



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2018

No. 75

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 9, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMES COMER 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.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING CRISIS

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of every family struggling to pay rent, every student facing homelessness, and every city that is seeing historic communities displaced.

We are facing an affordable housing crisis, and we cannot ignore this epidemic. Over 38 million families struggle to pay rent and put food on the table every day because they spend more than a third of their income on

housing. Now, in my district, in the East Bay in northern California, the average renter in Oakland would be forced to spend a staggering—mind you, staggering—70 percent of their income on housing if they were to move today. That is 70 percent. Clearly, the affordable housing crisis is off the scale in my district.

In April, I sent an email to my constituents asking for their stories and suggestions on how to address this very important issue. Today I would like to share just a few of those stories which really touched my heart.

One woman shared how, being unable to afford a place to live, she had to put herself in harm's way to have shelter. She said: I stayed in an unsafe and shared housing situation much longer than I would have had I been able to find an affordable place to move. I have found a place now but no longer have any disposable income. I worry that an unexpected event could lead to being unhoused. I have many friends who are single mothers with children who are sleeping in cars or bouncing from couch to couch.

The housing crisis has also taken a devastating toll on seniors in my district. One woman wrote: Many of my longtime friends and acquaintances have been forced to move out of the State. My husband and I have lived in an old place for a long time, and the rent is relatively low; but the building may be sold, and I don't know what we would do. I am a cancer survivor and fear moving out of the State would make me lose my health insurance. I would also have a hard time finding a new job at 62. We have applied at numerous senior housing apartments, but all have long waiting lists.

These stories also highlighted the impact of the housing crisis on public sector workers and students in our community.

One gentleman wrote: As a teacher, I cannot afford to stay in Oakland. Home

ownership is out of the question. Even as a dedicated public servant, I can't afford to work in urban schools in the Bay area.

A former student wrote me: I had to withdraw from classes at UC Berkeley so I could find stable housing and enough income to afford my monthly rent.

Mr. Speaker, our community, our country, cannot function without nurses, teachers, or young people living in decent affordable housing. We need to solve this crisis before it is too late. These stories represent just a small number of the responses I received. I heard from many constituents who are delaying having children and passing up opportunities to open a business or switch careers because they cannot afford to move or to live where they want to live.

I heard from some residents who live in cars, on couches, or on the streets because the cost of rent has soared. Now I see, sadly, homeless camps with sofas, chairs, and tables. So many people have been evicted with nowhere to go.

Believe you me, there are many more in my district and across America who are homeless right now: seniors, veterans, single moms raising children. They have nowhere to sleep at night. We must do better so that no one is forced to live on the streets. We must do better to ensure that no child is homeless. And we must do better to ensure that no senior has to choose between food and rent. We must do better because there is no option. The affordable housing crisis is tearing apart families and communities. This is not a partisan issue; it is a human one.

That is why I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will cosponsor my affordable housing resolution which I introduced yesterday, H. Con. Res. 120, and affirm that all people deserve access to basic living standards. We need to begin this debate, and it needs

□ 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.

H3837

to be bipartisan. People deserve to hear that from their representatives.

And I hope that these stories which I shared will inspire all of my colleagues to ask their constituents about this crisis and convince them to join me in bolstering Federal resources for affordable housing. We can't delay any longer.

Mr. Speaker, as a person of faith, there is no way that I can stand by and watch so many people living on the streets without shelter, without food. They deserve a chance at the American Dream, also.

HONORING MARTIN TWENHAFEL

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an Illinois hero who passed away this last week.

Martin Twenhafel of Gorham, Illinois, passed at the age of 92. He joins his wife, Katherine, who passed in March. Martin was a U.S. Army veteran and served in Europe during World War II. He was a life member of the American Legion Paul Stout Post 127 and VFW Post 7190 in Murphysboro for over 70 years.

Martin, a farmer, was a lifelong resident of southern Illinois, where he farmed corn, soybeans, and wheat with his sons on the Twenhafel Farms. He was so moved by his time in the war that he wrote and published a book titled "Far from the Farm" to save and share those experiences with his grandchildren and children.

Martin, it is with a heavy heart that we thank you for your service to southern Illinois and our Nation.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Teacher Appreciation Week to honor America's teachers.

I still know the names of my first nine teachers at the Houghton-Kearney Elementary School in Fresno County because they all made a difference in my life: Ms. Waiye, Ms. Seely, Ms. Clark, Ms. Piper, Ms. Collins, Mr. Garfield, Mr. Weens, Ms. Collins again, Mr. Reed, and Mr. Jones, our principal.

Like so many teachers across our country, these educators dedicated their careers to helping generations of students learn and grow. Teachers today provide us with the tools we need to achieve our goals and to be successful because they understand dedicating their lives to this profession educates the future of America, our Nation. It creates the foundation that lies ahead that ultimately creates the opportunities that we as Americans pursue.

So I would like to take this opportunity to thank the teachers in the San Joaquin Valley and across the Nation, throughout the United States, for all

that they do. Those first nine teachers who taught me, they saw something in me and in thousands of students whom they have taught. You know what: they made a difference. They made a difference in thousands of lives, as teachers across the country do every day. So we should—it is fitting and appropriate—honor the teachers of our Nation.

MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Military Appreciation Month. This is a time that we dedicate throughout the month of May honoring and celebrating those who have served our Nation, sacrificed; those of our military servicemembers, their families, both past and present, because families are a key part of those who have served our Nation. Their courage and their sacrifice, therefore, should never, ever be forgotten.

As a nation, on Memorial Day, later this month, we will honor and remember the men and women who have given their lives to serve our great Nation. Every year I join in the Memorial Day ceremonies across California's San Joaquin Valley. This year I will participate in the Memorial Day ceremony at the San Joaquin Valley National Cemetery in Santa Nella. Hundreds will gather there with us. In Fresno, I will be speaking both at the Veterans Liberty Cemetery and the Avenue of Flags at Memorial Gardens.

But I believe most Members of Congress weekly—I certainly do—meet with veterans. We meet to listen and to hear their concerns, as well as men and women serving in Active Duty. Last week, when I was in the district, I visited the Veterans Administration clinic in the city of Merced to listen to veterans getting their healthcare, to their concerns, to their needs, to ensure that they get the care that they deserve.

And just yesterday, I spoke with a group of Valley veterans visiting Washington, D.C., through the Central Valley Honor Flight. We have these Honor Flights all across the country. It is the 16th Honor Flight in 7 years from the San Joaquin Valley. Twenty-two of them were World War II veterans, and they also served in Korea and in Vietnam.

It is appropriate to say "thank you" to them and to those men and women we see across the country in uniform. I always remember to say "thank you."

As President John F. Kennedy once said: "As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them."

With these words in mind, I call on my colleagues and my fellow Americans to come together. America wants us to come together, not only during this month but throughout the year, and thank those servicemen and -women, the veterans, and their families; but also to do more than just utter words of gratitude, because we can do better. We must, and we should, work to ensure that our servicemem-

bers, veterans, and military families receive the resources, the justice, and the benefits that they have earned.

These are our true American heroes.

LIMIT MUELLER INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I am sending a joint letter to Attorney General Jeff Sessions asking him to limit the Mueller investigation in two respects. The letter to Attorney General Jeff Sessions states:

We, the undersigned, urge you to, one, limit Special Counsel Mueller's investigation to, A, alleged Russian interference with the 2016 Presidential election, herein referred to as "Russian interference," and, B, alleged collusion between the Trump campaign and Russians with respect to the alleged Russian interference, herein referred to as "Trump collusion."

Two, terminate the investigative phase of Mueller's authority no later than July 5, 2018, which is the 2-year anniversary of the date on which the FBI began investigating alleged Russian interference with the 2016 Presidential election.

We respectfully request that you consider the following reasoning for our request.

First, with respect to limiting the Mueller investigation scope, the letter states:

You recused yourself "from any existing or future investigations of any matters related in any way to the campaigns for President of the United States." This request does not conflict with your recusal because it asks that you direct Mueller to cease investigation of matters that go beyond allegations of Russian interference and Trump collusion. For emphasis, matters beyond alleged Russian interference and Trump collusion, if any, can and should be treated like any other matter investigated and prosecuted by Federal law enforcement officials and the Department of Justice.

While public opinion must not always dictate justice, it is important to emphasize that the expansion of Mueller's work scope goes way beyond the alleged Russian interference and Trump collusion that was the public basis for the appointment of a special counsel. As such, continuation of Mueller's work scope beyond alleged Russian interference and Trump collusion betrays the public trust on which America's justice system is founded.

□ 1015

Second, with respect to termination of the Mueller investigation on the 2-year anniversary of when the FBI and Department of Justice began the Russian interference investigation, the letter states:

The investigation of alleged Russian interference began almost 2 years ago. Two years is more than enough time for a competent and thorough prosecutor, backed up by the resources of the FBI and Department of Justice, to do his job.

If no harm was being done by the tardiness of an investigation, that would be one thing. But in this instance, Mueller's tardiness is damaging America. The alleged Russian interference and Trump collusion investigations have taken on the character of an endless political persecution that not only harms America's trust in the justice system

but also severely damages and distracts from the ability of a duly elected President to fulfill his duties to the American people.

As you know, America is racking up deficits and debt at a frightening and dangerous pace. Washington public officials must be more prudent with tax dollars forcibly taken from American citizens. Mueller appears to be burning through tax dollars at a roughly \$1.5 million-per-month clip. Given the rather paltry results to date, a strong argument can be made that Mueller's investigation is an extravagant waste of tax dollars.

We urge you, on the second anniversary of the start of the alleged Russian interference and Trump collusion investigations, to end it. Between now and then, Mueller has plenty of time to get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, so far, this letter has been respectfully signed and submitted to Attorney General Jeff Sessions by no less than 16 Members of the United States Congress.

MARCH FOR OUR LIVES STUDENT SPEECHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, I was in Morristown, New Jersey, with former Assistant U.S. Attorney Mikie Sherrill, where we attended the March for Our Lives.

The March for Our Lives was organized by students around the country to speak out against gun violence and call for action in Congress to strengthen our gun laws. This march came just days after a deadly shooting at Great Mills High School in St. Mary's County in my district, and it came in the wake of horrific incidents of mass gun violence at a school in Parkland, Florida, and at places of worship, entertainment, and even public streets across the country.

Congress can and should act. Nine in ten Americans, 90 percent of our fellow citizens, believe we ought to do so. We have the ability right now to strengthen background checks and ban the kinds of assault weapons that make our communities unsafe.

Law enforcement wants us to get this done. So do parents and so do teachers. In Morristown, we heard directly from students, nine of whom spoke at the march that Ms. Sherrill and I attended. I was moved by their words.

Because they are too long to insert here together, Mr. Speaker, I will be submitting these students' speeches individually into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the coming days. But today, let me just share with you some excerpts from each of them that capture the spirit of the march and the fears and hopes of these young Americans.

One student, Bella Bhimani, summed it up very well, and she said this: "All we want is to make the world safer, which is something, I think, everyone can agree on." Would that that were true, Mr. Speaker.

Another, Caitlyn Dempsey, said this: "We have been learning that actions speak louder than words since kindergarten. So we walked out. So we've

written our Congressmen. So we planned this march." They took action.

Senior Isabella Bosrock from West Morris Mendham High School lamented: "It is horrible that as adolescents we have become used to the idea that gun violence is a method of dealing with our problems."

Another student, Mia Paone, a sophomore at Chatham High School, declared: "I am not old enough to vote yet, but I am old enough to speak out against gun violence." She concluded: "I will not be silent."

Nile Burch, a student at Morristown High School, shared his hope that: "Piece by piece, we will inspire other students to gain the courage to stand up for what they believe in." What a lesson for all of us.

Luna Aguilar declared: "... we, the youth, the future of our country, are deciding—right here, right now—that our lives are worth more than the right to own an assault weapon."

One of the students, Benjamin Douglas, spoke about how he rides with Team 26, a group of cyclists who ride in memory of the victims of Sandy Hook Elementary School where so many children and teachers lost their lives. They stop along the way to raise awareness of gun violence.

He said this: "We must continue to organize these events and never stop making noise until"—until—"until our Representatives get it."

Raniya Madhi, a junior at Ridge High School, spoke about how many students now live in fear. How tragic. She told us this: "Most of us are just teenagers. We should be worrying about doing well on our AP tests and finals at the end of the year, not about being shot by someone who can enter our school." What parent is not terrified at that possibility?

Finally, Danilo Lopez, a junior at Dover High School, chose, instead of delivering remarks, simply to read aloud the names of the victims of the recent Parkland, Florida, shooting. When he concluded, he expressed what we are all feeling, by saying: "Let us hope and pray that they are in a better place—and we will always remember."

Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, remembering is not enough. Action is required. We stand on this floor and have a moment of silence for those we lost. We are sad for them, for their families, and, yes, for our country.

A moment of silence is not enough. Action is required to ensure that future moments of silence will not be necessary. The nine student speakers in Morristown, Mr. Speaker, like those across the country that day, gave voice to the millions who are scared but determined to see things change.

These speeches represent but a snapshot of what Americans heard on March 24 at the nationwide March for Our Lives. I hope my colleagues will read what these extraordinarily poised and thoughtful students had to say, and I hope we can listen to their fears

and their hopes and come together to take action.

That is what they want us to do. That is our responsibility. That is what we ought to do.

GREAT IMPACT OF TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, many Members have gathered in recent months to remind the American people about the great impact the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is having on individuals, families, and our economy. I join with them today to reiterate that reminder and reflect on the accomplishments of tax reform.

We kept our promise to deliver on tax reform, and with new legislation in place, we are finally creating an environment that fosters growth in our job market, brings jobs back to the U.S., and supports companies that want to compete globally.

Under the new tax law, the typical family of four in the First District of Kentucky will see an average tax cut of over \$1,700. Some people look at these cuts as nothing more than crumbs, which is unfortunate. A resident of Scottsville, Kentucky, shared with me that she plans to use her crumbs, as some in Congress like to call it, to put toward remodeling her house, updating appliances, and even helping her daughter and son-in-law remodel their home. The new tax law lowers tax rates on American businesses to help grow jobs, increases wages, and promotes economic growth here at home.

Until this legislation was passed, the United States had nearly the highest corporate tax rate in the world, making U.S. businesses uncompetitive, stunting economic growth, and sending jobs and profits overseas. Now many businesses across the U.S. are demonstrating how a lower tax rate helps boost business and the workforce.

One story of success from my district comes from Casey Jones Distillery in Hopkinsville, Kentucky. Miss Peg Jones, who works at the distillery, stated that they have already made plans to reinvest in the distillery for new space, employees, production, and barreling. This is all made possible by craft beverage modernization provisions in the tax bill which reduce taxes across the board, especially for small distilleries like Casey Jones.

Computer Services, Inc., or CSI, out of Paducah, Kentucky, which provides financial technology solutions, has acknowledged the positive effects of a reduced corporate tax rate, which has allowed them to reinvest in their employees in the form of bonuses and contributions to retirement plans.

The changes we have made to the Tax Code incentivize businesses to invest in new equipment and facilities. This is good news for businesses and communities throughout my district

and across the Nation. An employer in my district shared with me how the new 100 percent expensing provision has helped their customers afford more of the products they sell, which has, in turn, boosted their business.

Each time I return to my district, I hear about the different ways families and businesses are utilizing savings from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Delivering on these reforms was long overdue, but the tax reform is truly working for the American people. After more than 30 years, Americans are finally able to reap the benefits of a simplified Tax Code that cuts middle class taxes and supports expanding businesses. I am thrilled to see the continued success of tax reform and am eager to see more lasting changes that will strengthen our workforce and economy.

HONORING FOREIGN NATIONAL EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank the thousands of foreign national employees who work for United States Embassies overseas supporting our Foreign Service and promoting democratic ideals throughout the world.

Many Americans may not know exactly what the Foreign Service does both at home and abroad, but I can assure you that our diplomats are out every day promoting the interests of the United States, our constituents, our businesses, and our values.

Last August, I invited Ambassador Barbara Stephenson, president of the American Foreign Service Association, to Minnesota Farm Fest, a trade and policy forum that brings together about 40,000 people out on the rich soils near Redwood Falls, Minnesota. Her message was simple yet important: the work our Foreign Service officers do throughout the globe has a direct and substantial impact on the citizens of this great Nation—in that case, promoting export markets and food safety throughout the world so that the world's greatest producers of food and fuel and fiber are able to find those markets and able to grow our economies.

But what often goes unnoticed are the thousands of foreign national employees who work at U.S. Embassies in support of our diplomats as they build and strengthen democratic institutions, create and sustain markets for American products, and promote democracy in some of the most hostile, austere environments in the world.

□ 1030

These dedicated professionals are called LESEs among the Foreign Service, Locally Engaged Staff. And that is exactly what they are. They are engaged locally in a way that is simply not possible, even for the most expert

of American diplomats. They are that engaged because they are from the country they work in. And it is this understanding that only people native to a country can have, which makes them critical to the success of our diplomats and America's mission overseas.

I would like to tell you about one such unsung hero of the State Department's mission in Havana, Cuba. Olexis Lugo was born in Havana, Cuba, in 1966, and worked for the U.S. Interests Section, and later, the U.S. Embassy in Havana for more than a decade. Lugo, as he was known to diplomat colleagues, was a driver in the embassy's motor pool and supported countless missions with U.S. diplomats.

More than a driver, Lugo aided diplomats in understanding the nuances of Cuban culture, and provided critical insight that helped our diplomats do their jobs effectively. And more than that, Lugo was a friend and confidant to all of the U.S. diplomats posted in Havana, and a friend to America.

This past year, Lugo suddenly passed away in Havana, but his legacy will live on in the American lives he touched and the ideals of democracy and freedom that he helped support. I hope when it comes time to talk about our Foreign Affairs budget, we will remember our diplomats and the folks from foreign countries, like Lugo, who are working hard for the American people to keep this world safe for democracy.

WORKFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, we must reform our Nation's welfare programs.

President Ronald Reagan once remarked: "The Federal Government declared war on poverty, and poverty won." Unfortunately, his assessment remains all too accurate to this day. Over the past five decades, the United States Government has spent more than \$22 trillion on welfare, only to see the poverty rate remain unchanged.

Mr. Speaker, to solve this problem, we must first properly diagnose the cause. Too often, Washington's prescribed cure is yet another government program or increased spending on existing programs. However, we already have 13 Federal agencies running more than 80 Federal programs that provide food, housing, healthcare, job training, education, energy assistance, and cash to low-income Americans. And we should not gauge the success of our war on poverty by how much is spent, but on how many people are actually able to get out of poverty. That is the point.

