2012, Mary graduated with a master of Christian leadership with an emphasis in missions from Asbury Theological Seminary.

Mary and her amazing husband, Martin, have three children. She enjoys writing, preaching, and reading. In her free time, you can find her and her family enjoying the theme parks in central Florida.

And for that, Mary Downey, we honor you.

HONORING SHERI MORTON DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Sheri Morton.

For over half a century, Sheri Morton has volunteered for progressive causes. From the peace, civil rights, and women's movements in the 1960s to voting, equal rights, and quality affordable healthcare, Ms. Morton has volunteered tens of thousands of hours to help improve the quality of life for people in our community, our country, and our world.

Ms. Morton began volunteering as a teenager and continued doing so during her undergraduate years, when she was the first woman from her high school to attend Harvard College. She earned a master's degree at Harvard Graduate School of Education, where she later worked.

After receiving her JD, she became an attorney and is now retired.

Sheri has held numerous volunteer political positions as well as served on the Osceola County Library Advisory Board.

A lifelong supporter of quality affordable healthcare for all Americans, she was a local volunteer spokesperson, encouraging enrollment in the Affordable Care Act health insurance exchanges.

Ms. Morton's volunteer work has ranged from teaching English to immigrants and tutoring a blind student in high school math to collecting food for Appalachia's needy and warm clothes for the homeless. Currently, she regularly volunteers hosting Jewish cultural events for the residents of a local assisted living facility.

After half a century of volunteering, Ms. Morton's dedication to improving the lives of others continues unabated.

And for that, Sheri Morton, we honor you.

HONORING KATHLEEN PLINSKE DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Kathleen Plinske.

Kathleen Plinske serves as campus president of the Osceola, Lake Nona, and Poinciana campuses at Valencia College in Orlando, Florida, and in central Florida. She has served as an advocate for increasing access to higher

education in historically underserved communities and has been instrumental in Osceola County's "Got College?" efforts, which have resulted in an increase in the community college's going rate by more than 20 percent over the last 5 years.

Prior to joining Valencia in 2010, Plinske began her career at McHenry County College, rising up to ultimately becoming interim president of institutional effectiveness. A graduate of Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy, Plinske attended Indiana University Bloomington as a Herman B. Wells scholar, earning a bachelor of arts in Spanish and physics with highest distinction and honors. A member of Phi Beta Kappa, she completed a master of arts in Spanish from Roosevelt University, a doctorate in education technology from Pepperdine University, and a master of business administration from the University of Florida.

Actively involved in her community, Plinske has served as a board chair of the Education Foundation of Osceola County and as president of the Rotary Club of Lake Nona. She has also served on the board of CareerSource Central Florida, the Osceola Center for the Arts, Junior Achievement of Osceola County, and the Lake Nona Education Council.

In 2010, Plinske was recognized as one of 24 emerging leaders in the world by Phi Delta Kappa. In 2012, she was named Woman of the Year by Orlando Business Journal in its 40 Under 40 competition and the Outstanding Young Alumna by Indiana University.

In 2014, she received the Compadre Award from the Hispanic Business Council of the Kissimmee/Osceola Chamber of Commerce and the Don Quijote Hispanic Community Champion Award from the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando.

Plinske was selected as an Aspen Presidential Fellow in 2016 and was named Pepperdine University's Distinguished Alumna in 2017.

And for that, Kathleen Plinske, we honor you.

HONORING KATHY WANDEL DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Kathy Wandel.

Kathy Wandel comes from a career in transportation, which focused on sales, operations, and training. Upon her retirement, she and her husband relocated from Texas to central Florida.

She served on the board of directors for the Senior Resource Alliance, the Area Agency on Aging for Central Florida, representing Osceola County, and was board chair for three years. She also delivered Meals on Wheels for the Osceola County Council on Aging.

□ 1830

She became a volunteer guardian ad litem, helping to provide a powerful voice in court on behalf of Florida's abused, neglected, and abandoned children in 2003.

She was soon invited to join the local nonprofit for the Guardian Ad Litem Program in Osceola County, Voices for Osceola's Children, where she is serving as board chair. This nonprofit supports the efforts of over 200 certified local volunteer GALs, as well as provides for the unmet needs of over 500 local children while they are under the supervision of the court dependency system.

She is a longtime member of Rotary International's Kissimmee West Rotary Club in Osceola County. She plans on continuing to support her club's fundraising efforts through local causes, including the Adopt-A-Precinct program for the Osceola County Supervision of Elections.

She finds the Rotary ideal of "Service Above Self" a wonderful way to meet new people who share the ideal and work to give back to the community.

For that, Kathy Wandel, we honor you.

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

ABORTION IN AMERICA

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to have the opportunity to be here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I ask that people who are listening to our conversation weigh heavily on some of the remarks that will be made here this half hour.

I come to the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker, to address the situation of innocent, unborn human life in America and to recount the path that we have followed and to lay out a path for the future that gives us a better opportunity to save as many lives as possible.