The root cause of the failed "war on poverty" is that the structure of our current welfare system entrenches a culture of dependency rather than promoting a path to self-sufficiency.

Overwhelming evidence supports what should be a commonsense conclu-

sion: that there is a direct correlation between work and poverty. For example, before Congress reformed the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families program to incorporate a strict work requirement, there were 4.9 million families on the rolls of this program. Two decades later, thanks to these workfare reforms, we have seen 3.3 million families come off of the welfare rolls. Now, that is a success.

In my home State of North Carolina, reforms to unemployment insurance benefits led an increase in both employment and labor force participation. Later research has found that Congress' decision in 2013 to not extend Federal unemployment benefits resulted in 1.8 million new jobs nationwide the following year.

Furthermore, in 2014, when Maine began enforcing strict work requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents receiving food stamps, their caseload decreased by 80 percent within months. This requirement was paired with substantial job search assistance and job training opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, we should apply the lessons of these success stories to all government welfare programs, particularly food stamps and housing. It is imperative that welfare recipients understand that the government is not offering a one-way handout, but rather, a two-way deal. We are willing to help you, but only if you are willing to help yourself. And with the American economy growing, thanks to tax reform, opportunities are available.

Mr. Speaker, job openings recently hit a record-high of 6.6 million across the country, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. By incorporating education and training, benefit time limits, and strong work requirements, we can move millions of Americans from welfare to work.

In addition to fiscal benefits, engaging in workfare increases self-sufficiency, encourages community engagement, and offers recipients a sense of purpose and dignity.

We have a unique opportunity with this year's farm bill, Mr. Speaker, to enact such reforms, and I encourage my colleagues to not be afraid to seize on this chance and promote work over welfare.

CONGRATULATING ANDY MERFELD

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Andy Merfeld, an outstanding educator from my district, for being named Principal of the Year by the Central Minnesota Association of Secondary Principals. The Central Minnesota Association of Secondary Principals consists of over 200 administrators from more than 18 counties. The Principal of the Year is selected for excellence as a collaborative leader, unique curriculum, and personalization. With this

distinction, Principal Merfeld will be considered for the Principal of the Year award.

As principal of St. Michael-Albertville Middle School West, and after 16 years with the St. Michael-Albertville school district, Principal Merfeld has built a legacy as an educator and as a leader. He goes above and beyond, serving on the district's finance advisory committee and co-chairing a working group that aims to expand math opportunities for high-achieving middle school students.

To Principal Merfeld, thank you and congratulations. Minnesota's Sixth District is grateful for dedicated educators like you.

CAPITAL ONE

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Capital One, its executive team, and its employees for their generosity and commitment to our local communities.

Since 2012, Capital One has generously donated over \$80,000 to the Boys & Girls Clubs of Central Minnesota to support the mission of enabling young people to reach their full potential.

In particular, a Capital One grant to fund Project Learn helps advance the goal of equipping our kids with coding skills to meet the needs of the future. Capital One recognizes the importance of STEM- and tech-related skills to the future of our Nation, and I thank them for investing in our Nation's future leaders.

Thank you, Capital One, for your commitment to the young people of central Minnesota. We are grateful for your team in our community.

RECOGNIZING ANOKA RAMSEY ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Anoka Ramsey Athletic Association, a volunteer service organization, committed to providing opportunity for students across all skill levels to play and compete in recreational athletics. Comprised of coaches, parents, directors, commissioners, and board members, the organization serves nearly 40,000 Minnesotans each year.

For over 40 years, Anoka Ramsey Athletic Association has sought to provide character development through competition. Selfless volunteers have donated over 300,000 hours planning, coaching, training, maintaining fields, working concessions, and overall operations to ensure that our kids have the opportunity to participate in sports like baseball, basketball, football, lacrosse, softball, volleyball, wrestling, tennis, and soccer.

To the volunteers of the Anoka Ramsey Athletic Association for your decades of service, thank you.

CONGRATULATING ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY WRESTLING

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the St. Cloud State University Wrestling team for winning this year's NCAA Division II National Championship. The young men on this team strive every year for excellence,

and for the third time in the last 4 years, it paid off. But this year was special.

For the first time in Husky history, the team also clinched four titles in one season. The Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference title, the National Duals, and Regional and National tournament titles were all achieved. The perseverance and success of our Husky wrestlers reminds us all that when you commit to excellence and you work hard, the results will follow.

Congratulations to the outstanding student athlete wrestlers of the St. Cloud State Wrestling team for your remarkable achievement and another memorable season.

RECOGNIZING TEACHERS, COACHES, AND FIRST RESPONDERS

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding teachers, coaches, and first responders who saved the life of my constituent, Ryan Monahan of Big Lake, Minnesota. Ryan, who is only 15 years old and a student at Monticello High School, unexpectedly went into sudden cardiac arrest after a basketball practice.

The quick thinking and preparedness of the people around him saved his life. A call was immediately placed to 911 and five heroic coaches and teachers worked together to use the automated external defibrillator to revive Ryan. We are grateful to all who helped save Ryan's life.

Ryan was lucky. Unfortunately, more than 7,000 Americans lose their life to sudden cardiac arrest every year. It is my hope that Ryan's story serves as a reminder to all of us of the value of being prepared for an emergency like this.

Our local community back home in Minnesota is so grateful to those who reacted so swiftly, as well as all of the first responders who saved Ryan. Thank you all.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week was National Small Business Week. The end of the week brought, appropriately, not just good news, but great news:

Unemployment is now below 4 percent for the first time in nearly 20 years.

164,000 new jobs were created last month—24,000 new jobs in manufacturing and 17,000 new jobs in construction.

Nearly 3.2 million new jobs have been created since the election of November 2016;

We currently have 6.6 million job openings in the United States. This is an all-time high.

Wages for small business workers increased last month by 3¼ percent. That

is the strongest rate of increase in over 2 years.

All this, plus:

Female unemployment is at its lowest level since 2000;

Black unemployment is at its lowest level ever;

Hispanic unemployment is at its lowest level ever;

Consumer confidence is at its highest level since 2004;

Job market confidence is at its highest level ever; and

Small business confidence is at its highest level ever.

Because of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, since February, 90 percent of American workers—that is nine out of 10 American workers—have been opening bigger, less-taxed paychecks. They have more take-home pay, which means that they get to keep more of their hard-earned money to spend the way they want to spend it, not the way Washington wants to spend it.

More than 530 companies, and counting, have reinvested billions and billions of dollars into their businesses and our Nation's economy. As a result, more than 4 million American workers, and counting, have received major bonuses and/or pay raises and/or benefit increases.

This includes employees at local companies in western Pennsylvania like Erie Insurance, who gave their workers a \$1,000 bonus, and then another \$1,000 to their retirement plan. NextTier Bank did the same thing, \$1,000 to their workers. And PNC Bank, as well. There are a lot of good people who work for national companies, like Home Depot and Walmart. Walmart alone employs 4,000 people in western Pennsylvania.

Energy bills have gone down for more than 87 million of our fellow citizens in 48 States. That is an incredible lowering of their cost of living.

According to the International Energy Agency, the United States is on track to be the world's largest oil producer by 2023. The significance of this is that we no longer have to be held hostage by bad actors around the world when it comes to energy. We will be the biggest exporters of energy in the world. And when we ask other people not to buy from these folks because of their intentions of how to use that money, we can replace what they are not able to buy there with our own homegrown energy. That is an incredible advantage.

Thanks to the most recent National Defense Authorization Act—now, think about this—our sons and daughters who serve in uniform are going to be enjoying their largest pay increase in 8 years.

The facts are clear: America is winning again.

Speaker RYAN was addressing a group the other day, and I want to quote him, because I think this is so appropriate for where we are today: "We are working on reforms to get more people out of poverty and into the workforce. We

need to make sure that workers have the right skills they need to get a job and a good career.”

I am talking about a family-sustaining career, a community-building career, a career that actually allows us to dream.

Right now, our economy is thriving. Americans are right to feel good about how things are going. We have not seen those kinds of optimistic statistics in such a long, long time.

□ 1045

So we are going to keep pushing. We are going to keep pushing to close the skills gap. We are going to close the opportunity gap. We are going to make sure that all these jobs that are being made available are being filled with workers who are getting great careers and good lives and going from poverty and welfare to work.

The dignity of being able to get up in the morning and go to work, to take care of your families, to take care of your community, to take care of your churches and schools, what an incredible lift that is for the American people.

Listen, our Better Way agenda is about one thing and one thing only: it is about building stronger families, about building stronger communities, about building a stronger America. It is what we are in the middle of executing and implementing right now. We are really excited to see the great economic news that comes as a result of all these things that we have been working on.

I want you to think about something, Mr. Speaker. Never, never in at least a decade has America been winning the way we are winning today in every way and every day. America is truly winning again, and we are making America great again.

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 46 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

Reverend Andrew D. Singleton, Jr., Victory Apostolic Church, Matteson, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

We worship You, heavenly Father, for Your greatness, goodness, and glory that even the heavens cannot contain. Though You are King of Kings and Lord of Lords, You have given the responsibility of leading this country to these men and women of the House of Representatives.

May they each be led by Your spirit in every legislative decision they

make, for You are the ultimate law-giver and judge.

As they seek Your guidance, give them the wisdom, courage, integrity, faith, and unity necessary to find solutions to the multiple and complex issues facing America today. Those destiny determining issues include, but are not limited to: poverty, racism, injustice, violence, and the ever-looming threat of war.

Only as a nation under God, whose people trust in God, will America be strong and carry out its creedal principles of truth, liberty, and justice for all.

I pray God's continued blessings upon you all.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Gabrielle Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

WELCOMING REVEREND ANDREW D. SINGLETON, JR.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Reverend Andrew D. Singleton, Jr., pastor of Victory Apostolic Church in my hometown of Matteson, Illinois, as today's guest chaplain.

For more than 20 years, Pastor Singleton has been a powerful and positive force in our community working to improve the lives and futures of our neighbors while tending to their spiritual needs.

Pastor Singleton has a unique gift of communicating a message of faith, justice, and equality across generations. I could not be prouder to welcome him and his inspirational voice to Capitol Hill, especially at this critical time for our Nation.

I hope his words serve as an example and challenge to this Congress to redouble our efforts to uplift and empower families and communities.

Thank you, Pastor Singleton, for joining us and leading us in prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

RECOGNIZING LUPUS AWARENESS MONTH

(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 in recognition of Lupus Awareness Month because nearly two-thirds of the public know little to nothing about the disease beyond the name.

Lupus is a drastically unpredictable disease. It has no known cause, no known cure, and it can be fatal. An estimated 1.5 million Americans are currently living with lupus, including my lovely stepdaughter, Katharine; and millions more have sadly lost their brave battle with this disease.

I have been proud to work with the Lupus Foundation for many years to raise awareness about lupus and support efforts that bring us one step closer to solving the mystery of this dreadful illness.

I encourage my colleagues to join us in the Congressional Lupus Caucus to help advance lupus research and treatment. Through new scientific breakthroughs, we will better understand this disease and help patients living with lupus.

Mr. Speaker, let us “Pump Up the Purple” this May during Lupus Awareness Month and fight for a day when no one will be diagnosed with lupus.

GROWING OPTIMISM AND CONFIDENCE FROM MONTANA SMALL BUSINESSES

(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 report that optimism among Montana small businesses is strong and on the rise. I recently concluded a tour of Montana's Main Street businesses; and as I listened to business owners, they described their growing confidence.

They talked about how progrowth reforms, which this Congress and our President delivered, are providing them and their small businesses greater certainty. They described how cutting taxes and cutting red tape are leading them to invest, create Montana jobs, and grow.

Their confidence and optimism match the national trends. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce Small Business Index, which gauges optimism, hit new records in the second quarter. A survey from CNBC, which measures small business confidence, remains near its record high for the first quarter.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the optimism I saw from Montana small businesses, and I will continue working to grow opportunities that improve the lives of all Montanans.

HONORING JUDGE RENEE CARDWELL HUGHES

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize a woman who has worked tirelessly to make our communities back home a better place to live, work, and raise a family. Her decades of experience as a jurist, nonprofit executive, and an author mark a remarkable career of public service.

Judge Renee Cardwell Hughes, just last month, was the 2018 recipient of the Pearl S. Buck International Woman of Influence Award in Perkasio, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. During her tenure, Judge Cardwell Hughes has shown a sustained commitment to justice, presiding over some of Philadelphia's most noteworthy homicide cases. She was also a fierce advocate for fairness in our legal system, founding Philadelphia's mental health court.

Judge Cardwell Hughes most recently served as CEO of the American Red Cross of Eastern Pennsylvania, which serves over 6 million Pennsylvanians.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my gratitude to Judge Cardwell Hughes for her service and congratulate her on this well-deserved award.

HONORING ELIZABETH MAE THOMAS DE LAGARDE

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the outstanding achievements of Mrs. Elizabeth Mae Thomas de Lagarde.

Mrs. de Lagarde, one of four children, was born to Reverend Ernest Thomas and Antoinette Miller Thomas. She married her late husband, Henry W. de Lagarde, and that union brought forth four children, nine grandchildren, and ten great-grandchildren. Mrs. de Lagarde holds a bachelor or arts degree from Howard University and served in many capacities at Charlotte Amalie High School for 31 years.

As a contributor to the quality of life in St. Thomas, she served on numerous boards, including the National Association of Secondary School Principals; American Association of Retired Persons; Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.; the Cathedral Church of All Saints; and countless others.

The Virgin Islands community and I are grateful for the impact she has had with her career and the indelible mark she has made.

Congratulations, Mrs. de Lagarde, and happy 100th birthday to you and all

of your contributions to the people of the Virgin Islands.

INCREASING WORK OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to speak about the Workplace Choice and Flexibility for Individuals with Disabilities Act.

This legislation is a solution that will go a long way towards increasing opportunities for people with different abilities and will allow the promise of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, which was passed in 2014, to be fulfilled.

Unfortunately, since the time that that act was passed, unnecessary roadblocks have been thrown up in the way of people who want to work in work centers for people with disabilities.

These work centers, first of all, frequently provide a great opportunity for people to work; and secondly, provide job training that can be used by people as they get out in the community, which is the goal of so many people.

Let us not put these people in a straitjacket and say that between ages 19 and 25 you cannot or should not be able to work in work centers.

I know many of the employees at these work centers. They do a tremendous job, and it is time to expand options for people with different abilities.

This bill is not threatening WIOA. It is embracing the goals of WIOA.

RECOGNIZING HOGAR CREA OF PUERTO RICO

(Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Hogar CREA of Puerto Rico on its 50 years of service to our community, helping people who struggle with substance abuse reclaim their place in society.

Hogar CREA was founded on May 20, 1968, in Puerto Rico by Juan Jose Garcia. The nonprofit organization has over 55 houses and 12 projects, in addition to 32 service proposals that serve more than 2,000 residents daily. Prevention and counseling services were established for communities, schools, municipalities, civic and religious entities, among others.

Moreover, in 1976, Hogar CREA began establishing international homes; and today, it provides service in more than 10 countries throughout Latin America and in several States of the Union.

Hogar CREA's historic mission has been to serve the helpless and to be an instrument to mitigate the suffering of those who live under the influence of alcohol and drugs. Let's recognize Hogar CREA on their 50 years of service.

PROTECTING RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Restoring Community Oversight of Sober Living Homes Act of 2018. This bill addresses Federal policies that have resulted in the proliferation of sober living homes in residential neighborhoods.

These so-called homes, which are really businesses in all but name, house drug and alcohol addicts in single-family residences. This infusion of drug addicts and alcoholics into residential communities has had a deleterious impact on the quality of life of local families who now suffer increases in police activity, transient residences next door, and a decline of property values.

Federal law has shielded unscrupulous owners, operators, and inhabitants of these so-called sober living homes from meaningful oversight. The well-being of the neighbors that surround them has been ignored. This is a travesty.

My bill will empower the communities and the States to prohibit such facilities in residential areas if that is the will of the local people. I now submit this legislation and ask my colleagues to cosponsor the bill, which is based on the principle of federalism, protecting local residential communities across our land.

THANKING AMERICA'S TEACHERS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during national Teacher Appreciation Week to celebrate America's hardworking, dedicated, and passionate teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of this House can think of a teacher who had a positive influence on not only their education, but their life. Teachers push students to achieve their best, and they show students how to realize their full potential. Sometimes it is the interest of just one teacher that can transform the life of a young person.

Teachers are often the most underrated, yet powerful professionals in the entire world. They truly do shape young minds and our future.

Teachers lend a caring hand and extend a loving heart. They make differences in the lives of our students academically, emotionally, and physically.

So, Mr. Speaker, during national Teacher Appreciation Week, I rise to say "thank you" to those who educate our children. Thank you for the job you do, for the hours you work, for the patience you show, and for the impact

you have on so many lives. Day in and day out, our teachers are there. We are grateful to them.

□ 1215

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Teacher Appreciation Week to honor the educators in my district, who work tirelessly on behalf of our students.

The public schools in the Third District of Kansas are some of the best in our Nation, and our workforce of qualified, dedicated teachers are a major factor in making our schools so great. As a product of public schools myself, I know the kind of impact teachers can have on the lives of their students. Good teachers are a key to setting our kids and our communities up for a successful future.

I am working hard to give teachers the tools and resources they need to do to their jobs well. I fought to protect the educator expense deduction in tax reform, affirming that our Tax Code should support and reward our teachers. I also supported the recent omnibus funding bill, which included a \$2 billion investment in continuing education and workforce development grants for teachers.

Mr. Speaker, none of us would have the opportunities we have in life without the teachers who gave us the tools and skills to succeed, and we pay special recognition to each of the teachers who made a difference in our lives, and who continue to make a difference in the lives of kids in our districts this week during Teacher Appreciation Week.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2018.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 9, 2018, at 9:09 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1732.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3053, NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 879 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 879

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3053) to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-69. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and

reported a rule, House Resolution 879, providing for consideration of an important piece of legislation, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018. The rule provides for consideration of this measure under a structured rule, making three amendments offered by the minority in order. This legislation passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis by a vote of 49-4, and has been a comprehensive effort spearheaded by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) over several Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, in 39 States and in 121 communities across this country, including in the Tri-Cities community in my home district, in the great State of Washington, the Federal Government continues to fail to meet its obligation to collect and dispose of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. This spent fuel and waste is generated as a result of commercial nuclear power production, and as a byproduct of our Nation's nuclear defense activities, including used fuel from nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers and from the legacy waste created from uranium and plutonium development as nuclear weapons deterrents.