For me, Mr. Speaker, I recall that when 1973 rolled around—January 22, 1973—on that date, we had two major decisions that came down from the United States Supreme Court: *Roe v. Wade*, which most everybody knows; and the other was *Doe v. Bolton*. Of those two cases that dropped on us in January of 1973, not very many people, if any, understood the magnitude of the decisions that had been made that day or the impact it would have on the population of the United States of America.

They did not believe that we would see 45 years of pro-life marches coming to the city in the middle of the winter and sometimes marching through the snow from down on the Mall, all the way up to the United States Supreme Court building, calling upon the Supreme Court to correct the decision that was made by an activist court in 1973.

The bottom line of that decision was that an abortion was essentially declared to be, some would say, a con-

stitutional right for any reason or no reason at all, as much as you might want to parse the phrases in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, for me, I didn't realize the impact of this in 1973. But by 1976, when my first son was born, I remember holding him in my hands and looking at David Steven King, understanding the miracle of life and the miracle of birth and thinking within that first hour of his life how anyone could take his life now, this little miracle child with that big head and dark hair and blue eyes and gurgling a little bit and crying some and squirming a lot, but a miracle.

I thought: How could anyone take his life now, when he is an hour old or a minute old or a minute before he was born or an hour before he was born? Could they take his life a day before, a week before, or a month before, or a trimester before?

When could you decide that this child's life could be ended, and do so within a moral framework rather than a framework of maybe self-interest?

I concluded that there was only one moment, only one instant. We have to choose that moment when life begins. There is only one, and that is the moment of conception. We all know that. I knew it in 1973. I am sure I knew it before then, but I hadn't thought about it very much.

And here we are today and we know. We know by the benefit of ultrasound. We are watching little babies squirm around in the womb. We are watching them yawn and stretch and suck their thumbs and try to talk and stretch themselves and belch and do all the things inside the womb that they do pretty shortly when they get outside the womb. It is life. It is miraculous life. Little hands, little feet, little fingers, a little nose, little eyes. They are little babies that are defenseless.

This Congress has allowed a Supreme Court to impose abortion on demand in America, and we have worked to put together very few limitations on that abortion on demand. I don't think we have done enough, either, to send the message to America that life begins at the moment of conception. But ultrasound has shown many of us in this country—millions of us—that life does exist inside the womb.

We know that we can, even with a transabdominal ultrasound, verify a heartbeat in 7 to 8 weeks from conception. In 7 to 9 weeks, that little baby is formed by then with a beating heart. We know that of those babies that have a detectable beating heart, 95 percent of those babies will experience a successful birth. It is at least 95 percent. Some say more.

So 95 percent of them, or more, are destined to experience a successful birth. Yet the most dangerous place for a baby is in the mother's womb. It is the most dangerous place because our hearts are hardened by a Supreme Court decision that some think will not change, that we have to live with it

in perpetuity and accept the consequences of 60 million Americans being aborted.

There is a hole in the population of America that is 60 billion babies strong. Some of those little girls who were aborted would be mothers by now. When you do the math on that just on the back of the envelope, that is perhaps as many as another 60 million babies—a missing 120 million Americans that would otherwise have been born in this country and had the opportunity to live, to love, to laugh, to learn, to worship, to be mothers or fathers themselves. That is what we are asking for here in this Congress with 170 cosponsors on the Heartbeat bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), one of those cosponsors who is a bit of a rare commodity himself, a conservative from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am, indeed, pleased to join my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING) tonight, who has been a very strong, tireless leader on this issue and many other important ones for our Congress and our country. So I thank him for that and for letting me be here to be a part of this tonight.

Obviously, this is a very important issue and we need to have a much better discussion than we have had in a long time in this country.

The moral of the Heartbeat Protection Act is extremely simple to understand. It is against the law for a physician to perform an abortion after detecting a heartbeat, other than to save the life of the mother.

Mr. KING was speaking a moment ago about this. For anybody who uses common sense, life begins at that moment of conception. At that moment of conception, you have a life. If you don't have a conception, obviously, you don't have a life.

So how is it that it is even a debate? How do people hide on the sidelines, in the shadows, somehow debating it as something like, "Well, is it really a life," or, "At what line do we draw that point at?"

That is an important point Mr. KING made as well with all the different ideas of when an abortion is appropriate.

We have a 20-week mark. We have the end of the first trimester, the end of the second trimester.

What date is appropriate?

We have people these days talking about partial-birth abortion not being a problem at all. Even in some extreme quarters, some people are saying that post-birth is somehow an acceptable way and that it isn't really a person with rights at that point.

We are talking about a much narrower thing here, with the heartbeat being a true detectable moment of life. When prospective mothers go in for those ultrasounds, it is a very moving moment for her, and, hopefully, her mate there with her, to see what is going on inside there with all those little baby parts that are being formed and the miracle that life is.

But it is really a telling moment when that prospective mother hears that heartbeat. That is what is so important in this debate about having the tool of an ultrasound to show what is really going on here, for those who try to obfuscate what is happening with the pregnancy. Let that prospective mother make an informed decision, not one that is hidden, not one that is obfuscated by, "Oh, it is just a tissue mass or something."

The crime about a lot of this is that a lot of these women are not being allowed to make an informed decision about what is really going on.

So this Heartbeat bill that Mr. KING is championing here is an important moment in time for a prospective mom and her mate to be able to have an informed decision and really contemplate this life that is happening and the downside of what that abortion might mean.

So, indeed, is it not a crime to murder a human being with a heartbeat?

It really shouldn't be any different for babies that are yet to be born.

Arguably, since they are innocent, isn't it more important we protect their rights?

They don't really have someone to speak for them, except for those of us who realize what we are truly taking about here: an innocent life with a heartbeat that will become a life outside of the womb and walk amongst the rest of us humans with dignity, with passion, with ideas, with dreams. That is what we are defending here.

It really mystifies me how legislation like this is so difficult to move through this body, the Senate, the Congress as a whole, or State legislatures in other types of bills we have tried in order to preserve life, to preserve the value of life.

Indeed, if we are not a country that is going to value life in all of its human forms, then what are we?

Our Founders placed a great value on those liberties that have formed this country. Indeed, right above the dais it says: "In God we trust."

I think God watches what we do here. He is watching what is happening to these babies and he wants us to tell the truth and know the truth and be able to project the truth on what is really going on with a pregnancy or those who are contemplating a very serious decision.

This bill will go a long way toward shedding the light on a quantifiable moment when there is a detected heartbeat that anybody around that ultrasound can hear. That should be a reality moment. I think more times than not, a prospective mother will make a decision for life, given that.

I commend my colleague, Mr. KING, for battling this for those who have lost their lives so many millions of times in the past and had nobody to defend them. But he is building momentum on this legislation and his effort with so many pro-life groups around the country, so many pro-life legisla-

tors that are onboard with this. We need a couple more of these national groups to get involved and not see the fog, but, instead, see the clear path that this is.

I implore people to contact their legislators and contact the organizations that are supposed to be standing for life and make sure they get onboard with this effort, because a heartbeat is a true indication of life.

I thank Mr. KING for his effort with this.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman gives me a little too much credit and doesn't take enough credit for himself.

□ 1845

That is that measure of humility I was asked about earlier today. Trent Franks always said: The funny thing about humility, about the time you think you have achieved it, you have lost it.

Mr. LAMALFA is a solid principled conservative, and I appreciate him coming to the floor to defend life. The effort that we have had is the whip team has gone out and pulled together 170 cosponsors on this bill that has set the stage for a path that I believe soon will be to the floor of the House of Representatives. Let's put the Heartbeat bill over on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk. That is a good place for a lot of good things to have a chance to happen, even though they are a little slower at moving over there than we are over here.

One of the nimble folks who has been actively engaged in the pro-life movement in the House of Representatives is Mr. LAMBORN from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KING for his endless and tireless leadership in reminding us of the humanity of the unborn. I am a proud cosponsor of the Heartbeat Protection Act. I am one of those 170 who have stepped forward to support this much-needed piece of legislation.

The development of an unborn baby is truly miraculous. Around 6 to 8 weeks, you can detect, through ultrasound, the heartbeat of the little child inside the mother's womb; 6 to 8 weeks. So I don't see how people can deny that an abortion is the taking of a human life.

How many lives would we save if we remembered that simple fact?

What if instead of rushing to abortion, which some people think is their only option, we instead turned our attention to addressing practical needs, the needs of a woman facing a pregnancy decision?

What if we empowered women to carry and raise their child?

Or what if we did everything we could to promote a stable and happy life for the child through adoption?

America was built on the principle that life is a God-given gift. Here, in Congress, it is our duty to protect

human life at all stages. I will continue to do so, and I know Representative KING will continue to do so. I thank him for his leadership. I am glad that I can support him with this wonderful piece of legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for coming to the floor to make such a strong message here on the sanctity of human life.

When I think about that heartbeat, a heartbeat is a certain indicator of life. If the baby has a beating heart, we know that baby is alive. Statistically speaking, 95 percent or more of those little babies that have a beating heart, that can be detected by an ultrasound in that 6- to 8-week period of time, 95 percent of them will experience a successful birth.

I have asked the question to those who weren't supportive of the bill: Did you ever hear the expression, "Let's error on the side of life?"

Well, let's not error with life at all if we can help it. If we have a 95 percent chance of a successful birth, we can't take a chance on ending that little baby's life.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bill that has come together over the last year and a half or so. Just to mention some of the points here that I think are important is that we have at least 162 pro-life organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. I have a little demonstration here.

These are some of the organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. We have to really search pretty hard to find somebody that is not on-board.