No one knows the magnitude of impact stemming from the development of these nuclear deterrents more than the Tri-Cities community, where the Hanford Site played a major role within the Manhattan Project during World War II to develop the first atomic bomb. It was because of the extraordinary work of the more than 50,000 workers at Hanford that we were able to end World War II, and later the Cold War.

However, this work came with great repercussions. The Hanford Site contains 56 million gallons of high-level radioactive waste, and is one of the world's largest nuclear cleanup efforts. Fifty-six million gallons, Mr. Speaker, enough to fill this room that we are standing in today more than 20 times.

This amount of radioactive waste has been a legacy issue in my district since the 1940s. My constituents fully understand the impacts holding this waste has on the region. The Federal Government must keep its commitment to collect and dispose of it to a permanent repository.

Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018, would make great strides in addressing this very problem. H.R. 3053 would, rightfully, move forward with the licensing of the Yucca Mountain facility in Nevada as the first permanent geological repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

First designated by Congress in 1987 as the location for these materials to be disposed of, the site has undergone extensive scientific and technical evaluations. In 2002, the U.S. Department of Energy concluded that Yucca Mountain met all of the requirements to serve as a permanent repository. In

2008, DOE applied to construct the repository, but the Obama administration illegally terminated the effort for what appeared to be political, rather than scientific, reasons. Fortunately, for our Nation, and for the communities like the Tri-Cities, this administration has stated its firm commitment to getting this project back on track and moving forward.

Not only does central Washington continue to store the legacy waste from Hanford, but it is also home to the only nuclear power plant in the Pacific Northwest, the Columbia Generating Station. While H.R. 3053 provides for a path forward for a long-term solution for waste disposal at Yucca Mountain, it also authorizes DOE to contract with a private company to temporarily store spent nuclear fuel for the very first time.

Communities that host nuclear power production sites across the country have, for far too long, been held responsible for the management of spent fuel, even though, under law, it is the legal obligation of the Federal Government to collect and dispose of it. This legislation directs DOE to initiate a program to consolidate and temporarily store commercial spent nuclear fuel during the development, construction, and initial operation of a repository.

H.R. 3053 provides for other innovative and necessary management tools for waste, including encouraging DOE to take ownership of spent nuclear fuels from facilities that have ceased commercial operation, and allowing the Department to enter into contract with private storage facilities.

The legislation also protects taxpayers by reducing legal liabilities. Consumers of nuclear energy across the country have paid over \$42 billion into the nuclear waste fund, with nearly \$40 billion still waiting to be spent to dispose of nuclear waste. This includes more than \$200 million from Washington State ratepayers.

What have they received from the Federal Government for paying of these fees, Mr. Speaker?

Absolutely nothing. Not one ounce of waste has been collected, which is the very purpose of the fund.

This legislation will reform the fund to protect ratepayers by assuring there is a definite answer on the Yucca Mountain repository prior to restarting the fee collection.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of visiting the Yucca Mountain facility. While it may seem to some like just a dusty 5-mile tunnel bored 1,000 feet deep in a remote Nevada desert, I found it to be an impressive site and full of potential. The Federal Government has spent decades, and billions of American taxpayer dollars, studying the best place for a repository. The conclusion was that Yucca Mountain is now the legal repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste under the law.

I cannot express more ardently the importance of moving this effort for-

ward, both for my district and districts around the Nation. This legislation takes a great leap forward for a long-term solution, while also tackling serious impacts and disparities of the current situation facing these communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward rule, allowing for considering of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018. I encourage my colleagues to support the rule, as well as the underlying legislation, to address this vital issue for our entire Nation.

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

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

I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate the rule for consideration of this measure, H.R. 3053.

As my good friend alluded to, this legislation has bipartisan support and takes an important step towards permanently securing nuclear waste in our country.

□ 1230

Thirty-six years ago, Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. In doing so, this institution created a formal process for constructing a permanent geological repository for the growing amount of nuclear waste across our country.

This particular provision established a scientifically based, multistage process for selecting an eventual site of permanent storage for highly radioactive nuclear waste, delineated the Federal Government's responsibilities for the transportation of spent nuclear fuel, and created a dedicated funding source for disposing of nuclear material.

Five years after passing the NWPA and following significant congressional review of the Department of Energy studies, it was determined that the facility be built at Yucca Mountain. However, after many subsequent years of planning, licensing, and construction, the project has stalled—at a cost of tens of billions of dollars.

The question of how to dispose of spent nuclear fuel and nuclear waste has been an ongoing problem in our country for decades. Even with the statutory requirements put in place by the NWPA nearly four decades ago, no permanent solution is currently available for safely storing high-level radioactive waste in a consolidated, secure location. Rather, spent nuclear fuel is stored at nuclear reactors across the country. Many of these facilities have been shut down, or soon will be, without any solution to the long-term problem.

For obvious reasons, the issue of nuclear waste storage at plants across the country is of great concern to the surrounding communities, especially as

some nuclear plants are shuttered early. The longer we wait, the greater the problem will become.

H.R. 3053, the underlying legislation, directs the Secretary of the Department of Energy to create a program to consolidate and temporarily store commercial spent nuclear fuel during the development, construction, and initial operation of a national repository. The legislation provides the Energy Department with consolidated storage options to help fulfill the Federal Government's obligations to take possession of spent nuclear fuel in other States that are waiting for a permanent repository.

This bill, although I have some concerns, is a good step forward. This is a complicated issue, and I believe this institution has come together to present at least a viable option for addressing a very serious need.

Mr. Speaker, in taking up this legislation, the Rules Committee has acted for the second time in just a few weeks to bring bipartisan legislation to the House floor. While the bill we are debating today is certainly not perfect, it is, nonetheless, an example of what can be accomplished through compromise and bipartisan cooperation. This type of process should not be the exception to the rule. It should be the standard operating procedure for the House of Representatives.

I mention this because we all know this is, by and large, not the case. Instead of working together, we have witnessed dozens of controversial and partisan bills pushed through the House through a closed process designed to silence the minority and even voices within the Republican majority. That is wrong, and for the sake of this institution, it cannot continue.

Using the closed process, my Republican friends recently pushed through one of the largest tax giveaways in American history. They did so at the expense of middle class families across the country, passing the bill without so much as a single hearing or bipartisan conversation.

According to the latest survey by the National Association for Business Economics, the massive tax cuts have not made any difference in businesses' hiring plans. Rather, almost every week, we hear of corporations using their millions of dollars in handouts to buy back stock and pad the pockets of their investors. It is no wonder most Americans haven't seen their paychecks go up.

In a few years, when the tax breaks expire—that is right, they are only temporary—the few families across the country who benefit will recognize the tax scam for what it really is: an empty bag of goods that added nearly \$2.5 trillion to the national debt.

My friends on the other side are even contemplating paying for part of their tax plan by retroactively eliminating funding for a number of programs, and the children's healthcare program is one of them.

Let me say that again. In order to pay for the tax cuts for millionaires and large corporations, my Republican colleagues are suggesting cutting billions of dollars from healthcare programs for vulnerable children.

How dare they.

The closed process isn't just about what is being rammed through the House; it is about what is being blocked altogether.

Americans across our Nation continue to be victims of gun violence, yet Congress has failed to pass even basic commonsense reforms like banning bump stocks or fixing our background check system.

More than 26,000 children and teens have been killed in gun violence since 1999. This year alone, 500 teens and over 100 children have been killed or injured by guns. People are killed every single day, and this body has done nothing but prevent sensible reforms from even being considered.

Another example is DACA. Eighty-three percent of Americans say they favor continuing the DACA program, as do a majority of the Members of this House, and that includes Republicans and Democrats; yet the majority refuses to bring up the Dream Act for a vote.

Just put it down here for a vote; that is all. The 26 measures for guns that are reasonable, put it down here for a vote. If it doesn't pass, then at least we can say to the American people that we tried to do something about gun violence and we tried to do something about the Dream Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to the American people to consider legislation in a transparent and serious manner, and the legislation that we are considering today is exactly that kind of situation, something that doesn't happen nearly enough. I commend my colleagues for their bipartisan work on H.R. 3053, but it is absurd that bipartisan work is such a rarity, and that is worthy of comment.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for joining me in support of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to my State of Washington and the legacy of the Federal Government's work at Hanford, like I said, they left behind 56 million gallons of radioactive and chemical waste that is currently being stored in 177 underground tanks in temporary storage.

I had the fortune of being able to join a bipartisan congressional tour of Yucca, of the Yucca Mountain site, to see firsthand what we were talking about. Under the law, Yucca is the Nation's permanent nuclear repository.

What I saw deep beneath the mountain in a remote desert that is between, I think, 90 and 100 miles north of Las Vegas—it has been referred to as the most studied site on Earth. But imag-

ine this: being inside a 5-mile-long tunnel with 1,000 feet of rock above your head and 1,000 feet of rock below your feet. That is what we are talking about.

The Federal Government has spent \$15 billion over decades preparing the site as the Nation's sole permanent nuclear repository. Yucca has been deemed safe by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC. A recent safety evaluation found that the site could safely isolate spent nuclear fuel for 1 million years.

Mr. Speaker, the prospect is that Yucca could stand in two different ways: it could be a monument to billions of dollars in government waste instead of being a monument to a solution that we promised every American in this country.

I hope it is the latter, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, few people in this body understand the dynamics of Yucca Mountain as do the Members from the State of Nevada. One of my good friends is on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I have had the pleasure of being on the Rules Committee and hearing her make presentations with reference to this matter. She speaks very clearly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind words and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Las Vegas, which is the heart of southern Nevada. We have over 2 million people, and we welcome 40 million people from around the world every year. Let me give you a different perspective.

I have been fighting Yucca Mountain since the 1980s. I do know these issues. I appreciate some of the points that have been made, but some of them are just incorrect. H.R. 3053 is a flawed piece of legislation, and it just doubles down on bad policy and bad politics.

I testified in front of the Energy and Commerce Committee on this bill when it was first introduced last year and noted many of the flaws in the legislation, flaws that remain in the bill.

I also presented a map that showed that, if this waste is taken to Nevada, it will go through over 300 of our Members' districts: past their schools, past their churches, past their businesses, in their backyards. So I want them to keep that in mind as they focus on Nevada.

Other flaws with the bill: First, the bill would bust the cap for the amount of highly radioactive nuclear waste that would be dumped in Nevada. The bill arbitrarily increases the amount by 37 percent, 37 percent over what was authorized in 1987. But what is more, not one of the environmental impact studies, the five-volume safety evaluation report, or any scientific document that relates to Yucca Mountain has

studied the impact of increasing that original 70,000-metric-ton cap. So this would not only increase it, they haven't even studied what the impact of the increase would be.

The bill also deems approved changes in the EPA's radiation protection standards for Yucca Mountain prior to the NRC's final licensing document. This leads one to conclude that, no matter what challenge they face, they will just figure out a way to get around it regardless of what the science says.

Proponents of this legislation also say that, well, you will get generous host benefits if you take this facility. Well, that is just another falsehood. The provisions in the bill that were changed after it passed the committee in order to bring down the cost of the bill and address the massive scoring issues make our getting those benefits much less likely.

These benefits have to be approved by future Congresses appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars. You don't really think they are going to do that, do you? They shut down the government twice just this year alone over disagreements on spending.

If this legislation were about good policy or addressing the issue or getting the technicalities correct, I would be standing here supporting it, but I just cannot do that the way it is written.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress first passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as you heard, in 1982. It was amended in 1987 just to look at Nevada, not any of the other sites. We call that the "Screw Nevada" bill.

Well, we call it that because you didn't have Nevada wanting it to come there. You didn't have the science to put it there. You just screwed Nevada and stuck it there.

□ 1245

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentlewoman from Nevada an additional 1 minute.

Ms. TITUS. Well, this is just more of the same. It is politics, pure and simple. It is three decades later. We have heard we spent \$15 billion. All you got is a hole in the ground. This is "Screw Nevada 2.0."

I am going to offer an amendment that allows for consent-based decision-making, which was the Blue Ribbon Commission's recommendation, and I hope that we can go in that direction. You allow consent-based for interim storage, why not for permanent storage? That would be the way to solve this problem. That would be the way to move us forward. We wouldn't waste billions more and decades more in terms of time.

So I urge a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the bill.

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

Let me quote the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee,

the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who said that:

Overall, this legislation is a balanced step in the right direction that will benefit ratepayers, taxpayers, and those living near nuclear facilities housing nuclear waste.

So I am happy to have his support for this legislation as well.

And just a couple of points from the gentlewoman from Nevada, whom I deeply respect and take her perspective on this with a great deal of gravity.

The transportation issue has been brought up several times. Nuclear waste is transported in this country already, and I have just got to tell you, the vessels, the containers that I have witnessed that this waste is being temporarily stored in and used for transportation, literally, is missile-proof. I mean, it is in containers that are very solidly contained and in such a way that the safety factor is many times over to ensure that, in case of any incident, that there would be no contamination.

As far as the language, it is true that the bill would allow the potential increase of storage capacity at Yucca Mountain. However, there is a strict process of approval that would have to be gone through in order to increase the amount of nuclear waste stored at Yucca Mountain, so it is not a given, passing this legislation. It would be something that would go through a very long, strict process.

I just have to say that we would gladly have entertained any amendments to clarify or perfect language along those lines as far as the storage amounts in Yucca Mountain.

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

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

When debating a bill as significant as this one, it is imperative that the people's House allow as much debate and as open a process as possible. Sadly, the Rules Committee did not even allow all Members from Nevada, whose State this bill will impact the most, to offer their amendments on the House floor.

Once again, this majority picked winners and losers and limited debate to just a select few amendments. This is unfortunate but all too common an event during the 115th Congress.

To block a Member from offering an amendment to a bill that would impact their district, in particular, is to block a Member from representing their constituents. I might add, there were five Members, Democratic and Republican, from the Nevada delegation who were present at the Rules Committee last night.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to allow the people's House to debate and vote on Representative ROSEN of Nevada's amendment, which was blocked by the Rules Committee.

Her amendment, which is a thoughtful proposal, would delay licensing,

planning, or construction of the nuclear repository at the Yucca Mountain site until the Director of OMB studies the economic viability and job-creating benefits of alternative uses of the Yucca Mountain site.

It is bothersome to me that we have had most of the discussion here already without talking about reprocessing; and I asked last night how much research is being done, of the distinguished chairman of the committee, who, I believe, has done an incredibly good job in offering up bipartisanship.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. As I said previously, the members of the Nevada delegation know more about this issue than all the rest of us combined. So to discuss our proposal, yet another clear voice that came to the Rules Committee last night and her amendment was not made in order.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), a member of the Armed Services Committee, and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, if today's vote on the previous question fails, we have the opportunity to vote on my amendment, the Jobs, Not Waste amendment, a proactive and innovative proposal to turn Yucca Mountain into something useful, a project that would create jobs without threatening the health and safety of Nevadans and other Americans across this country.

My amendment would prohibit the Department of Energy from moving forward with its current plan to ship nuclear waste by truck and rail through 329 congressional districts to Yucca Mountain until the Federal Government considers a number of other job-creating alternatives, including defense activities, like a command facility for unmanned aircraft systems, scientific research, the development of a secure electronic data center, or renewable energy generation.

One of the arguments I regularly hear from proponents of Yucca Mountain is that it will create jobs and that we have already invested billions in building a repository at this sight. Well, I am here to say that we can still create jobs without having to take on monumental health and safety risks that come with transporting over 100,000 metric tons of hazardous and lethal nuclear waste.

Congress should have the opportunity to vote on my amendment because it would give Members a chance to find a smart, strategic solution that repurposes this dangerous and costly project. This amendment gives us an opportunity to convert Yucca Mountain into a facility that could still pro-

vide economic opportunity, drive innovation, and create new, good-paying jobs.

Relaunching the failed Yucca Mountain nuclear waste storing experiment will also cost the taxpayers an additional \$80 billion to complete, minimum. Let me repeat that: \$80 billion, minimum.

Instead of spending billions more of hard-earned taxpayer dollars on the project that is destined to fail, that will inevitably put Nevada families and your families in your districts at risk, let us consider these forward-thinking opportunities.

I strongly urge you to do what is smart and fiscally responsible, what is right for the health and safety of all of our constituents, by making my amendment in order. I therefore ask all Members to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), who has been carrying the banner for the Yucca Mountain project for many Congresses.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Rules Committee for bringing this bill to the floor tomorrow. I appreciate the due diligence they did on scrutinizing those amendments that could be additive to it and also the one from my colleague, Representative TITUS, so we can really put aside this debate on a consensus-based issue because we need to help educate the American people. We need to help educate our colleagues.

In the State of Nevada, 90 percent of all the land is owned by the Federal Government, and a big portion of that is at this location.

When people say "not in my backyard," we think they are talking about the Rayburn Building. Not in my backyard, in this debate, we are talking about Baltimore. But in between here and Baltimore, there is desert; and in the 60-mile radius is a fenced-in enclosure where we used to set off atomic weapons and groundbursts. So there is a place in this land that is called Yucca Flats, and some of us have seen that. Yucca Flats is where we did atomic testing.

We need to make sure people understand this debate. Big area of land, Federal Government, really, the local consensus is us. It is the Federal Government. We are the landowners of this property.

This is a tough decision. No one wants nuclear waste or defense waste. I am glad my colleague, Mr. NEWHOUSE, is managing this bill, because I have been out to his location. In Hanford, we have a lot of defense waste there.

So what are we trying to do? We will flesh this out more, obviously, tomorrow, but this issue is a multigeneration debate which we in this Chamber get a chance to move forward again after a long delay.

This goes back to World War II. This goes back to the atomic age. This goes back to winning the Cold War. This goes back to our weapons programs. When that occurred, they said: Now we have got this technology; let's use it for civil electric generation.

The government wanted to encourage that because we wanted to have nuclear scientists and we wanted to have energy generation, but we also wanted to have the experience and the expertise of nuclear scientists and engineers who could move back and forth from the private sector to the defense sector for our Nation's security, and, hence, we agreed.

In 1982, we had to address the spent nuclear fuel at nuclear power sites and we had to address the defense waste that is predominantly in Congressman NEWHOUSE's district, a lot of it in South Carolina. There is a little bit in New York. We have some left in Colorado. That is just the defense waste, not including the 39 States and 121 locations that have nuclear fuel—a national issue, a national concern, and we are moving forward to a national solution.

In 1982, under the Reagan administration, they said: Well, how are we going to pay for this? So they decided to charge ratepayers who are using electricity that has been generated by nuclear power a fee, a fee-based system to help the industry find a location to store their spent fuel and for us to clean up the defense sites—pretty good proposal.

Years later, they are trying to find the location. They do three analyses. Yucca Mountain was on the top three of these three. Then, as I will mention tomorrow, Senator JOHNSON and a guy named John Dingell said: Yucca Mountain, we need to move forward.

So that was in 1987. Then we started generating the movement to get to a point where, under the law, the State of Nevada could say, "We reject the proposal," which they did. The law then said the Federal Government could veto their objection, which we did.

□ 1300

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, we had an administration that put a pause on that for about 8 years, and now we are ready to move forward again. We have got an administration that wants to fund the licensing process.

I see my good friend from California (Ms. MATSUI) is on the floor, and she has worked on interim; what do we do with the waste before we put it in the final repository?

There are what I call dead plants—probably not the proper word—we have plants that are no longer generating electricity, but they have waste on site.

Can't we consolidate those for the benefit of the Nation and get them away from some of our more pristine areas?

The answer is "yes." That is what we tried to do with the bill. We are going to accept a couple amendments that have been brought forward by some Democrat colleagues on, I think, financing, or evaluation of the money and what do we do to the cities and how do we help them redevelop. And I will encourage my colleagues to support those when we have that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is not an easy process in the Rules Committee. This is a step to get it to the floor. I appreciate the kindness that was shown to me yesterday, and I look forward to joining with you all tomorrow.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), my good friend, who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and is a former member of the Rules Committee, so she understands our process extremely well and has done extraordinary work on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HASTINGS for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

We worked in a bipartisan manner in the Energy and Commerce Committee to ensure there is language in this bill that provides a responsible path forward for consolidated interim storage.

When this bill was first presented in committee, the licensing of an interim storage facility was linked to a final decision on Yucca Mountain.

As someone who is critical of Yucca Mountain and its chances of ever being completed, I found that to be unacceptable. It meant that our Nation's nuclear waste could continue to be stranded at decommissioned plants in California and across the country. That is not sustainable.

However, through bipartisan negotiations, we were able to successfully agree on language that creates a separate path to interim storage, decoupling it from a permanent repository.

That is the primary reason why I am supporting the bill today.

This is an issue that directly impacts my constituents and many others across the country. My local utility, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District or, as we call it, SMUD, currently maintains the decommissioned Rancho Seco nuclear power plant. SMUD has reiterated how important it is for the redevelopment of the site, that we have a plan for consolidating spent fuel at a safe, licensed facility.

Moving spent fuel will enable SMUD to expand their adjacent solar development or environmental mitigation area.

Consolidated interim storage is currently the most viable solution to our Nation's spent fuel challenge. And there are private applicants that want to take this fuel. Today's bill strength-

ens the regulatory pathway that allows them to do so.

This bill also funds transportation safety, ensuring that we build on our country's decades-long history of safely moving spent fuel.

While I don't believe every provision of H.R. 3053 is ideal, it is a balanced step in the right direction, and that is why I will vote "yes" for this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by again commending the committees involved in presenting this legislation, and for doing so in a bipartisan manner.

While the underlying bill we are debating today is not perfect, it is, nonetheless, an example of what can be accomplished through bipartisan work.

In bringing up this bill, the Republican leadership has, perhaps, tipped its hand. It has demonstrated that it is capable of working with the minority and allowing for mature debate and compromise worthy of this institution. I hope this trend continues. I suspect that it will not.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say, it is a pleasure to manage a rule with my friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), and my hands are wide open, not tipped whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have spent over \$15 billion in research and development of the Yucca Mountain project. It would be utterly foolish, in my estimation, to literally flush this time, energy, and capital down the drain, particularly as the Department of Energy has deemed that the site has met all the requirements to move forward with the licensing process.

The rule we have debated here today provides for consideration of very, very important legislation, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018, which would jump-start this vital effort to move the Yucca Mountain plan forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to speak in favor of this rule, and I urge all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 879 and the underlying legislation to provide relief and a long-term plan for communities like those in my district and those in Mr. HASTINGS' State of Florida, and the rest of our districts around the Nation.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 879 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment specified in section 3 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative

Rosen of Nevada or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 206. STUDYING THE ECONOMIC BENEFIT OF ALTERNATIVE USES OF YUCCA MOUNTAIN SITE

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy may not take any action relating to the licensing, planning, development, or construction of a nuclear waste repository at 6 the Yucca Mountain site until—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget submits to Congress, and makes available to the public, a study on the economic viability and job-creating benefits of alternative uses of the Yucca Mountain site as outlined in GAO Report 11-847, published on September 16, 2011, including—

(A) defense activities, such as a command facility for unmanned aircraft systems;

(B) a secure electronic data center;

(C) the development of renewable energy sources; and

(D) scientific research; and

(2) Congress holds a hearing on the alternative uses under subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (1).

(b) DEFINITION. In this section, the term “Yucca Mountain site” has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101).

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

vious question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TROTT). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—223

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

| | | |
|--------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Hurd | McSally | Scott, Austin |
| Issa | Meadows | Sensenbrenner |
| Jenkins (KS) | Mitchell | Sessions |
| Johnson (LA) | Moolenaar | Shimkus |
| Johnson (OH) | Mooney (WV) | Shuster |
| Johnson, Sam | Mullin | Simpson |
| Jordan | Newhouse | Smith (MO) |
| Joyce (OH) | Noem | Smith (NE) |
| Katko | Norman | Smith (NJ) |
| Kelly (MS) | Nunes | Smucker |
| Kelly (PA) | Olson | Stefanik |
| King (IA) | Palazzo | Stewart |
| King (NY) | Palmer | Stivers |
| Kinzinger | Paulsen | Taylor |
| Knight | Pearce | Tenney |
| Kustoff (TN) | Perry | Thompson (PA) |
| LaHood | Poe (TX) | Thornberry |
| Lamborn | Poliquin | Tipton |
| Lance | Posey | Trott |
| Latta | Ratcliffe | Turner |
| Lesko | Reed | Upton |
| Lewis (MN) | Reichert | Valadao |
| LoBiondo | Renacci | Wagner |
| Long | Rice (SC) | Walberg |
| Loudermilk | Roby | Walden |
| Love | Roe (TN) | Walker |
| Lucas | Rogers (AL) | Walorski |
| Luetkemeyer | Rohrabacher | Walters, Mimi |
| MacArthur | Rooney, Francis | Weber (TX) |
| Marchant | Rooney, Thomas J. | Webster (FL) |
| Marino | Ros-Lehtinen | Wenstrup |
| Marshall | Roskam | Westerman |
| Massie | Ross | Williams |
| Mast | Rothfus | Wilson (SC) |
| McCarthy | Rouzer | Wittman |
| McCaul | Russell | Womack |
| McClintock | Rutherford | Woodall |
| McHenry | Sanford | Yoder |
| McKinley | Scalise | Yoho |
| McMorris | Schweikert | Young (AK) |
| Rodgers | | Young (IA) |

NAYS—189

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

Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

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

NOT VOTING—16

Castor (FL)
Gutiérrez
Harris
Hoyer
Jenkins (WV)
Jones

Kuster (NH)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Messer
Pittenger
Rogers (KY)

Rokita
Royce (CA)
Smith (TX)
Zeldin

□ 1333

Mr. NADLER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 184, answered “present” 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

AYES—224

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davis, Rodney

Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd

Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem

Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross

Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

NOES—184

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

Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

PRESENT—1

Amodei

NOT VOTING—19

Castor (FL)
Cohen
Davidson

Doggett
Duffy
Gutiérrez

Hoyer
Huizenga
Jenkins (WV)

Jones
Kuster (NH)
Labrador
Messer

Pittenger
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Royce (CA)

Smith (NE)
Woodall

□ 1341

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 174.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 774

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 774.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 774

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 774.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS OF SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-118)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004—as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011, Executive Order 13582 of August 17,

2011, Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012, and Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012—is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2018.

The regime's brutal war on the Syrian people, who have been calling for freedom and a representative government, not only endangers the Syrian people themselves, but also generates instability throughout the region. The Syrian regime's actions and policies, including pursuing and using chemical weapons, supporting terrorist organizations, and obstructing the Lebanese government's ability to function effectively, continue to foster the rise of extremism and sectarianism and pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared with respect to this threat and to maintain in force the sanctions to address this national emergency.

In addition, the United States condemns the Assad regime's use of brutal violence and human rights abuses, and calls on the Assad regime to stop its violent war, uphold the Cessation of Hostilities, enable the delivery of humanitarian assistance, and negotiate a political transition in Syria that will forge a credible path to a future of greater freedom, democracy, opportunity, and justice.

The United States will consider changes in the composition, policies, and actions of the Government of Syria in determining whether to continue or terminate this national emergency in the future.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 9, 2018.

□ 1345

STANDARD MERGER AND ACQUISITION REVIEWS THROUGH EQUAL RULES ACT OF 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 872, I call up the bill (H.R. 5645) to amend the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that the Federal Trade Commission shall exercise authority with respect to mergers only under the Clayton Act and only in the same procedural manner as the Attorney General exercises such authority, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 872, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5645

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 "Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAYTON ACT.

The Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 4F and inserting the following:

"SEC. 4F. ACTIONS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OR THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

"(a) Whenever the Attorney General of the United States has brought an action under the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission has brought an action under section 7, and the Attorney General or Federal Trade Commission, as applicable, has reason to believe that any State attorney general would be entitled to bring an action under this Act based substantially on the same alleged violation of the antitrust laws or section 7, the Attorney General or Federal Trade Commission, as applicable, shall promptly give written notification thereof to such State attorney general.

"(b) To assist a State attorney general in evaluating the notice described in subsection (a) or in bringing any action under this Act, the Attorney General of the United States or Federal Trade Commission, as applicable, shall, upon request by such State attorney general, make available to the State attorney general, to the extent permitted by law, any investigative files or other materials which are or may be relevant or material to the actual or potential cause of action under this Act.";

(2) in section 5—

(A) in subsection (a) by inserting "(including a proceeding brought by the Federal Trade Commission with respect to a violation of section 7)" after "United States under the antitrust laws"; and

(B) in subsection (i) by inserting "(including a proceeding instituted by the Federal Trade Commission with respect to a violation of section 7)" after "antitrust laws";

(3) in section 11, by adding at the end the following:

"(m)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), in enforcing compliance with section 7, the Federal Trade Commission shall enforce compliance with that section in the same manner as the Attorney General in accordance with section 15.

"(2) If the Federal Trade Commission approves an agreement with the parties to the transaction that contains a consent order with respect to a violation of section 7, the Commission shall enforce compliance with that section in accordance with this section.";

(4) in section 13, by inserting "(including a suit, action, or proceeding brought by the Federal Trade Commission with respect to a violation of section 7)" before "subpoenas"; and

(5) in section 15, by inserting "and the duty of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to a violation of section 7," after "General.".

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT.

The Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) is amended—

(1) in section 5(b), by inserting "(excluding the consummation of a proposed merger, acquisition, joint venture, or similar transaction that is subject to section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18), except in cases where the Commission approves an agreement with the parties to the transaction that contains a consent order)" after "unfair method of competition";

(2) in section 9, by inserting after the fourth undesignated paragraph the following:

"Upon the application of the commission with respect to any activity related to the consummation of a proposed merger, acquisition, joint venture, or similar transaction that is subject to section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18) that may result in any unfair method of competition, the district courts of the United States shall have juris-

diction to issue writs of mandamus commanding any person or corporation to comply with the provisions of this Act or any order of the commission made in pursuance thereof.";

(3) in section 13(b)(1), by inserting "(excluding section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18) and section 5(a)(1) with respect to the consummation of a proposed merger, acquisition, joint venture, or similar transaction that is subject to section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18))" after "Commission"; and

(4) in section 20(c)(1), by inserting "or under section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18), where applicable," after "Act,".

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this Act shall not apply to any of the following that occurs before the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) A violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18).

(2) A transaction with respect to which there is compliance with section 7A of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a).

(3) A case in which a preliminary injunction has been filed in a district court of the United States.

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 the Judiciary.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 115-664, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON ADOPTING AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5645

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting the amendment to H.R. 5645 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5645.

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

There was no objection.

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

In 1914, Congress passed the Federal Trade Commission Act, marking the

beginning of a dual antitrust enforcement regime in the United States.

Because both Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission enforce our Nation's antitrust laws, companies may, and often do, have different experiences when interacting with one agency relative to the other. One area in which the disparity can be the most striking and troubling is in the merger review process.

When a company wishes to merge with or purchase another company, it must notify both antitrust enforcement agencies of the proposed transaction. The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission then determine which agency will be responsible for reviewing the transaction. As there are no fixed rules for making this determination, it can appear that the decision is made on the basis of a flip of a coin.

There are two substantial differences that companies face based on the identity of the antitrust enforcement agency that reviews the companies' proposed transaction.

The first difference arises if the agency seeks to prevent the transaction by pursuing a preliminary injunction in Federal court. A different legal standard is applied to a preliminary injunction request based solely on the identity of the requesting antitrust enforcement agency.

The second difference lies in the process available to each antitrust enforcement agency to prevent a transaction from proceeding. The FTC may pursue administrative litigation against a proposed transaction, even after a court denies its preliminary injunction request. In contrast, DOJ cannot pursue administrative litigation.

There is no justification for these disparities in the merger review processes and standards. The bipartisan Antitrust Modernization Commission recommended that Congress remove these disparities, and the bill before us today, the Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act, or the SMARTER Act, does just that. I applaud Representative HANDEL for introducing this important legislation that will enhance the transparency, predictability, and credibility of the antitrust merger review process.

By enacting the SMARTER Act into law, Congress will ensure that companies no longer will be subjected to fundamentally different processes and standards based on the flip of a coin. Notably, the legislation has garnered the support of former and current FTC commissioners, including former Chairman David Clanton, former Commissioner Josh Wright, and current Commissioner Maureen Ohlhausen.

The SMARTER Act is an important step toward assuring that our Nation's antitrust laws are enforced in a manner that is fair, consistent, and predictable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this good government bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5645, the Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act. This bill would significantly undermine the Federal Trade Commission's ability to enforce the Nation's antitrust laws, which help protect Americans from anticompetitive behavior in the marketplace. In the guise of harmonization with the Department of Justice, it would eliminate the FTC's administrative litigation enforcement authority with respect to corporate mergers and other transactions. It would also change and potentially increase the burden the FTC must demonstrate in court when seeking a preliminary injunction against the proposed merger.

In doing so, the bill would undercut a critical tool that the FTC relies on to promote competition. It also risks sacrificing the fundamental nature of the FTC as an independent administrative agency, rather than an executive department, subject to the political whims of the President. This blatant attack on the FTC's congressionally mandated independence contravenes more than a century of legislative intent.

In 1914, Congress responded to a wave of mergers and corporate abuses by establishing the FTC as an independent body of experts tasked with developing and advancing competition policy free from political pressure. In doing so, Congress specifically gave the Commission broad enforcement and investigatory authorities, including the power to challenge anticompetitive mergers and other conduct through administrative litigation.

This broad grant of statutory authority was not accidental. Louis Brandeis, a visionary architect of our Nation's competition system, advocated for the embrace of administrative litigation during Congress' consideration of the FTC Act, and President Woodrow Wilson said such authority was critical to the FTC's mission "to warn where things were going wrong and assist instead of check."

As former Republican FTC Chairman William Kovacic warned: "Without a substantial, effective administrative litigation program, the aim of making the Commission an influential competition policy tribunal could not be accomplished."

Nevertheless, this bill would eliminate this critical tool for promoting competition and, in the process, would erode the Commission's unique qualities and independence.

To further undermine the Commission's independence, the bill would also require the FTC to meet the same standard in court that the Justice Department meets when seeking a preliminary injunction against the proposed merger. But the FTC and the DOJ are two different agencies with different missions and different traditions.

Under current law, the Commission, by statute, must show that a preliminary injunction "would be in the public interest." The Justice Department, on the other hand, has no statutory standard and must simply meet the common law preliminary injunction standard, such as the balance of equities and the risk of irreparable harm.

As our Nation's leading antitrust enforcers have previously testified, there is no practical difference between the standards or evidence that the Commission has abused its authority. So it is entirely unclear what problem the bill is attempting to solve. But in making this change, this bill could cause unnecessary confusion for the courts or could signal a desire to increase the burden on the agency to demonstrate the harms of an anticompetitive merger. That result alone is unacceptable.

But even more fundamentally, this legislation is a step in the wrong direction for our economy and for the prosperity and security of all Americans. The decline of antitrust enforcement over the past several decades has been an economic catastrophe for millions of workers who have lost their jobs or seen their wages lowered. It has resulted in fewer choices and higher prices for consumers, including increased costs for healthcare, prescription drugs, and other essential goods and services.

The importance of robust antitrust enforcement is not simply a question of preventing higher prices for consumers. In the absence of competition, employers have the power to suppress the wages and mobility of American workers through anticompetitive contracting practices, such as noncompete clauses and no-poach agreements.

And when large corporations run amok, locally owned businesses, the economic lifeblood of our communities, wither on the vine. Concentrated economic power is also a serious threat to our vibrant democracy. Large corporations with an outsized role in the policymaking process are able to further entrench their dominance through favorable rules and enforcement decisions.

And when a large corporation with market power has the ability to control the flow of information, it also has the power to shape public opinion in ways that erode democratic values and undermine the voice of the many in favor of the outsized profits of the few.

By further weakening our antitrust laws, H.R. 5645 would accelerate this disturbing trend. Accordingly, I must oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote against this very bad bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. HANDEL), the chief sponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for the opportunity to bring this bill forward. I rise

today in support of H.R. 5645, the Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act, or the SMARTER Act.

Mr. Speaker, the SMARTER Act is a much-needed piece of legislation to harmonize and modernize our antitrust procedures. Despite the shared responsibilities for the antitrust review between the FTC and the DOJ, both agencies follow dramatically different review processes, meaning that businesses are held to conflicting standards and procedures, depending on which agency actually conducts the review. And that review, as Chairman GOODLATTE pointed out, is essentially a coin toss.

We can do better than that. The SMARTER Act in no way weakens or undermines our antitrust review process. It does not prevent or hinder either agency from conducting a full and thorough review.