You can go down through this list. I could read these all off, but I think it would be a little bit tiresome and maybe a little bit redundant. I put this together. This may be one-third of—or maybe even one-fourth—of the overall list of 162 pro-life organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. It is nearly universal across this country.

Of course, we don't have Planned Parenthood on here. We don't have the NARAL here. The National Abortion Rights Action League is what they used to be. They say they aren't anymore, but, yes, they are.

We have the pro-life organizations here: the people who care about life, the people who understand that human life is sacred in all of its forms, it begins at the moment of conception, that we have to protect life from that time on, and that we have a constitutional duty to do so. We have an equal protection clause in the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution that tells us that.

But it seems as though the United States Supreme Court, in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, upset that. They decided that a right to privacy, which was a manufactured right—I don't think I have it in my memos—but it is *Griswold v. Connecticut* back in the 1960s. It is a decision that a couple had

a right to privacy in order to buy birth control pills. It was in Connecticut in that period of time. Shortly after that decision, they decided it wasn't just a married couple that had a right to privacy; it was an unmarried couple that had a right to privacy in the form of contraceptives. That was only in the mid-sixties.

Then *Roe v. Wade* came along. I think that this Court can never be defended for the decision that they made, the idea that privacy trumps life, and that the privacy of a mother will allow for an abortion at any stage, is how this all came together between *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*.

But even some of our professors that you might think have been on the other side of the issue had their skepticism. In fact, there is a bit of it here in Ruth Bader Ginsburg in a statement that she made in 1985. Our Supreme Court Justice Ginsburg said:

Roe, I believe, would have been more acceptable as a judicial decision if it had not gone beyond a ruling on the extreme statute before the court. Heavyhanded judicial intervention was difficult to justify and appears to have provoked, not resolved, the conflict.

I would restate the Fourteenth Amendment. It says this: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

This comes back to personhood. I believe that a conceived baby from that moment is a person. We don't have the technical medical ability to define that moment at this point, Mr. Speaker, but we can define "heartbeat," and we have done so in the Heartbeat Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), who has been a leader and a fighter for life since back in the 1980s or so, when I was still in the crib.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Mr. KING for his work on the Heartbeat Protection Act. It gives us an opportunity to reflect on some of those bigger issues that we have going on in our society.

This is personal to everybody. We all have our own stories of when we are in a family situation and somebody becomes pregnant. I certainly remember that when my wife and I had our first child. The first visit to the doctor when you got to hear the heartbeat was just amazing.

I remember also having a subsequent appointment where the doctor couldn't find the heartbeat. We were very concerned, very worried, so they sent us to the hospital. They wanted us to have another test. It is a small town we were in. The hospital was where they had the sonogram. My wife and I were praying all the way: Please, let this baby be okay.

Well, we got to the hospital and the technician did a sonogram, and, lo and

behold, we saw the baby, we saw the beating heart, and we were just in awe at this new human life.

Mothers and fathers are forever changed when they first hear that heartbeat, that tiny pulse that reinforces the big and beautiful reality of a precious human life.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I rise in support of H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act. As a lawmaker, I took an oath to our Constitution to protect the constitutional rights of all Americans. That is why I am cosponsoring this bill.

This legislation protects a pre-born baby's life when his or her heartbeat is detected. A heartbeat is a very basic sign of life. The pulse represents a unique person with inherent dignity and natural, human and constitutional rights that extend throughout the continuum of life through conception until natural death.

And where do these rights come from?

The Founders who signed the Declaration knew, for the Declaration itself says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

That is interesting, Mr. Speaker, because the first unalienable right that is identified is the right to life.

Do you know who else knew?

President Kennedy.

President Kennedy reminded us in a different context, in the struggle against atheistic totalitarian communism. He said these words: "And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God."

The right to life, defined in our Declaration, protected in our Constitution, and reiterated time and again by leaders across the religious and political spectrum, applies to every human life. It is easy to see who is human, if you look.

Twenty-six years ago, the late Governor Bob Casey from Pennsylvania, and others, including Sargent Shriver and Eunice Kennedy Shriver, signed onto a statement regarding abortion as true today as when it was published. Under the section of that document that was titled "Without a Doubt, a Human Life," Governor Casey and his coauthors observed:

From the beginning, each human embryo has its own unique genetic identity. Three and a half weeks after conception, its heart starts beating. At 6 weeks, brain activity can be detected. At the end of 2 months, the limbs, fingers, and toes are complete. By 3 months, the baby is quite active, forming fists, bending arms, and curling toes. At 4 months, vocal cords, eyelashes, teeth buds, fingernails, and toenails are all present. By 5 months, the baby is sucking its thumb, punching, kicking, and going through the motions of crying. By 6 months, it responds to light and sound and can recognize its mother's voice.

The statement went on:

Advocates of unrestricted abortion do not want the public to focus on these undeniable facts of fetal development, but the facts cannot be ignored. They may claim that abortion is a violent act, not against potential life, but against a living, growing human being, a life with potential.