Rather, the SMARTER Act actually strengthens the antitrust review process by injecting greater consistency, more transparency, and enhance consumer protection when we have these mergers and acquisitions.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support the SMARTER Act.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the distinguished ranking member of the Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Subcommittee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5645, the so-called SMARTER Act, an assault on the Federal Trade Commission's ability to vigorously promote competition through merger enforcement.

□ 1400

Over a century ago, Congress responded to waves of consolidation by creating the Federal Trade Commission to promote, development, and protect competition and the antitrust laws.

There is longstanding, bipartisan consensus that the Commission's use of administrative litigation to address anticompetitive mergers and conduct is core to this mission. This includes the former Republican and Democratic chairs of the Commission under George W. Bush and the Obama administrations, who have each raised serious concerns about this legislation, precisely because it eliminates a tool that has been critical in combating anticompetitive mergers and conduct, including mergers that would have raised Americans' cost of healthcare.

Top Republican antitrust enforcers have long supported the use of administrative litigation in merger enforcement to promote competition and develop the antitrust laws.

In 2003, Joseph Simons, who was appointed by President Trump and recently confirmed as the chairman of

the Commission, stated as director of the FTC's Bureau of Competition that administrative litigation has "substantial public policy benefits." He also referred to this tool as "an instrument for developing the law" that "increases the transparency of Commission decisionmaking through carefully written opinions that accompany a Commission final litigated order can give considerable guidance to the bar and the business community on applicable standards and enforcement policy."

And in 2004, Barry Nigro, who also served as a director of the FTC's Bureau of Competition under the George W. Bush administration, and was appointed by President Trump to serve in the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, stated that the "volume of administrative litigation is no accident. It reflects our belief in administrative litigation as a way to take advantage of the FTC's expertise in the development of antitrust jurisprudence, particularly in the kind of complex matters that the FTC was created to address."

Nevertheless, proponents of the SMARTER Act argue that the outcome of a transaction should not depend on a "coin flip" to determine which antitrust agency will review a transaction. But this claim is untethered from how antitrust enforcement actually works in the vast majority of cases. In fact, the determination of the moving party is determined by each agency's jurisdictional district, or areas committed by statute, and consistent with a well-developed body of case law, and not by a coin toss.

In the most comprehensive study of administrative litigation to date, Republican FTC Commissioner Maureen Ohlhausen debunked procedural concerns with administrative litigation as "mostly anecdotal or theoretical," concluding it has been a transformative tool for advancing competition policy.

And last Congress, Jonathan Jacobson, a leading antitrust attorney, who currently serves as the chair of the American Bar Association's section on antitrust law, testified that, in his decades of practice, he has never seen a merger that turned on the differences that the SMARTER Act seeks to address. In fact, less than 2 percent of all mergers are blocked by the antitrust agencies, and an even smaller percentage of these cases go to trial.

The FTC also has a pristine record when using this authority. It has won six out of seven cases before the Supreme Court, and five of these were brought through administrative litigation.

We should, therefore, be deeply skeptical about baseless speculation and support of the bill. Empty rhetoric is no substitute for evidence that the SMARTER Act actually solves a real problem.

But even more importantly, this bill is a major step in the wrong direction on making our economy work for ev-

erybody. There is overwhelming evidence that concentrated economic power is at historic levels in this country, and has structurally weakened competition on an economy-wide basis.

This lack of competition is a fundamental threat to the economic opportunity of hardworking Americans who want lower prices, more and better services, and better wages. We need more competition, not less.

As the nonpartisan Open Markets Institute notes, "Given the severity of the concentration problem in America today, and its economic and political consequences, Congress should be looking to enhance the powers of all of America's antimonopoly agencies."

House and Senate Democrats have proposed a better deal to enhance competition to reduce lower prices and more choices for consumers.

Instead of undermining antitrust enforcement on the basis of purely speculative harms—as H.R. 5645 would do—we should be giving the antitrust agencies the resources and tools they need to robustly enforce the law.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, which does nothing to reduce concentrated economic power or address the economic challenges working people face every day and, in fact, will make the problem worse. It will make it easier to consolidate economic power in the way that undermines consumer choices, consumer costs, and will ultimately undermine hardworking American families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the nonpartisan Open Markets Institute, in its opposition to H.R. 5645 states: "Given the severity of the concentration problem in America today, and its economic and political consequences, Congress should be looking to enhance the powers of all of America's antimonopoly agencies."

I strongly agree: Congress should be strengthening, not weakening, our competition system to protect economic opportunity, innovation, and choice. That is why I have joined several of my Democratic colleagues—Representatives JOE CROWLEY, DAVID CICILLINE, and KEITH ELLISON—in introducing a package of bold economic measures to strengthen protections that will help ensure that hardworking Americans have more economic opportunity by ending anticompetitive employment practices.

This package includes H.R. 5642, the Restoring and Improving Merger Enforcement Act, legislation that I introduced to prohibit the consideration of false economic efficiencies—like corporate layoffs, actually costing employment—to justify anticompetitive mergers.

But rather than address these important measures, which would actually

help American workers and consumers, or give the antitrust agencies the resources they need to really promote competition, this bill would do the opposite by undermining the FTC's ability to vigorously enforce antitrust laws under the guise of attempting to solve a problem that does not exist.

I would submit that an economy in which we are down to four major airlines and two major railroads, and going in the same direction in almost every other segment of the economy, we should not be weakening our antitrust laws and our antitrust enforcement, we should be strengthening them. This bill goes in exactly the wrong direction and is guaranteed to further increase the concentration of economic power in our economy, and to further decrease the bargaining power that workers have to get decent wages and working conditions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a deeply anti-employee bill, it is a pro-monopoly bill, and it is a very anti-economic growth bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose this deeply flawed measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5645, the Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act—otherwise known as the SMARTER Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not about creating equal rules or implementing “smarter” legislation.

Rather, it is about attacking the administrative authority of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

H.R. 5645 is an unnecessary measure that would fundamentally undermine the FTC's independent enforcement authority and ability to prevent anti-competitive mergers.

As we all know, the FTC was created by Congress with the specific intent of creating an independent antitrust enforcement agency and supplemental authority to the Department of Justice (DOJ).

Specifically, if enacted, the SMARTER Act would strip the FTC of its power by eliminating the agency's authority to enforce antitrust laws in larger merger cases, and by blocking its ability to use its administrative proceedings to stop a harmful merger transaction.

The bill seeks to do so by requiring that the FTC use the same enforcement process as the DOJ.

This proposed sweeping change undercuts the FTC's administrative litigation process for contested mergers or acquisitions and effectively removes the very core and functioning character of this agency.

Moreover, reducing the FTC's independence directly conflicts with Congress's intent in creating this antitrust enforcement agency and policymaking body as a distinct and independent shield from political and executive interference.

As enforcers of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, both the FTC and the DOJ have the authority and responsibility to prohibit mergers and acquisitions that would “substantially lessen competition” or “tend to create a monopoly”.

Under this enforcement authority, these agencies serve to complement each other, and have developed over the years to specialize in particular industries and markets.

Based upon historical experience and coordinated developments, the FTC serves to protect consumers and consumer spending. For example, healthcare, pharmaceuticals, professional services, food, energy, and certain high-tech industries like computer technology and internet services.

Whereas, the DOJ typically assumes a specialized focus on larger corporate industries like telecommunications, banks, railroads, and airlines.

Thus, while the FTC and the DOJ have operated with a shared responsibility of enforcing federal antitrust laws, these two federal agencies are unique and each retain exclusive authority of certain conduct.

Serving as joint enforcement agencies for over 100 years, the FTC and DOJ rely upon each other to coordinate agency jurisdiction and harmonized standards and practices.

The SMARTER Act is simply unnecessary as it fails to put forth any meaningful effort to enhance or rectify any expressed concerns governing these longstanding agency operations.

In particular, in 2002 Congress sought to review and amend antitrust laws and policies in light of the changing economy and rise in technological advances.

In 2007 a report issued by the Antitrust Modernization Commission (AMC) set forth specific recommendations for the FTC to eliminate real or perceived disparities in the review process for merger transactions.

According to the AMC, Congress should seek to ensure that the same or comparable standard is used when seeking a preliminary injunction against a potentially anticompetitive transaction.

However, the SMARTER Act goes beyond this recommendation and seeks to chip away and carve out the entire administrative adjudication authority of the FTC.

In order to identify potential violations of the Clayton Act, the FTC and the DOJ review proposed merger transactions pursuant to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act (the HSR Act), which provides advance notice and sets forth guidelines on large merger and acquisition transactions.

The heart of this concern is the alternate means by which the FTC and DOJ carry out their enforcement roles during this HSR pre-merger process.

Namely, H.R. 5645 is curiously motivated by the preliminary injunction process utilized by the FTC and the DOJ to halt proposed transactions that would violate the Clayton Act if completed.

Additionally, the DOJ typically consolidates the preliminary and permanent injunction proceedings, while the FTC typically only pursues preliminary injunctions.

While some argue that proposed transactions reviewed through the FTC would be treated more leniently than those reviewed through the DOJ, this assertion has not been fully substantiated by the AMC.

The pre-merger review process and the injunction standards utilized by the FTC and DOJ are the very procedural steps that characterize and distinguish the respective enforcement roles of these agencies.

This supposed area of concern addresses only a small fraction of proposed transactions,

as the vast majority of merger and acquisition proposals are found to not be in violation of the Clayton Act upon undergoing the review process.

The FTC and DOJ review over a thousand merger filings every year.

Yet 95 percent of those merger filings present no competitive issues or challenged transactions.

As reported by the American Antitrust Institute (AAI), the overall concerns purported by the bill's sponsors are simply without foundation.

In contrast, the overall work of the FTC has an incredible impact on American consumers, communities and corporations and will be severely impacted if disrupted.

As highlighted by the FTC Chairwoman Edith Ramirez in her testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, the FTC prioritizes the protection of consumers and the prevention of anticompetitive market practices.

In fact, the FTC exists to ensure fair competition and to prevent enormous concentrations of economic power that hurts consumers and small businesses.

For example:

In the past year, the FTC has challenged over 28 mergers, (although in most it was able to negotiate a remedy to allow the merger to proceed).

At the consumer level in my home state of Texas, the FTC secured an \$82,000 settlement against an auto-dealer found in violation of the Fair Credit Reporting Act in September 2017.

Also last year, the FTC ordered the largest divestiture ever in a supermarket merger, requiring Albertsons and Safeway to sell 168 supermarkets in 130 local markets throughout several states, ensuring that communities continue to benefit from competition among their local supermarkets.

The FTC has also taken an aggressive stance on stopping anticompetitive mergers and conduct in the healthcare market by halting such practices through administrative litigation.

In September 2017, the FTC secured a \$1.1 million settlement to consumers who lost money to a health insurance telemarketing scam.

And in the last two years, the FTC took action in 13 pharmaceutical mergers, ordering divestitures to preserve competition for drugs that treat diabetes, hypertension, and cancer, as well as widely used generic medications like oral contraceptives and antibiotics.

Last year, on March 18, 2016, after a thoroughly vetted investigation, the FTC approved a final order preserving competition among outpatient dialysis clinics in Laredo, Texas.

That is, the FTC cleared U.S. Renal Care, Inc.'s (the country's third largest outpatient dialysis provider) \$640 million purchase of dialysis competitor DSI Renal, on the condition that three of DSI's outpatient clinics in Laredo, Texas be handed over to a third party.

Absent this agreed divestiture, the acquisition would have led to a significant increase in market concentration and anti-competitive effects.

The likely result, according to the FTC, would have included the elimination of direct competition between U.S. Renal Care and DSI Renal, reduced incentives to improve services

or quality for dialysis patients, and increased ability for the merged company to unilaterally increase prices.

Notably, the DOJ has also been successful in securing investigations and halting suspected harmful merger practices on a much larger scale (in the health care and airline industry as of late).

In June 2016, the DOJ put pressure on several multibillion dollar health insurers seeking to engage in large merger transactions with near certain suppression of market competition in the healthcare industry.

In August 2016, the DOJ issued civil investigative demands on several major US airlines seeking to halt any potential unlawful mergers.

These cases demonstrate the need for continued protection of the FTC and its ability to effectively carry out injunctions on harmful merger and acquisition activities, as well as, anticompetitive business conduct that harms consumers and restrains market activity.

The ability of the FTC to function independently is necessary to the success of both the FTC and DOJ.

The far-reaching and elusive SMARTER Act fails to keep the foundational integrity of these agencies and should be opposed.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this serious threat to our fundamental protections of consumers and fair economic competition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 PRINTED IN HOUSE REPORT
115-664 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 9, strike “7” and insert “15”.

Page 3, strike lines 2 through 10, and insert the following:

(A) in subsection (a) by inserting “or a proceeding brought by the Federal Trade Commission under section 15” after “United States under the antitrust laws”; and

(B) in subsection (i) by inserting “or a proceeding instituted by the Federal Trade Commission under section 15” after “antitrust laws”;

Page 3, strike lines 11 through 22, and insert the following:

(3) Section 11 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 21) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b) by striking “Whenever” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (m), whenever”, and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(m) The Federal Trade Commission may not use the procedures for administrative adjudication set forth in subsection (b) of this section to prevent the consummation of a proposed merger, acquisition, joint venture, or similar transaction that is subject to section 7, unless the complaint is accompanied by a consent agreement between the Commission and a party to the transaction that resolves all the violations alleged in the complaint. The Federal Trade Commission may institute proceedings in a district court under section 15 to prevent the consummation of such a transaction. In any such proceeding the district court shall apply the same standard for granting injunctive relief as applicable to a proceeding brought by the United States attorneys under section 15. The Federal Trade Commission may issue an administrative complaint under this section if the complaint is accompanied by a

consent agreement between the Federal Trade Commission and a party to the transaction settling the alleged violations.”;

Page 3, line 23, strike “(including” and insert “or”.

Page 4, beginning on line 1, strike “with respect to a violation of section 7)” and insert “under section 15”.

Page 4, strike lines 3 through 5, and insert the following:

(5) in section 15, by inserting “and the duty of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to the consummation of a proposed merger, acquisition, joint venture, or similar transaction that is subject to section 7 and not yet consummated,” after “General”.

Page 5, strike lines 12 through 14, and insert the following:

(4) in section 16(a)(2)—

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

(B) in subparagraph (E) by adding “or” at the end, and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) under section 15 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 25);”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 872, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment makes a series of useful technical and clarifying changes suggested by the Federal Trade Commission.

At the FTC’s request, the amendment adds language stating explicitly that the agency retains independent litigating authority in merger cases brought under the Clayton Act. This makes clear that the FTC is not forced to rely on the Department of Justice in these cases.

The amendment also strikes language referring to the FTC’s authority to issue civil investigative demands in merger cases. This is because the reference is unnecessary and could create a negative inference that the FTC does not enjoy such authority in other contexts.

The amendment makes further technical improvements in several places in the bill that refer to the FTC bringing an action under section 7 of the Clayton Act. The FTC’s authority to bring an action in court actually derives from section 15 of the act, so the amendment updates that citation.

Furthermore, the amendment changes the phrase “including” FTC proceedings to “or” FTC proceedings in several places in the underlying bill. This is to underscore that FTC settlements are distinct from DOJ antitrust settlements and, thus, are not subject to the judicial review provisions of the Tunney Act.

The amendment also refines language in the underlying bill that ensures the same legal standards are applied to FTC and DOJ injunctions, and that preserves FTC authority to use administrative adjudication as part of a settlement agreement.

Specifically, the changes more clearly define the circumstances in which the FTC may seek an injunction and

more clearly state that the FTC must proceed in Federal court, not administratively. The amended language also more accurately reflects the FTC’s practices for administrative settlements, more clearly states that the district courts must apply the same standard in those cases as it would apply when the Department of Justice seeks injunctions, and more clearly provides that the new rules change only administrative adjudications, not investigative procedures.

Finally, the amendment clarifies that the FTC’s duty to use the courts, rather than administrative procedures, to block anticompetitive behavior, extends only to the merger-type actions that this bill is intended to cover.

Again, these changes are of a technical nature and were all recommended by the FTC itself. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

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

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

This amendment makes several technical revisions to clarify that the bill does not apply to consummated mergers and other transactions. While this change marginally addresses one concern with the bill, it does nothing to change the most fundamental flaw with the bill, which is that it eliminates the Federal Trade Commission’s administrative litigation authority in merger cases.

As we noted during consideration of this bill in the Judiciary Committee last year, and in prior Congresses, the SMARTER Act is overbroad as currently drafted and applies to both unconsummated and consummated transactions.

According to John Jacobson, a leading antitrust attorney, who served as commissioner of the Antitrust Modernization Commission, this bill could easily be “construed as prohibiting a challenge to the consummation of any merger in administrative proceedings, even a post-merger challenge, notwithstanding the term ‘proposed.’”

Technical feedback by senior staff at the FTC, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, confirmed this view.

While the amendment makes the useful clarification that H.R. 5645 would not apply to already consummated transactions, the bill would still eliminate the FTC’s ability to use administrative litigation in proposed mergers, striking at the core of the Commission’s independence and congressionally mandated design, without any evidence that such a change is warranted or desirable.

As Mr. Jacobson has also noted in his testimony in opposition to a similar

version of this legislation considered by the Senate, eliminating the “FTC’s ability to conduct administrative proceedings in pre-consummation merger challenges is harmful to the sound administration of the antitrust laws.”

At a time when there is an increasing desire across the ideological spectrum to strengthen antitrust enforcement in the face of extreme concentrations of corporate power in industry after industry, the SMARTER Act proposes to go in the opposite direction. Congress was wise to establish an independent agency in 1914 to ensure strong antitrust enforcement, and we would be wise today not to undermine that choice.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment essentially puts lipstick on a pig. It does not change my basic opposition to a bill that is fundamentally flawed in its conception. Therefore, I must oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, as a practical matter, the FTC only challenges a handful of proposed mergers, on average, per year. These transactions present some of the largest, most complex, and potentially most concerning issues. But in most of these cases, the parties either abandon the transaction or negotiate a settlement.

Nonetheless, in those few instances where the FTC does challenge a transaction, it is in a position to answer novel questions of law and, thereby, develop expertise and guidance for future applications. Indeed, that is the whole point of having an FTC, and that is the whole point of administrative adjudication authority.

As the Antitrust Institute has noted in its opposition to the SMARTER Act to this bill, “the FTC’s use of administrative powers should be carefully safeguarded, because it has contributed critically to the effective shaping of U.S. merger policy without detracting from the speed or effectiveness of merger review.”

□ 1415

In addition, Republican FTC Commissioner Maureen Ohlhausen’s 2016 study on administrative litigation debunks the claim of procedural bias against merging parties. Her study found that the FTC’s appellate success and case work “do not support a narrative that the Commission blindly supports ill-conceived cases because of systemic bias. To the contrary, they show a recent history of solid, well-supported enforcement actions.”

Even where the FTC does not use administrative adjudication, the potential use of this tool is invaluable in the agency’s ability to successfully get emerging parties to agree to structural remedies, such as divestitures, to address concerns with a proposed merger.

It is unthinkable to remove the FTC’s administrative litigation authority, as this amendment would continue to do, when such authority is only used to protect against the most anticompetitive mergers that are certain to substantially lessen competition, harm consumers, raise prices, and hurt workers.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

The arguments we have heard against this bill are without merit.

It has charged that the SMARTER Act would make it more difficult for the FTC to fulfill its consumer protection mandate. This is incorrect.

The FTC’s consumer protection powers are completely independent from the antitrust laws. The SMARTER Act deals only with the antitrust piece, so, by its terms, does not impact the FTC’s ability to prosecute “unfair or deceptive acts or practices.”

As for harm to consumers from proposed mergers, the SMARTER Act does not, in any way, affect substantive antitrust law; it does not amend, in any form or fashion, section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act or any of the FTC’s consumer protection powers.

Opponents also claim that the SMARTER Act removes an important tool from the FTC by eliminating its ability to pursue administrative litigation. This, too, is a red herring.

The SMARTER Act only removes the FTC’s administrative litigation authority in the very narrow context of proposed transactions. A report from the bipartisan Antitrust Modernization Commission determined that any benefit from such authority was marginal and “significantly outweighed by the costs.”

The FTC can still pursue administrative litigation in conduct cases and in actions against consummated mergers. Indeed, the AMC report stated specifically that: “Elimination of administrative litigation in . . . merger”—review—“cases will not deprive the FTC of an important enforcement option.”

Opponents also charge that enacting the SMARTER Act will make it more difficult for the antitrust enforcement agencies to stop a merger, but the SMARTER Act only changes the process; it does not have any substantive impact on merger reviews.

But don’t take my word for it. A letter from 15 leading antitrust professors states: “The SMARTER Act does nothing to undermine the FTC’s authority; it simply ensures that the merger review processes and standards are equally applied to merger parties regardless of which agency reviews the transaction.”

But perhaps the most ironic argument brought against the bill is that it is unnecessary because the FTC rarely initiates administrative litigation

after a court denies a preliminary injunction request. Administrative adjudications may be rare, not because regulators use the powers sparingly, but because the mere prospect of this protracted, costly process may prompt companies to abandon the merger even though they prevailed in court. That hardly seems fair.

Parties to a merger should receive the same treatment and have the same process regardless of the reviewing antitrust agency, and the SMARTER Act accomplishes that goal.

This legislation will help America continue to serve as a leader and innovator in competition law, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Strongly.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Doggett moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 5645) to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 5. PROTECTING CONSUMERS AGAINST HIGH PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) the amendments made by this Act shall not apply to mergers that would unreasonably increase the costs of pharmaceutical drugs; and

(2) the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12 et seq.) and Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45 et seq.) as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act shall apply to mergers that would unreasonably increase the costs of pharmaceutical drugs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer this motion to recommit because Republicans have been motionless when it comes to acting on the spiraling drug prices that are harming so many Americans.

The willingness of this Congress to sit on its hands, stand idle in the face of the prescription price gouging that so many of our neighbors face, is nothing short of appalling, and there is

nothing “smarter” in this bill about dealing with that terrible problem.

Of course, President Trump has told us it is going to be “beautiful,” but every time you turn around, he is cozying up with some pharmaceutical lobbyists that are raising prices and putting some of their people in charge of his drug agenda.

All that this motion does is to take the very modest step of reducing the possibility that, through further mergers of drug companies, we will see the sick and dying extorted even more than they are today with skyrocketing prices that are made even worse when these mergers occur.

If this motion passes, it won't kill the bill or slow it down a moment.

What it will do is to give life to an effort to contain these mergers and see that prescription prices don't soar even further. Yes, it is not the principal issue on drug prices. Unfortunately, there is no wonder drug to stop prescription price gouging, but this is one of the only ways to get the issue to the floor of this House because our Republican colleagues in every committee are determined to remain silent and see no action whatsoever.

I continue to hear from my neighbors back in Texas who care about this a lot more than my Republican colleagues. They tell me they cannot afford their prescriptions or they are burdened with immense debt to do it.

I think of Elaine in San Antonio, who has suffered with glaucoma for a number of years. She is fighting to save her eyesight, but now her copays on three different necessary drops are costing \$400, \$227, \$178 per month. She says she wants to finish her senior years in dignity but is burdened down by these outrageous prices.

The choice should not be blindness or rent for a senior who has worked and saved all their lifetime.

Even in the face of the opioid epidemic, where we are about to hear about a whole lot of bills on the floor that don't do a whole lot, but in the face of that crisis, a devastating national public health emergency, the price of naloxone, a lifesaving overdose reversal drug, has been spiked by almost 600 percent.

Even an effective drug is 100 percent ineffective when it is unaffordable.

Too many drugs are ineffective for too many people because drug prices have soared at a rate of ten times the rate of inflation. But where some see a crisis like that, others see a revenue opportunity.

Brand name pharmaceutical manufacturers rely upon government-approved monopolies to charge monopoly prices, whatever they can get out of the sick and dying. They utilize as many maneuvers as possible to perpetuate their monopolies as long as possible while pouring their money, not into research and development of new drugs, but into lobbying this Congress and the administration.

Drug manufacturers spent \$171 million last year in Federal lobbying,

more than insurance, oil and gas, electronics, or any other industries. They had more lobbyists than we had Members of Congress. In fact, they could have a two-on-one defense to assure that this Congress is quiet, it is inactive, it is unresponsive to people.

Let's pass this motion and ensure that when the pharmaceutical companies use the \$80 billion tax windfall, that they were just rewarded by the Republicans to pay for more mergers, that consumers don't get caught in the middle and see their prices spike even further.

We need to commit ourselves to action by approving this motion to recommit, to commit ourselves to putting consumers first over Big Pharma.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this motion is unnecessary because this bill does nothing to undermine substantive antitrust enforcement. It might even hold up mergers that the court already found procompetitive and could help lower drug prices.

This is simply a dilatory tactic used by my friends on the other side of the aisle to hold up this important legislation.

For decades, American antitrust laws have been a shining example of how to protect against anticompetitive activities in a consistent, predictable, and fair manner.

Other countries have looked to our laws as the template for the creation of their own competition laws. Let us continue to be a model of proper antitrust enforcement.

The SMARTER Act is a common-sense process reform that ensures fairness and parity in the narrow field of merger reviews. The bill was recommended to Congress by a bipartisan commission and is supported by former top antitrust enforcement officials and past and present FTC Commissioners of both political parties.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I urge my colleagues to do the smart thing by opposing this bill and supporting the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT OF 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 872, I call up the bill (H.R. 2152) to require States and units of local government receiving funds under grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds for pretrial services programs, to submit to the Attorney General a report relating to such program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 872, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2152

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 “Citizens’ Right to Know Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE GRANT RECIPIENTS USING FUNDS FOR PRETRIAL SERVICES PROGRAMS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—For each fiscal year in which a State or unit of local government receives funds under any grant program operated by the Department of Justice, including the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance grant program under subpart I of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.), and which uses funds received under such program for a pretrial services program, the State or unit of local government shall submit to the Attorney General a report which contains the following:

(1) *The name of each defendant participating in a pretrial release program administered by the pretrial services program, and whether, as applicable, each occasion on which such defendant failed to make an appearance.*

(2) *Information relating to any prior convictions of each defendant participating in the pretrial services program.*

(3) *The amount of money allocated for the pretrial services program.*

(b) *PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT.*—Subject to any applicable confidentiality requirements, the Attorney General shall, on an annual basis, make publicly available the information received under subsection (a).

(c) *REDUCTION IN FUNDING.*—The Attorney General shall, for State or unit of local government which fails to comply with the requirement under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, reduce the amount that the State or local government would otherwise receive under each grant program described in subsection (a) in the following fiscal year by 100 percent.

(d) *REALLOCATION.*—Amounts not allocated to a State or unit of local government under subsection (c) shall be reallocated under each such grant program to States and units of local government that comply with the requirement under subsection (a).

(e) *DEFINITION.*—The term “failed to make an appearance” means an action whereby any defendant has been charged with an offense before a court and who is participating in a pretrial release program for which funds received under a

grant program referred to in subsection (a) are used as a condition of pretrial release—

(1) does not appear for any court date regarding such charge;

(2) does not appear for any one appointment with the pretrial services program; or

(3) does not appear for any post-release appearance the court may require.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2152.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1430

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

I rise in support of H.R. 2152, the Citizens' Right to Know Act of 2018, introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

A little over 50 years ago, there were three pretrial options for defendants accused of a crime: they were released on their own recognizance, granted commercial bail, or remanded to custody.

When considering the options on whether to grant ROR, set a bail amount, or remand, the judge considers a number of factors, including the severity of the crime charged, the suspect's criminal record, the danger posed to the public if the suspect is released, and the suspect's ties to community, family, and employment. Commercial bail ensures the appearance of the defendant in court at no cost to the taxpayer.

The situation for defendants began to change in the 1960s. The first U.S. pretrial services program, the Manhattan Bail Project, was established in 1961. The Manhattan Bail Project was intended to help defendants who were financially unable to post the surety bond conditions set in New York City.

The program interviewed defendants to gather information on community ties to determine a defendant's likelihood to appear in court. Based on these interviews, low-risk individuals were recommended for release on their own recognizance or the defendant's promise to appear without financial obligation.

Unfortunately, over the last four decades, pretrial release programs have expanded well beyond their original scope and purpose. Today, there are over 300 pretrial release programs na-

tionwide, whose participants routinely include violent and repeat offenders, many of whom are able to post a commercial bond and have done so in the past. In many instances, the Federal Government has become a major source of funding for pretrial release programs.

Currently, these pretrial release programs funded by the taxpayers are not required to report any information about the defendants released through their programs into the communities. Basic information on defendants is neither collected nor reported in any systematic fashion.

H.R. 2152 requires jurisdictions that receive grant money from the Department of Justice to operate a pretrial release program to report certain information concerning the defendants to the Attorney General.

The bill requires the jurisdiction to submit the criminal histories of the defendants and the number of times the defendant has failed to appear as ordered by the court. It also requires the Attorney General to make public the information the Department of Justice receives. In my mind, that isn't a whole lot to ask these jurisdictions.

In fact, this bill is beneficial because citizens have the right to know what types of defendants are being released prior to their trial. If a defendant has a long history of criminal behavior or frequent failures to appear in court, the community should know that. Likewise, residents should be aware if their community is running a successful pretrial services program where defendants are regularly making it to their court appearances.

Simply put, no matter what side of the bail or no-bail debate you find yourself on, you should support this bill. Information like this, in the hands of the public, is never a bad thing. It will also be helpful to those of us who make policy on these matters.

I want to thank Mr. POE for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2152.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank the ranking member of the committee, Mr. NADLER, and the chairman of the committee, Mr. GOODLATTE, who is now managing the bill; and I certainly acknowledge my fellow Texan and know that he has all good intentions on important legislation dealing with the question of safety and security.

H.R. 2152, unfortunately, has been noted possibly to have requirements that would undermine the privacy of those who participate in the program, who are disproportionately poor Americans, and discourages the use of pretrial service programs in communities across the country because of the punitive measures in this bill. I rise to oppose H.R. 2152 because it is flawed and

needs to address the disparate treatment of poor Americans.

I believe the consideration of the issues underlying the bill is timely but, unfortunately, not directed in the right way. The House should examine pretrial services and bail issues with the goal of reforming our Nation's bail system, not for the purpose of protecting the use of money bail which is unfair to the indigent, unproductive, and expensive for American taxpayers.

In fact, in Harris County, we have a money bail system, and a Federal judge, Judge Lee Rosenthal, indicated that it was disproportionately unfair to poor constituents in the State of Texas and, particularly, Harris County. We have been working to come together and have an agreement in our local community on recognizance bonds for individuals who work, and put a certain criteria in.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, we are as concerned about the safety and security of our constituents, but it would be inappropriate for us to enhance the commercial bond industry, which I certainly appreciate—they create jobs and they are businesses—in contrast to individuals who simply cannot afford a money bond.

In this instance, this bill would penalize those entities, those communities that use Federal funds for pretrial release programs if they don't provide all of this data. Now, it might be important to provide this data for someone who is particularly dangerous, but, Mr. Speaker, you know just like I do, those individuals do not get a bond.

So, as I indicated, the Citizens' Right to Know Act would require a State or local government that uses Justice Department grant funding to pay for pretrial services, which are important programs, to report, annually, certain information to the Department of Justice about defendants who participate in the pretrial services program.

The very fact that you are in the program is an indication, in most jurisdictions, that you are not a violent felon. You would hope that you are not a person accused of sex crimes, sex trafficking, human trafficking. Those are matters that can be fixed.

Information that will be required to be reported includes the name of each defendant participating in the pretrial release program and each occasion that the person failed to make an appearance, the record of prior convictions of each participant, and the amount of money allocated for the pretrial services program.

If a unit of government fails to comply with the reporting requirement, it would lose its entire funding under the relevant program for the following fiscal year, penalizing smaller communities, innocent communities that didn't have the wherewithal to provide all that data. Certainly, it would be better spent on making sure that they use the pretrial program efficiently and safely and secure.

The requirements in this bill largely mirror legislative initiatives being advanced by ALEC, the American Legislative Exchange Council, in the States, under the false guise of transparency.

Citizens have a right to know what their government is doing. I absolutely agree with that, and I support the reporting of information that will educate us as to what is taking place. As for H.R. 2152, however, I question whether the categories and information that must be reported under the bill are designed to do that or are adequate to tell us about the efficacy of these programs. In addition, the bill requires that this information be made publicly available by the Attorney General.

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the ACLU, NAACP, Human Rights Watch, and Color of Change have written to us opposing the bill and expressing concerns about this publication requirement and the harm to individuals resulting from a sharing of criminal records and personally identifying information. I share these concerns. The groups that I have named have been historic organizations that have dealt with the civil rights, civil liberties, privacy, and constitutional rights of Americans, no matter who they are.

Although the Judiciary Committee adopted an amendment to eliminate the reporting of arrest records of the participating defendants, I see no need to compile and make public information about prior convictions and the failures to appear in connection with identifier-specific defendants—maybe overall numbers, but this would be unnecessary and unproductive.

The main crux of what we should be about is that a pretrial program is a secure and safe program. The levels of a person who can participate should be utilized with guidelines, restrictions, and, certainly, local monitoring. But to penalize an organization, entity, a governmental entity trying to do its best and to be fair and balanced in the criminal justice system based on money bail is something that I would raise the question.

You can document, in Harris County, that we have had an enormously disproportionate impact on individuals with small offenses who have had to go no other route but either jail or money bail. They have no money bail. They are in jail. They could have a legitimate job. They could be a teacher.

We just had an incident with a mother who was placed in—she was, unfortunately, at least the allegations are, that she was driving, unfortunately, in a school zone and had a minute amount of marijuana. Whatever our positions are on that, she was sent to the Harris County jail, of course, lost her job. She was gainfully employed and is, obviously, distraught.

I hate to say it; her allegations are that she was raped in the Harris County jail, sad to say that. But the point is, just think if she could have been re-

leased on her own recognizance and/or a small amount in a pretrial release program. Not given that opportunity, she was taken in and, unfortunately, suffered these unfortunate consequences.

Members submitted amendments to the Rules Committee to address some of these concerns and also to encourage States to eliminate monetary bail, but none were made in order for consideration on the floor today. That is unusual, a closed rule on a Judiciary Committee bill that is the arm of decency as relates to decency, dignity, liberty, justice, and freedom.

Those are very important elements to the American people, and, certainly, the amendments should have been at least given consideration for the Representatives of the people of the United States in the people's House to debate these amendments. That was not the case, so we have a closed rule. I am baffled by that.

Instead of considering this bill, the House should be taking up legislation to encourage States to end the practice of requiring money bail, a practice that disparately impacts the poor and most vulnerable in our society.

For instance, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1437, the No Money Bail Act of 2017, which would reduce Justice Department grant awards to States that do not eliminate money bail and would also eliminate bail at the Federal level. Instead of considering H.R. 2152, we should be advancing legislation such as H.R. 1437, or, minimally, both bills should on be on floor at the same time.

Again, this is no attempt to undermine how we secure our communities. I certainly take no backseat to the fact that our families, communities, police officers, and people in the criminal justice system should be protected, and those who have been given the benefit of a pretrial release should adhere to the rules that are there; but I can see no reason to be punitive to the local governmental entities as relates to not reporting names and all those details, including prior convictions, et cetera, et cetera.

What is the Federal Government going to do, say, if you have two prior convictions, you can't be in the pretrial release program? That is a local, State issue as opposed to a Federal issue, and what you are doing is connecting desperately needed criminal justice dollars from the Department of Justice to communities that may be trying to do their best.

With the version of H.R. 2152 that was reported out of the Judiciary Committee, we are not doing that, unfortunately. Therefore, I oppose the bill and hope that the House will soon take steps to do something about the real problem: our Nation's unjust money bail system.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing this legislation to the floor.

I have several comments that I would like to make in response to my friend from Houston, Ms. JACKSON LEE, about this legislation and about what it is and, more importantly, what it is not.

I served 22 years on a criminal court in Houston, Texas, felony cases, saw about 25,000 people work their way through my court. Before that, I was a prosecutor for 8 years in State court. Mr. Speaker, I saw a lot of people charged with criminal conduct, and this legislation is necessary because of some problems that the system has created.

As the chairman pointed out, pretrial release is a relatively new concept in our justice system. When a person comes and is charged with a crime, generally speaking, in most jurisdictions, there are four ways in which that individual can be released until their day in court:

One way is to put up a cash bond, where they put up the cash to the sheriff's department sometimes, and after the case is over with, they get that cash back.

Another way is to go through a bonding agency where they pay a bonding agency a percentage and they, the bond company, are responsible for making sure the person appears in court. If they don't appear, the bonding company loses the entire bond money.