Governor Casey subscribed to that belief.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. Intentionally stopping a heartbeat is not healthcare.

H.R. 490 recognizes what science has already affirmed: that there is a baby growing in her mother's womb, one with her own distinct heartbeat.

Therefore, we have an obligation to protect the most vulnerable among us: to defend the defenseless.

How can our country continue to flourish and claim itself as a champion of human rights when we allow our society to rid ourselves of our own future generations?

That is why I came to the floor today to urge support for the Heartbeat Protection Act, to give our country a chance to reflect on some of the deeper questions and deeper values, to walk in solidarity with one another when one encounters a difficult situation, and to stand in each another's shoes with empathy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his eloquent words.

I hadn't heard the description delivered by Governor Casey in those years back. But Governor Bob Casey—God rest his soul—captured my attention years ago, 20 or more years ago. I had a quote from Governor Bob Casey, a Democrat, that I had on my bulletin board that I don't have to look up anymore. And it was this:

Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

It rang so clear and true to me that I cut it out of the magazine and stuck it up on the bulletin board. His words echo in this Chamber today. I wish they echoed in his son over in the Senate the same way they echoed out of the mouth of Governor Bob Casey back in those days when he was denied the opportunity to speak before the Democratic National Convention because he is pro-life. And we look today and we see this issue has been more and more polarized. I hope that we can be more broad with this and that we can be more bipartisan than we are.

□ 1900

We do have bipartisan cosponsorship on this bill. It is narrow, but it exists.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, this body to take this bill to the floor. 170 cosponsors is further ahead than any comparable piece of pro-life legislation. To have that many cosponsors and a good number of other Members who have said, "I am not ready to sign on the dotted line, but you bring it to the

floor, and I will vote 'yes,'" I think we get to "yes," but we need to bring it here.

There are concerns that, well, if we pass it off the floor of the House, the Senate won't take it up. Well, we know they won't take it up if we don't pass it off the floor of the House.

There is concern about the Supreme Court. Of course there is. We have to challenge the Court. We are going to live with the 1 million abortions a year in this country until we are willing to challenge the Court and do so successfully.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to see one or two more appointments to this Court in the next 2 or 3 or more years, and we need to get the bill off the floor, onto the desk of Leader McCONNELL so that it has a chance then to go to the President's desk, where I am very confident that President Trump will sign the bill. And then it has a chance to go—I am happy with it not being litigated, but we expect it will be litigated like every other effective piece of pro-life legislation.

I appreciate the attention tonight, Mr. Speaker, and the speakers who have come to the floor to weigh in for innocent, unborn human life and to lay out the path for the future that we have to follow here if we are to answer to God and country for that gift from God, which is life, in the first priority, then liberty, then the pursuit of happiness.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for after 4 p.m. today and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and March 7 on account of his duties with the Ohio National Guard.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of flight delays.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY2018 AND THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FY2018 THROUGH FY2027

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2018, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027. This status report is current through February 23, 2018. The term "current level" refers to the amounts of

spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

Table 1 in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues to the overall limits, as adjusted, contained in H. Con. Res. 71, as agreed to on October 26, 2017, for fiscal year 2018, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, which establishes a rule enforceable with a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2018 because appropriations for those years have not yet been completed.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for legislative action completed by each authorizing committee with the limits contained in the Statement of Committee Allocations of the Fiscal Year 2018 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017, for fiscal year 2018, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027. For fiscal year 2018 and the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027, "legislative action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the levels set forth in H. Con. Res. 71 and the Statement of Committee Allocations published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2018 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending in excess of the base discretionary spending limits allowed under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.

Table 4 compares the levels of changes in mandatory programs (CHIMPs) contained in appropriations acts with the permissible limits on CHIMPs as specified in section 5103 of H. Con. Res. 71. The comparison is needed to enforce a rule established in H. Con. Res. 71 against fiscal year 2018 appropriations measures containing CHIMPs that would breach the permissible limits for fiscal year 2018.

Table 5 displays the current level of advance appropriations for fiscal year 2019 of accounts identified for advance appropriations pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017. These tables are needed to enforce a rule against appropriations bills containing advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of the Chairman published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017 and (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in section 5104 of H. Con. Res. 71.

In addition, a letter from the Congressional Budget Office is attached that summarizes and compares the budget impact of legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregates in force.

If you have any questions, please contact
Brad Watson.

Sincerely,

STEVE WOMACK,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

TABLE 1—REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2018, AND 2018–2027 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 2018 ¹	Fiscal Years 2018–2027
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	3,136,721	n.a.
Outlays	3,131,688	n.a.
Revenues	2,490,936	31,171,521
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	3,314,353	n.a.
Outlays	3,244,451	n.a.
Revenues	2,503,102	31,096,088
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	+177,632	n.a.
Outlays	+112,763	n.a.
Revenues	+12,166	–75,433

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2020 through 2027 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

¹ The FY2018 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget was agreed to in H. Con. Res 71.