There is a personal recognizance bond, where an individual comes to court and tells the judge and promises: Judge, I will come back to court for my trial.

□ 1445

It is an agreement between the judge and the individual.

And then there is the pretrial release system.

The pretrial release system is similar to personal recognizance, except the person is supposed to be supervised by a government agency, usually called the pretrial release agency, that makes sure that that person abides by certain conditions, doesn't leave town, and that pretrial release agency is usually run by the local judiciary or the justice system like the county, four different ways.

This legislation deals only with the pretrial release programs in our Nation, the 300 pretrial release programs.

The Citizens Right to Know Act is really not reforming pretrial release, it is an accountability portion of pretrial release to let people know how the Federal money is being used to operate.

Each year, millions of dollars in Federal grant money goes to State and local pretrial release agencies to operate those programs. These programs allow the accused individual to be released and await trial, usually to stay in the jurisdiction.

However, some jurisdictions overuse the programs and release many repeat and dangerous individuals with no

oversight by anybody. They are just released into the community.

Some of these released individuals disappear from the justice system indefinitely. We don't know how many do because there is no reporting of people under the pretrial release program to the Federal Government when they receive Federal funds.

In many cases, repeat, violent, and hardened criminals participate. As a result, in jurisdictions across the country, taxpayers are literally bailing out individuals with a long criminal record on a new criminal offense.

All across America, terrible crimes are being committed by individuals who are bailed out on a pretrial release program because there is no accountability of the program.

This bill is an accountability bill. Who is being released? What types of cases are being released? How many people repeat a crime while they are out on pretrial release?

We don't know because those records are never kept. So if the taxpayers are going to fund pretrial release programs, as they should in local jurisdictions, let the pretrial release program report back to the Federal Government the results of the program. Is it working? Is it not working? That is what we need to know, and we have no idea today.

It doesn't have anything to do with determining who is released on pretrial release, it just wants these organizations to report back to the Federal Government because the public has the right to know if the program is working.

Right now, that is neither collected or reported in any systematic fashion.

Why not? Why don't these pretrial release programs in the country say: Yes. It is working. Everybody comes back, or a great percentage comes back. Or: No. It is not working. People disappear. They commit crimes. We don't know, Mr. Speaker.

All this bill does is help pretrial release let us know and let them know and the public know, is the pretrial release program working in that jurisdiction?

You are using Federal money to operate the program, therefore, report back to the Federal Government on how that program is working or not working.

It doesn't change the pretrial release program, except it requires accountability. For too long, we have not allowed or required accountability of what takes place under the pretrial release program.

It does not collect data on each pretrial release defendant to determine if these agencies are effective in ensuring that defendants adhere to their pretrial requirements and whether the defendants actually show up for trial. It collects it on all defendants that the pretrial release program must report to the Federal Government.

Congress must be able to determine the effectiveness of these programs,

and without basic information like this, Congress can't ensure that the programs are working around the country.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers need to know if their resources are being spent wisely, and that communities are being protected.

There have been numerous cases where individuals were released on pretrial release bonds, and they had a long criminal record, and they commit another offense.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter regarding pretrial release programs.

OCTOBER 27, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

GENTLEMEN: We are writing to express our strong support for HR 2152, the Citizens Right to Know Act, sponsored by Rep. Ted Poe (R-TX). The legislation has been referred to the House Judiciary Committee.

This legislation is long overdue. It requires pre-trial release agencies receiving federal funds to report to the Department of Justice, who participates in their programs, including participant:

Criminal history, including previous charges filed

Previous failures to appear for trial

Previous and current non-compliance infractions

Currently these pre-trial release programs aren't required to report any information about the defendants released through their programs. Basic information on defendants is neither collected nor reported in any systematic fashion. The DOJ only collects data from pre-trial release agencies related to crime rates and trends in the aggregate. It does not collect data on specific participants and programs. Thus, there is no mechanism to determine if pre-trial release agencies are effective in ensuring that defendants adhere to their pre-trial release requirements or whether these defendants actually show up for trial.

Without this legislation, policymakers and taxpayers have no ability to determine the effectiveness of taxpayer-funded pre-trial release programs. And without such data, hundreds of federally funded pretrial release programs lack sufficient accountability to U.S. taxpayers. This lack of accountability has allowed many repeat and violent offenders to get out of jail on our tax dollars.

Until the 1960's, principal options for the accused were ROR (release on one's own recognizance) commercial bail or incarceration. Commercial bail ensured the appearance of the defendant in court at no cost to the taxpayer. Pre-trial release programs began in the 1960's for the purpose of securing release for indigent, non-violent offenders who couldn't afford monetary bail.

However, over the last four decades, pre-trial release programs have expanded well beyond their original scope and purpose. Today there are over 300 pre-trial release programs nationwide whose participants routinely include violent and repeat offenders, many of whom are able post a commercial bond and have done so in the past. In many instances, the federal government has become a major source of funding for pre-trial release programs.

If Congress continues to fund pre-trial release programs, then Congress must be able to determine the effectiveness of such pro-

grams. Taxpayers deserve to know if their limited resources are being spent wisely and their communities are being protected.

We believe swift passage of H.R. 2152 will provide greater transparency for pre-trial programs, greater accountability for taxpayer funds, and increased public safety for our communities.

Sincerely,

Patricia Wenskunas, Crime Survivors;
Mark Klaas, Father of Polly Klaas,
Klaas Kids Foundation; Ronald
Lampard, Criminal Justice Reform, Reform Task Force, American Legislative
Exchange Council (ALEC); Jim
Backlin, Christian Coalition; Colin
Hanna, Let Freedom Ring; Kay Daily,
Coalition for a Fair Judiciary; Susan
Carleson, American Civil Rights Union;
Harriett Salerno, Crime Victims
United; Beverly Warnock, Parents of
Murdered Children; Gary Bauer, American Values; Jim Gilmore, Free Congress/American Opportunity Foundation; Beth Chapman, Professional Bail
Agents Association; Larry Cirignano,
Children First Foundation.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens Right to Know Act simply states that if a State or local jurisdiction is going to use Federal money for a pretrial release program, they must report to the Federal Government information on who participates in the program, the criminal records of those individuals, the appearance rate at trial, and the previous failure to appear of those programs.

I also want to be clear that any State or local jurisdiction that does not report this information will lose the portion of Federal funds which they use for pretrial release programs only. Other Federal funds will not be affected that go to, for example, Byrne grants. I just want to clear that up because my friend, Ms. JACKSON LEE, mentioned that they are going to lose all Federal funds. No. They just lose the funds that apply to Federal pretrial release programs if they don't report those statistics.

There is some question about the privacy of individuals. If States have a law to protect the privacy of certain persons on pretrial release, this bill does not change that. This bill says that if the State has those privacy laws for individuals, which some do, that is fine. That will not be affected or overruled by this Federal law.

I think that this legislation is necessary to see if these programs are working. If they are working, maybe we ought to expand them. If they are not working, maybe Congress needs to reform the pretrial release program.

This legislation enjoys widespread support. One of those supporters is the National Association of Police Organizations. I include in the RECORD a letter indicating their support.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF

POLICE ORGANIZATION, INC.,

Alexandria, VA, May 9, 2017.

Hon. TED POE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POE: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), I am writing to you to express our support for the Citizens' Right to Know Act of 2017, H.R. 2152.

NAPO is a coalition of police unions and associations from across the United States that serves to advance the interests of America's law enforcement through legislative and legal advocacy, political action, and education. Founded in 1978, NAPO now represents more than 1,000 police units and associations, 241,000 sworn law enforcement officers, and more than 100,000 citizens who share a common dedication to fair and effective crime control and law enforcement.

Each year, millions of dollars in federal grant monies go towards state and local pretrial release programs, which allow accused criminals to await their trial at home, rather than in jail. These programs, which in many cases serve repeat, dangerous criminals, often operate with little oversight, putting public safety at risk. Increased oversight of these programs would decrease the possibility of the accused committing crimes while on pretrial release or simply disappearing to avoid facing justice.

The Citizens' Right to Know Act addresses the lack of oversight of these programs by mandating that federally-funded pre-trial service agencies publicly report on program participants, including if they have a history of criminal behavior, whether they appear for their trial, and whether they have ever previously failed to appear for trial. As federal dollars are going towards bailing out criminals, this Act helps ensure that the accused face justice and our communities are protected.

We look forward to working with you to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON,
Executive Director.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this so we can know exactly what is taking place with Federal funds that are being used to keep people and let people, as Ms. JACKSON LEE pointed out, out of jail without having to use some other type of system. And if it is working, let's expand it. If it is not working, maybe Congress needs to be involved to make sure that people do show up for trial, because that is the whole key of a bond, is to release the person under some type of bond, like a pretrial release bond, but we want them to appear in court.

I had cases in my court where people were released on pretrial release bonds; they would show up for trial. I had cases in my court where they were released on pretrial release bonds, and they are still running loose years later.

We don't know the statistics of who is released and who comes back and who is released who never comes back.

This legislation just wants a report to Congress so we can decide on reforms if necessary in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. He is a dear friend. As we debate this question, I think it is a very important moment as we look at comprehensive criminal justice reform.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that this body oppose H.R. 2152, which is a classic piece of legislation which poses itself as a solution, but it is in search of a problem. The solution has very ominous consequences for minorities and poor people, and infringes on the constitutional rights of citizens, that they should be presumed to be innocent until proven guilty when they participate in these pretrial release services.

When I was a magistrate court judge in DeKalb County, Georgia, over a period of 12 years, starting in 1989 to a time about 5 years before I came to Congress, it was my duty to commit people to pretrial services.

Everybody knows how it works, everybody knows who is eligible, and everybody knows that it is a roaring success. There are no problems with pretrial services, which help poor people and basically minorities, who tend to be disproportionately caught up in the criminal justice system.

It helps people who can't afford to make a money bail to be able to get out of jail with some minimal supervision as they await disposition of the charges against them.

It is a simple program administered by State and local authorities around the country. It works. There is no question about it. There is no need for any Federal supervision or oversight of these programs.

What H.R. 2152 would do would be to require local governments who receive DOJ funding for pretrial services to send a report to the DOJ, the Jeff Sessions DOJ, detailing the personally identifiable information on those defendants participating in alternative bail/pretrial release programs, which are typically utilized by those who can't afford money bail.

Sending this information to the DOJ will create a permanent record of the defendants who are awaiting trial, and that data will remain in a Federal database, even if the charges against the accused are dropped or the accused is found innocent.

Pretrial service programs are critical in protecting those who are unable to post bond during their pretrial stages, and this legislation would disproportionately impact minorities and poor people.

The presumption of innocence is one of the most sacred elements of our criminal justice system and a pillar of many modern-day criminal justice operations in modern society throughout the world.

H.R. 2152 threatens this right to a presumption of innocence. Pretrial service programs are critical, and poor people and minorities should not be penalized by being permanently marked in a Federal database, and for that reason I ask my colleagues to not approve this solution in desperate search for a problem with ominous implications for poor and minority people.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2152, the Citizens Right to Know Act.

As a cosponsor of this bill, and a law enforcement for over a decade, I believe this bill is common sense and a needed piece of legislation.

May I share respectfully with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who may be in doubt of this bill, if you are in support of pretrial diversion programs, then you should support this bill.

The existence of pretrial diversion courts is manifested in our Nation due to a righteous need for proper adjudication at all levels of the economic strata and all portions of our culture and society.

But the pretrial diversion program comes after arrest. Arrest is made by the police officer investigating the incident. Innocence is presumed until adjudicated guilty or otherwise, and within 48 hours of arrest, probable cause has to be presented in the form of an affidavit to a magistrate court, and that judge will determine if that American has been rightfully incarcerated, his freedom taken from him, our most precious right as Americans.

We stand in the body which gave birth to the concept of a man and a woman's right to be free, and I support that.

The diversion programs across America, however, through their rather brief history within our judicial system, have failed to provide sufficient data to the jurisdictional authorities that gave birth to them, and that data has not been shared at the Federal level which supports them financially through the harvesting of treasure from the American people that we serve.

I respectfully submit to my colleague that I am a compassionate American man that believes in innocence until proven guilty, and I would like for diversion court programs to continue and grow across our country to better serve the needs of we the people, to recognize the fact that all of us, in some way, are failed and fallen, and we should, of course, with compassion, move forward through the judicial system.

The pretrial diversion programs that exist across our country depend upon a cornerstone of confidence among the jurisdictional authorities that they operate within and the Federal Government that funds them, that they are operating within parameters that are accepted across the country as abiding by laws local, State, and Federal.

□ 1500

To not share data that is readily available by these courts with the Federal Government that funds them is an angle that could be used to defeat these courts that we support. So the compilation of data righteously collected and disseminated is something that we should support if we further support these very court systems.

So this legislation before us today would give Federal and State law enforcement agencies vital data on criminal offenders, repeat or otherwise, who

are placed within the diversion court systems. This information is crucial to both promoting public safety and giving policymakers better insight into the effectiveness of pretrial programs, which I support.

I would like to thank Congressman POE for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues very respectfully, on both sides of the aisle, to support this legislation.

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

Let me indicate and reemphasize points that I made and, as well, points that Mr. JOHNSON made.

This will have a disparate impact, and what strikes me of great concern is that this amendment was, in essence, a closed rule.

I submitted an amendment that would basically gather data—which, I think, is what the proponent of this legislation wants—to ensure that pretrial release is working, to show that people who would be a threat to the community are not running without restraint, and to show the number of people who would appear for their appearance, if you will, in court who were beneficiaries of the pretrial release program. Those are all good elements, but it concerns me, again, that we don't have any clear parameters of whom this will hurt.

And also, small communities are dependent upon Federal grants. Their structure may not be the best, and so, if you are now asking them for reporting of individual names and past offenses, I beg the question of the value of that information.

What we really should have is aggregate numbers of who, under the pretrial program, is able to or is, in essence, not meeting the criteria and is breaking the agreement and commitment they have to either appear or to stay in a certain area. That is important information, and I think the DOJ could utilize that in an aggregate form.

Why are we giving names that will remain in the DOJ database for someone who may ultimately go back to work, as this mother may go back to her family and her life would hopefully—even though she experienced a tragedy in the jail and lost her job, let's hope that she has a future.

But if she were caught in this bill, would her name now be in the database? I have not researched her case. It seems that this might have been her first offense, but it certainly was a minor offense with a small amount of marijuana. As the facts evidence, it was the jurisdictional, the geographic area that she was in that caused the greatest trouble.

So the other side of it is that money bail is another issue that we should have looked at. We should have put both bills on the floor of the House because there is a movement across the Nation to begin to address, again, disparate treatment of money bail—not on the issue of race, but on the issue of economics.

So the person working in the fast-food place is in jail and, most likely, loses their job. We know that people who work in fast-food are mothers, fathers, grandmothers, and grandfathers taking care of families, and being in jail does not help them take care of their family. You can be assured—unlike maybe other positions where you can say I was on vacation or that you didn't even stay in jail because you had the money to get out of jail—you cannot say you are on vacation for a couple of days or that you were nothing because you are right out back at work. You are fired.

A very evident case is the gentleman who was wealthy in Texas—a very renowned case—found in a hotel room in Galveston. He had decapitated his roommate's head and disposed of it—is my recollection. I stand to be corrected if my recollection is not correct—in the Galveston Bay, and because he could post a \$100,000-plus bond, Mr. Speaker, he was released. Put that on any poor person, and we would be aghast at even how this person got bond set. But he did. Ultimately, he was acquitted in that case. I still shake in my boots.

So the issue is there is more to this than giving names and putting it in a database in the DOJ for persons who may never commit another offense in life. Money bail contributes, again, to the unnecessary detention of many low-risk pretrial defendants, inappropriate release of high-risk defendants who have financial means—as I just indicated, a person who decapitated a person's head—unwarranted financial burdens on low-income communities, and the gamble of placing public safety in the hands of a bail bonding industry that will always profit before the public good, a real point to the unfairness of the money bail.

Yet you would deny funds to small towns that are doing pretrial release, or even big counties and cities that are trying to do their best, but they need these Federal funds. Find another way for us to be able to assess what is going on.

Wealth-based detention has disastrous consequences: overcrowding of local jails, lost jobs, lost housing, poor sanitation and medical care, broken families, and it drains local budgets.

In many cases, an arrestee may be held longer in jail while awaiting trial than any sentence she or he would likely receive if convicted. Right now, in my own county and other big counties around the Nation that have not corrected that, they are doing that right now: causing innocent people to plead guilty to offenses that they did not commit in order to shorten the lengthy pretrial detention. Individuals who are detained are not able to assist their attorneys in the investigation of charges against them, resulting in many wrongful convictions and longer sentences.

So I only offer this thought so that we can have a viable discussion on the

money bail issue and the disparate treatment that this legislation—though, not intended—would bring about when you ask communities to give the names and prior convictions of persons who may have had one or two marijuana or DUI—which all of us abhor—convictions. But the privacy issues are a concern, and the lack of debate on the impact of money bail and its unfairness are not being discussed, and the lack of a rule that allows amendments, I think, concerns me.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the American Civil Liberties Union, NAACP, Human Rights Watch, and Color of Change, who expressed their opposition to this legislation.

MAY 8, 2018.

VOTE “NO” ON THE “CITIZENS’ RIGHT TO KNOW ACT OF 2017” (H.R. 2152)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the NAACP, Human Rights Watch, and Color of Change, we urge you to vote “No” on H.R. 2152, the “Citizens’ Right to Know Act of 2017,” as the House considers this bill. This legislation raises serious privacy concerns for the civil and human rights community given the personally identifiable data that is to be collected and publicly reported by the federal government. The bill also undermines efforts to eliminate or reduce jurisdictions’ reliance on money bail systems. We urge the members to instead consider H.R. 1437, the “No Money Bail Act of 2017,” and other bipartisan efforts to encourage the elimination of money bail systems.

THE CITIZENS’ RIGHT TO KNOW ACT RAISES PRIVACY CONCERNS

The Citizens’ Right to Know Act requires jurisdictions receiving funds from the Department of Justice (DOJ) to report to the Attorney General the names, arrest records, and appearance failures for those participating in DOJ funded pretrial services programs. The legislation allows the Attorney General to make public the names, arrest records, and failure appearances that jurisdictions report. Except for a clause that subjects the data “to any applicable confidentiality requirements,” the bill does not provide any explicit privacy protections for those whose personally identifiable information has been collected by the federal government and is subject to public release. The bill requires that the Attorney General penalize noncompliant jurisdictions by denying them 100 percent of the DOJ grant program funds that are used to support pretrial services programs.