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR BUDGET CHANGES REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2018		2018–2027	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
302(a) Allocation	–2,243	–1,991	–209,852	–206,919
Legislative Action	+55	+55	+1,282	+1,369
Difference	+2,298	+2,046	+211,134	+208,288
Armed Services:				
302(a) Allocation	–1,651	–1,485	–32,949	–32,601
Legislative Action	–78	–69	–1,142	–1,082
Difference	+1,573	+1,416	+31,807	+31,519
Education and the Workforce:				
302(a) Allocation	–16,809	–9,799	–353,852	–326,214
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	+16,809	+9,799	+353,852	+326,214
Energy and Commerce:				
302(a) Allocation	7,805	–24,661	–1,652,820	–1,656,131
Legislative Action	+22,268	+5,408	–70,992	–140,028
Difference	+14,463	+30,069	+1,581,828	+1,516,103
Financial Services:				
302(a) Allocation	–10,980	–10,695	–124,012	–123,666
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	+10,980	+10,695	+124,012	+123,666
Foreign Affairs:				
302(a) Allocation	0	0	0	0
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
302(a) Allocation	–430	–193	–25,270	–24,689
Legislative Action	0	0	–3,320	–3,320
Difference	+430	+193	+21,950	+21,369
House Administration:				
302(a) Allocation	0	0	0	0
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Judiciary:				
302(a) Allocation	–16,098	–1,528	–67,078	–67,178
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	+16,098	+1,528	+67,078	+67,178
Natural Resources:				
302(a) Allocation	–3,816	–3,171	–60,417	–59,302
Legislative Action	+75	+26	–379	–379
Difference	+3,891	+3,197	+60,038	+58,923
Oversight and Government Reform:				
302(a) Allocation	–12,746	–12,746	–281,830	–281,706
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	+12,746	+12,746	+281,830	+281,706
Science, Space and Technology:				
302(a) Allocation	0	0	0	0
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
302(a) Allocation	0	0	0	0
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
302(a) Allocation	–241	–193	–122,290	–3,066
Legislative Action	–2	–2	–42	–42
Difference	+239	+191	+122,248	+3,024
Veterans' Affairs:				
302(a) Allocation	–748	–748	–49,022	–49,022
Legislative Action	+2,100	+1,050	+2,100	+2,100
Difference	+2,848	+1,798	+51,122	+51,122
Ways and Means:				
302(a) Allocation	–19,499	–19,108	–800,344	–799,687
Legislative Action	–8,233	–8,584	–102,388	–87,522
Difference	+11,266	+10,524	+697,956	+712,165

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018

[Figures in Millions]¹

	Allocations		302(b) for GWOT		Current Status General Purpose ¹		Current Status GWOT		General Purpose less 302(b)		GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	20,001	21,459	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Commerce, Justice, Science	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	53,935	64,318	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Defense	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	584,169	553,725	75,112	39,395	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Energy and Water Development	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	37,562	38,915	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Financial Services and General Government	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	20,230	22,384	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Homeland Security	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	51,989	48,687	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Interior, Environment	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	31,442	32,090	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	157,936	168,354	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Legislative Branch	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	3,580	3,697	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	88,166	84,593	638	6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
State, Foreign Operations	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	34,469	45,194	12,019	4,725	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	56,512	120,914	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Full Committee Allowance	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Total	1,064,806	1,167,885	76,591	43,121	1,139,991	1,204,330	87,769	44,126	+75,185	+36,445	+11,178	+1,005
Comparison of Total Appropriations and 302(a) allocation									General Purpose		GWOT	
									BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation									1,064,806	1,167,885	76,591	43,121
Total Appropriations									1,139,991	1,204,330	87,769	44,126
Total Appropriations vs 302(a) Allocation									+75,185	+36,445	+11,178	+1,005
Memorandum					Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec 251(b) Designated Categories					BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA					n.a.	n.a.	4,868	3,125	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science					n.a.	n.a.	1,199	328	0	0	0	0
Defense					n.a.	n.a.	4,921	1,087	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development					n.a.	n.a.	17,420	411	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government					n.a.	n.a.	1,786	1,310	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security					n.a.	n.a.	59,323	21,709	6,793	340	0	0
Interior, Environment					n.a.	n.a.	1,278	920	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education					n.a.	n.a.	3,987	1,762	0	0	1,896	1,576
Legislative Branch					n.a.	n.a.	14	11	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs					n.a.	n.a.	1,014	66	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations					n.a.	n.a.	0	3	0	0	0	0
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development					n.a.	n.a.	29,829	921	0	0	0	0
Totals					0	0	125,639	31,653	6,793	340	1,896	1,576

¹ Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown in this table.

TABLE 4—CURRENT LEVEL OF FY 2018 CHIMPS SUBJECT TO H. CON. RES. 71, SECTION 5103 LIMITS (IN MILLIONS) AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018

Appropriations Bill	Budget Authority
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	0
State, Foreign Operations	0
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development	0
Total CHIMP's Subject to Limit	0
H. Con. Res.71, Section 5103 Limit for FY 2018	19,100
Total CHIMP's vs. Limit	-19,100

TABLE 5—2019 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 5104 OF H. CON. RES. 71 AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018

[Budget Authority, millions]	
Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations	2019
Appropriate Level	70,699

TABLE 5—2019 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 5104 OF H. CON. RES. 71 AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018—Continued

[Budget Authority, millions]	
Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations	2019
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Department of Veterans Affairs	
Veterans Medical Services	0
Veterans Medical Support and Compliance	0
Veterans Medical Facilities	0
Veterans Medical Community Care	0
Subtotal, enacted advances	0
Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(1) Limit	-70,699
Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations	2019
Appropriate Level	28,852
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Special Education	0
Career, Technical and Adult Education	0
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	0
Project-based Rental Assistance	0
Subtotal, enacted advances ¹	0
Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(2) Limit	-28,852
Previously Enacted Advance Appropriations	2019
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	445
Total, enacted advances	445

FISCAL YEAR 2018 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH FEBRUARY 23, 2018

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^{a b c}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,658,139
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,070,788	1,985,384	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	513,307	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-866,685	-866,685	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,204,103	1,632,006	2,658,139
Enacted Legislation ^b			
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (P.L. 115-91)	-33	-24	0
CHIP and Public Health Funding Extension Act (P.L. 115-96, Division C)	705	205	0
An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 . . . and for other purposes (P.L. 115-96, Division D)	2,100	1,050	0
An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (P.L. 115-97)	-8,600	-8,600	-143,800

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2018.Hon. STEVE WOMACK,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2018 budget and is current through February 23, 2018. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 71, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

This is CBO's first current level report for fiscal year 2018.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2018 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH FEBRUARY 23, 2018—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
An act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–120, Divisions C and D)	14,509	1,203	– 1,263
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Divisions A and C–G) ^a	7,504	4,050	– 9,974
Further Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 3) ^a	– 315	– 315	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	15,870	– 2,431	– 155,037
Continuing Resolution ^c ^d			
Further Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 3)	1,085,570	627,733	0
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	1,008,810	987,143	0
Total Current Level ^c ^e	3,314,353	3,244,451	2,503,102
Total House Resolution	3,136,721	3,131,688	2,490,936
Current Level Over House Resolution	177,632	112,763	12,166
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Memorandum			
Revenues, 2018–2027			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	31,096,088
House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	31,171,521
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	75,433

Source Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable, P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the budgetary effects of the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues and were cleared by the Congress during the 1st session of the 115th Congress, but before the adoption of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 the VA Choice and Quality Employment Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–46); the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–48); a joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to the establishment of the Washington Metrorail Safety Commission (P.L. 115–54); the Continuing Appropriations Act 2018 and Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–56); the Emergency Aid to American Survivors of Hurricanes Irma and Jose Overseas Act (P.L. 115–57); the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–62); the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63); the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria Education Relief Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–64); and the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–72).

^b Pursuant to section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act), amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act, and are excluded from current level totals. In addition, emergency funding designated that was not designated pursuant to the Deficit Control Act does not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. Those amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Deficit Control Act:			
Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act 2017 (P.L. 115–56, Division B)	0	3,406	0
Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–72)	36,517	16,256	0
Department of Defense Missile Defeat and Defense Enhancements Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–96, Division B)	4,686	803	0
Further Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 1)	84,436	11,185	0
Subtotal, Deficit Control Act emergency requirements	125,639	31,650	0
Other Emergency Requirements			
Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63)	263	263	0
Bipartisan Budget Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 2)	2,217	1,469	– 509
Subtotal, other emergency requirements	2,480	1,732	– 509
Total, amounts designated as emergency requirements	128,119	33,382	– 509

^c Pursuant to sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255), certain funding provided to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—in 2017 through 2026 shall not count for the purposes of the Deficit Control Act or the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts shown in this report do not include \$866 million in budget authority and \$706 million in estimated outlays from such amounts.

^d The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123) contains seven divisions. Division A, Subdivision 2 of Division B, and Divisions C–F contain authorizing legislation, of which the budgetary effects of Subdivision 2 of Division B were designated as being for emergency requirements. Subdivisions 1 and 3 of Division B contain appropriations legislation. Subdivision 1 provided supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for disaster relief and designated those amounts as being for emergency requirements; Subdivision 3 provided continuing appropriations until March 23, 2018, while Section 158 provided authority, for the duration of fiscal year 2018, for the Secretary of Energy to draw down and sell crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Division G of P.L. 115–123 provided for the budgetary treatment of Divisions A–F.

^e For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3656. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a consistent eligibility date for provision of Department of Veterans Affairs memorial headstones and markers for eligible spouses and dependent children of veterans whose remains are unavailable.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4181. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting

the Corporation's 2017 Annual Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827(a)(2); September 21, 1950, ch. 967, Sec. 2(17)(a) (as amended by Public Law 101-73, Sec. 220(a)); (103 Stat. 263) and 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4182. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Computation of Annual Liability Insurance (Including Self-Insurance), No-Fault Insurance, and Workers' Compensation Settlement Recovery Threshold", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395y(b)(9)(D); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1862(b)(9)(D) (as added by Public Law 112-242, Sec. 202(a)(2)); (126 Stat. 2379); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4986. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reauthorize appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, to provide for certain procedural changes to the rules of the Commission to maximize opportunities for public participation and efficient decisionmaking,

and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-587, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1116. A bill to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4545. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4986 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 5171. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to provide for the establishment of a Ski Area Fee Retention Account; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 5172. A bill to assist Indian tribes in maintaining, expanding, and deploying broadband systems; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 5173. A bill to include Portugal in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E-1 and E-2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of Portugal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 5174. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act with respect to functions assigned to Assistant Secretaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 5175. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program relating to physical security and cybersecurity for pipelines and liquefied natural gas facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5176. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide coordinated care to patients who have experienced a non-fatal overdose after emergency room discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 5177. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5178. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for small business concerns located in Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 5179. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to coordinate a National Cyber Hacking Competition for high school students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5180. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide protections for employees receiving tips, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 5181. A bill to require certain licensees under the Federal Power Act make annual payments to the county in which a licensed hydropower facility is located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLEG0 (for himself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 5182. A bill to require annual reports on funds expended by the Federal Government with the Trump Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5183. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply the rules related to the treatment of certain qualified film and television and live theatrical productions to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5184. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to improve conservation practice standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5185. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for the Cops in Schools program for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5186. A bill to amend the definition of a school resource officer to include certain veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. JONES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 5187. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1585 Yanceyville Street, Greensboro, North Carolina, as the "J. Howard Coble Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 5188. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 with respect to land stewardship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 764. A resolution electing Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 765. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 15, 2018, as "National Senior Fraud Awareness Day" to raise awareness about the barrage of fraud attempts that seniors face, to encourage the implementation of policies to prevent these scams from happening, and to improve protections from these scams for seniors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. SCHNEIDER introduced a bill (H.R. 5189) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Francis E. Normoyle for acts of valor during the Korean War while a member of the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States;"

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 5172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 5175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 5176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 5179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I 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. DELAURO:

H.R. 5180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 5181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 5182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 5183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; [. . .]

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; [. . .]—And

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

Moreover, the Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 states, “The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .”

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 states, “The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . .” And; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 states, “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 Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 5187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7: To establish post offices and post roads.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 5188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill can be enacted pursuant to Article I Section 8

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 5189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 103: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 299: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 350: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 362: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 394: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 440: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 681: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 807: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 809: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 881: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 911: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 930: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1120: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1156: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1223: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1276: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1439: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1484: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1615: Mr. PETERS, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 1683: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1697: Mr. CURTIS, Mr. YOHO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1734: Mr. BARR and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1772: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1828: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1904: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1905: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1972: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 2044: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2069: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 2259: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2285: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2358: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2452: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2803: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2856: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2886: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3207: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. O'ROURKE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3391: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3497: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 3592: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3611: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 3613: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3637: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 3641: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 3681: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ROSEN, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3773: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 3784: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3790: Mr. BARR, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 3867: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3871: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 3889: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 4052: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4058: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4090: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 4099: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 4101: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4143: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 4177: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 4198: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4223: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 4238: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 4245: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 4265: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 4373: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 4444: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 4471: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 4486: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 4489: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 4527: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4573: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4575: Mr. MESSER, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 4635: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 4659: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 4677: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 4681: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 4703: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 4706: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 4720: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BOST, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4732: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 4747: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 4772: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 4779: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 4800: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4808: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 4811: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. CORREA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BERA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4821: Mr. ROSS and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4828: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 4841: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 4846: Ms. TITUS, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 4878: Mr. RUSH and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 4886: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 4888: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 4909: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BLUM, Mr. COLE, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. FASO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4910: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 4912: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4916: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 4932: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 4940: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4944: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 4995: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 5002: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 5006: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 5012: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 5022: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5031: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 5042: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 5062: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5083: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 5085: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5086: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5104: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 5106: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. DeSAULNIER.

H.R. 5116: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 5129: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 5132: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BARR, and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 5140: Mr. COLE.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Con. Res. 108: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN,

Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 128: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 199: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H. Res. 257: Mr. VALADAO.

H. Res. 344: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H. Res. 361: Mr. HASTINGS.

H. Res. 576: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. CURTIS.

H. Res. 632: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H. Res. 697: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H. Res. 752: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 755: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Mary-

land, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DeSAULNIER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 760: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, and Miss RICE of New York.

H. Res. 761: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. PANETTA.