While we appreciate the need for the federal government to collect and report data, personal privacy interests must be balanced with public interests. When personally identifiable information is being collected and publicly reported, we believe that such information should be obtained and disseminated only with individuals’ informed consent. We also believe that the potential to harm individual reputations should be considered when arrest records are publicly shared. We are troubled that the Citizens’ Right to Know Act would collect and publicly report personally identifiable information of individuals participating in pretrial services programs—individuals who have not been convicted of a crime given their pretrial status.

THE CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT UNDERMINES
BAIL REFORM EFFORTS

The Citizens' Right to Know Act is inconsistent with efforts to reform money bail systems, like the No Money Bail Act, which many of our organizations support. By collecting and reporting only certain data about pretrial services programs and those participating in them, the Citizens' Right to Know Act will depict a one-sided picture of pretrial services programs and participants. For example, the legislation's focus on when an individual has failed to appear promises a negative narrative around the pretrial stage. If this bill were serious about measuring the true impact of pretrial services programs, it would collect a more robust data set and not that which is of interest only to the bail bonds industry.

We support bail reform that corrects the injustice of basing a defendant's release on how much money the person has. Instead of considering the Citizens' Right to Know Act, Congress should take up the No Money Bail Act of 2017. This legislation would incentive jurisdictions to reform their money bail systems using federal resources. The No Money Bail Act would build safer communities, stronger families, and a fairer criminal justice system by ensuring that people who are innocent in the eyes of the law are not deprived of their freedom because they cannot afford money bail.

For the above described reasons, we urge members of the House to vote "No" on the Citizens' Right to Know Act. Instead, we encourage the House of Representatives to give serious consideration to bail reform bills through legislative and oversight hearings on the issue.

Sincerely,

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, American Civil Liberties Union, NAACP, Human Rights Watch, Color of Change.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). The gentleman from Virginia has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when a person is arrested and charges are filed, usually, now, in our country, they don't sit in jail waiting to see a judge for weeks or months. They see a judge within 24 hours. They appear in court. The judge sets bail. This is all public record, including the name and what the person is accused of. It is already public record. So it is not something that is new.

The judge sets bail and determines if the person can afford a lawyer or not and appoints a lawyer right then, within 24 hours. I think that is marvelous in our country. I remember the old days when that did not happen.

This idea that we are denying a person's right of privacy, it is public already, people who are charged with crimes.

My friend from Georgia said pretrial release works. It is a proven thing to work. Well, how does he know that? Because he says so? We don't know if it works or not.

Mr. Speaker, in April of 2017, 26-year-old Christian Rogers was walking along the street in New Jersey and he was shot 22 times. His assailant, Jules Black, a 30-year-old from Vineland, New Jersey, had just been arrested 4 days earlier by the State police and charged with possession of a handgun. He was released on pretrial release and had a long criminal record.

Christian Rogers is just one example of a victim who was killed because of the pretrial release program. So I would disagree with my friend from Georgia that it is working. We don't know the statistics.

I told you this earlier when I spoke. I was a judge in Harris County for 22 years. People were released on pretrial release. The very people who are released on pretrial release are the people that my friend from Texas is talking about: people who can't afford a surety bond, people who can't afford any kind of bond.

So pretrial release serves its purpose and it serves it to a specific part of the community, but we need to know if it is working, if these people come back for their day in court or they don't come back for their day in court or if they commit a crime while they are on pretrial release. We don't know the statistics.

All this legislation says is let's audit pretrial release across the country and see if it is working, see if it is not working, see if we can make improvements. That is all it is. It is an audit. It is not denying anybody any rights under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I think the legislation is a good idea. We need to know if taxpayer money is working. I appreciate the extra time the chairman has given me.

Mr. Speaker, that is just the way it is.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am clear and I think my colleague Mr. JOHNSON is clear on the pretrial release versus the money bail, but in many instances, pretrial release may have a negative impact on a poor, alleged actor of criminal activity as the money bail system. But this will add additional pain and lack of promise.

As I said, my amendment was to have the aggregate number of those who did not appear. That is viable and important information. You could have it by counties, small towns, villages, and cities to indicate what the impact is of pretrial release.

What strikes me as a concern is to have names and prior convictions, because it becomes part of a DOJ database and these persons may never commit another crime. They might have been in the hospital, maybe they get back and say why—I don't know what it means if you didn't make the first one and they got information that Mr. Smith was in the hospital, didn't have a lawyer, is coming back, but his name

has already been sent out. And then you are going to penalize the local jurisdiction for the Federal funds that they are so desperately in need of.

By the way, I am grateful that in the omnibus that we recently passed, we plussed up all of those numbers. And I can assure you, our communities are jumping for joy in the work that they have to do in criminal justice reform or to secure or to make safe their communities, particularly, our police officers for whom I have championed the COPS on the Beat, and I just wish we could really plus that program up because it is a very viable program that we had from the 1990s.

So taking money away is going to be, in this instance, when there could be a positive alternative to giving the information, something that I would be concerned about.

□ 1515

I have already mentioned the issue that wealth-based detention has disastrous consequences: overloading the local jails, the lost jobs, the lost housing, poor sanitation, medical care, broken families, and draining local budgets. So let us have a moment on the floor that we can discuss the reform of money bails, as was done in the Federal court in the Southern District of Texas.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that this bill is, as they say, an effort at finding a problem. It is important that we promote transparency and accountability in government, but this bill does not move in that direction. I am willing to extend my hand of friendship to my friend from Texas. We will see where this bill goes.

But we know what it may really do. The bill was written for the purpose of burdening pretrial services programs, publicizing the sensitive information of defendants who are charged with but not convicted of a crime—and I think that is an important element; you really do deserve privacy if you are just an accused and not yet convicted—and in order to undermine the efforts to reform the money bail system.

That is why civil rights organizations have written to oppose this bill. I would like to think that they would be willing as well to work with us and come halfway to address the question of the money bail disparate treatment, discriminatory impact. By the way, it is not just a racial disparate treatment; it is a poor people's disparate treatment; it is a working people's treatment, when they don't have money.

We have heard the stories. They put up grandmother's house, their house, and it becomes a real tall mountain to climb. The money bail has been harmful and, in some instances, shameful in what it has done to poor, working families. And instead of considering the

bill that would help us reform that, we should be considering—rather, this bill with the ask of private information. I would like to see if we have to have this bill to do it in aggregate. No names on it would be very helpful. And we should be advancing legislation to eliminate the placing of financial conditions on someone's release from jail pending trial, which is taking money away from the local jurisdiction.

The bill today does that, and I think that we can work to do better. And I am not pleased to be opposing, but I would ask my colleagues to consider all that I have said about bail reform and disparate treatment and how we can best handle the needs of finding out who leaves pretrial release and who doesn't. Let's just get the numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against this bill. I ask my colleagues to join me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am baffled by those who oppose this very simple and straightforward legislation. Not a single Member in this Chamber should be opposed to the Citizens' Right to Know Act.

When has more data in the hands of this body ever been a bad thing? We have a number of obligations we owe our constituents. Two of those obligations are to make sure our communities are safe and that tax dollars are spent wisely. This bill accomplishes both. Without the Citizens' Right To Know Act, we and our constituents lack the ability to determine the effectiveness of taxpayer-funded pretrial release programs. Without the required data, hundreds of Federally funded pretrial release programs lack sufficient accountability to U.S. taxpayers. This lack of accountability has the potential to allow many repeat and violent offenders to get out of jail on our tax dollars. We and our constituents deserve to know if resources are being spent wisely and our communities are being protected.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on this very important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2152, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 872, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1545

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 2152;

The motion to recommit with respect to H.R. 5645; and

Passage of H.R. 5645, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 2152) to require States and units of local government receiving funds under grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds for pretrial services programs, to submit to the Attorney General a report relating to such program, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 197, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—221

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

Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman

Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent

DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko

Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratchcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)

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

NAYS—197

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa

Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Curtis
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gotthelmer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa

Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Luján, Ben Ray | Peters | Sherman | Cohen | Kaptur | Peters | Luetkemeyer | Posey | Smith (TX) |
| Lynch | Peterson | Sires | Connolly | Keating | Peterson | MacArthur | Ratcliffe | Smucker |
| Maloney, | Pingree | Smith (WA) | Cooper | Kelly (IL) | Pingree | Marchant | Reed | Stefanik |
| Carolyn B. | Pocan | Soto | Correa | Kennedy | Pocan | Marino | Reichert | Stewart |
| Maloney, Sean | Polis | Speier | Costa | Khanna | Polis | Marshall | Renacci | Stivers |
| Massie | Price (NC) | Suozzi | Courtney | Kihuen | Price (NC) | Massie | Rice (SC) | Tenney |
| Matsui | Quigley | Swalwell (CA) | Crist | Kildee | Quigley | Mast | Roe (TN) | Thompson (PA) |
| McCollum | Raskin | Takano | Crowley | Kilmer | Raskin | McCarthy | Rogers (AL) | Thornberry |
| McEachin | Rice (NY) | Thompson (CA) | Cuellar | Kind | Rice (NY) | McCaul | Rohrabacher | Tipton |
| McGovern | Richmond | Thompson (MS) | Cummings | Krishnamoorthi | Richmond | McClintock | Rooney, Francis | Trott |
| McNerney | Ros-Lehtinen | | Davis (CA) | Lamb | Rosen | McHenry | Rooney, Thomas | Turner |
| Meeks | Rosen | Titus | Davis, Danny | Langevin | Roybal-Allard | McKinley | J. | Upton |
| Meng | Roybal-Allard | Tonko | DeFazio | Larsen (WA) | Ruiz | McMorris | Ros-Lehtinen | Valadao |
| Moore | Ruiz | Torres | DeGette | Larson (CT) | Rodgers | | Roskam | Wagner |
| Moulton | Ruppersberger | Tsongas | Delaney | Lawrence | Rush | McSally | Ross | Walberg |
| Murphy (FL) | Rush | Vargas | DeLauro | Lawson (FL) | Ryan (OH) | Meadows | Rothfus | Walden |
| Nadler | Ryan (OH) | Veasey | DeBene | Lee | Sánchez | Mitchell | Rouzer | Walker |
| Napolitano | Sánchez | Vela | Demings | Levin | Sarbanes | Moolenaar | Royce (CA) | Walorski |
| Neal | Sanford | Velázquez | DeSaulnier | Lewis (GA) | Schakowsky | Mooney (WV) | Russell | Walters, Mimi |
| Nolan | Sarbanes | Visclosky | Dingell | Lieu, Ted | Schiff | Mullin | Rutherford | Weber (TX) |
| Norcross | Schakowsky | Walz | Doggett | Lipinski | Schneider | Newhouse | Sanford | Westen |
| O'Halleran | Schiff | Wasserman | Doyle, Michael | Loeb | Schrader | Noem | Scalise | Westerman |
| O'Rourke | Schneider | Schultz | F. | Lofgren | Scott (VA) | Norman | Schweikert | Williams |
| Pallone | Schrader | Waters, Maxine | Duncan (TN) | Lowenthal | Scott, David | Nunes | Scott, Austin | Wilson (SC) |
| Panetta | Scott (VA) | Welch | Ellison | Lowe | Serrano | Olson | Sensenbrenner | Wittman |
| Pascarell | Scott, David | Wilson (FL) | Engel | Lujan Grisham, | Sewell (AL) | Palazzo | Sessions | Womack |
| Payne | Serrano | Yarmuth | Eshoo | M. | Shea-Porter | Palmer | Shimkus | Woodall |
| Pelosi | Sewell (AL) | | Españillat | Luján, Ben Ray | Sherman | Paulsen | Shuster | Yoder |
| Perlmutter | Shea-Porter | | Esty (CT) | Lynch | Sinema | Pearce | Simpson | Yoho |
| | | | Evans | Maloney, | Sires | Perry | Smith (MO) | Young (AK) |
| | | | Foster | Carolyn B. | Smith (WA) | Poe (TX) | Smith (NE) | Young (IA) |
| | | | Frankel (FL) | Maloney, Sean | Soto | Poliquin | Smith (NJ) | Zeldin |
| | | | Fudge | | | | | |
| | | | Gabbard | | | | | |
| | | | Gallego | | | | | |
| | | | Garamendi | | | | | |
| | | | Gomez | | | | | |
| | | | Gonzalez (TX) | | | | | |
| | | | Gottheimer | | | | | |
| | | | Green, Al | | | | | |
| | | | Green, Gene | | | | | |
| | | | Grijalva | | | | | |
| | | | Gutiérrez | | | | | |
| | | | Hanabusa | | | | | |
| | | | Hastings | | | | | |
| | | | Heck | | | | | |
| | | | Higgins (NY) | | | | | |
| | | | Himes | | | | | |
| | | | Hoyer | | | | | |
| | | | Huffman | | | | | |
| | | | Jackson Lee | | | | | |
| | | | Jayapal | | | | | |
| | | | Jeffries | | | | | |
| | | | Johnson (GA) | | | | | |
| | | | Johnson, E. B. | | | | | |

NOT VOTING—10

| | | |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Deutch | Labrador | Rokita |
| Jenkins (WV) | Messer | Wilson (SC) |
| Jones | Pittenger | |
| Kuster (NH) | Rogers (KY) | |

□ 1611

Mr. SANFORD changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico changed his vote from “present” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANDARD MERGER AND ACQUISITION REVIEWS THROUGH EQUAL RULES ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 5645) to amend the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that the Federal Trade Commission shall exercise authority with respect to mergers only under the Clayton Act and only in the same procedural manner as the Attorney General exercises such authority, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), 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.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 220, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

YEAS—193

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Adams | Bonamici | Carson (IN) |
| Aguilar | Boyle, Brendan | Cartwright |
| Barragán | F. | Castor (FL) |
| Bass | Brady (PA) | Castro (TX) |
| Beatty | Brown (MD) | Chu, Judy |
| Bera | Brownley (CA) | Cicilline |
| Beyer | Bustos | Clark (MA) |
| Bishop (GA) | Butterfield | Clarke (NY) |
| Blum | Capuano | Clay |
| Blumenauer | Carbajal | Cleaver |
| Blunt Rochester | Cárdenas | Clyburn |

NAYS—220

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Crawford | Harper |
| Aderholt | Culberson | Harris |
| Allen | Curbelo (FL) | Hartzer |
| Amash | Curtis | Hensarling |
| Amodei | Davidson | Herrera Beutler |
| Babin | Davis, Rodney | Hice, Jody B. |
| Bacon | Denham | Higgins (LA) |
| Banks (IN) | Dent | Hill |
| Barletta | DeSantis | Holding |
| Barr | DesJarlais | Hollingsworth |
| Bergman | Diaz-Balart | Hudson |
| Biggs | Donovan | Huizenga |
| Bilirakis | Duffy | Hultgren |
| Bishop (MI) | Duncan (SC) | Hunter |
| Bishop (UT) | Dunn | Hurd |
| Blackburn | Emmer | Issa |
| Bost | Estes (KS) | Jenkins (KS) |
| Brady (TX) | Faso | Johnson (LA) |
| Brat | Ferguson | Johnson (OH) |
| Brooks (AL) | Fitzpatrick | Johnson, Sam |
| Brooks (IN) | Fleischmann | Jordan |
| Buchanan | Flores | Joyce (OH) |
| Buck | Fortenberry | Katko |
| Bucshon | Fox | Kelly (MS) |
| Budd | Frelinghuysen | Kelly (PA) |
| Burgess | Gaetz | King (IA) |
| Byrne | Gallagher | King (NY) |
| Calvert | Garrett | Kinzing |
| Carter (GA) | Gianforte | Knight |
| Carter (TX) | Gibbs | Kustoff (TN) |
| Chabot | Gohmert | LaHood |
| Cheney | Goodlatte | LaMalfa |
| Coffman | Gosar | Lamborn |
| Cole | Gowdy | Lance |
| Collins (GA) | Granger | Latta |
| Collins (NY) | Graves (GA) | Lesko |
| Comer | Graves (LA) | Lewis (MN) |
| Comstock | Graves (MO) | LoBiondo |
| Conaway | Griffith | Long |
| Cook | Grothman | Loudermilk |
| Costello (PA) | Guthrie | Love |
| Cramer | Handel | Lucas |

NOT VOTING—15

| | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Arrington | Jones | Roby |
| Barton | Kuster (NH) | Rogers (KY) |
| Black | Labrador | Rokita |
| Deutch | Messer | Taylor |
| Jenkins (WV) | Pittenger | Webster (FL) |

□ 1619

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 176.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. 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 230, nays 185, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—230

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

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Gibbs | Love | Rouzer |
| Gohmert | Lucas | Royce (CA) |
| Goodlatte | Luetkemeyer | Russell |
| Gosar | MacArthur | Rutherford |
| Gowdy | Marchant | Sanford |
| Granger | Marino | Scalise |
| Graves (GA) | Marshall | Schweikert |
| Graves (LA) | Massie | Scott, Austin |
| Graves (MO) | Mast | Sensenbrenner |
| Griffith | McCarthy | Sessions |
| Grothman | McCaul | Shinkus |
| Guthrie | McClintock | Shuster |
| Handel | McHenry | Simpson |
| Harper | McKinley | Sinema |
| Harris | McMorris | Smith (MO) |
| Hartzer | Rodgers | Smith (NE) |
| Hensarling | McSally | Smith (NJ) |
| Herrera Beutler | Meadows | Smith (TX) |
| Hice, Jody B. | Mitchell | Smucker |
| Higgins (LA) | Moolenaar | Stefanik |
| Hill | Mooney (WV) | Stewart |
| Holding | Mullin | Stivers |
| Hollingsworth | Newhouse | Taylor |
| Hudson | Noem | Tenney |
| Huizenga | Norman | Thompson (PA) |
| Hultgren | Nunes | Thornberry |
| Hunter | Olson | Tipton |
| Hurd | Palazzo | Trott |
| Issa | Palmer | Turner |
| Jenkins (KS) | Paulsen | Upton |
| Johnson (LA) | Pearce | Valadao |
| Johnson (OH) | Perry | Wagner |
| Johnson, Sam | Peters | Walberg |
| Jordan | Peterson | Walden |
| Joyce (OH) | Poe (TX) | Walker |
| Katko | Poliquin | Walorski |
| Kelly (MS) | Posey | Walters, Mimi |
| Kelly (PA) | Ratcliffe | Weber (TX) |
| King (IA) | Reed | Webster (FL) |
| King (NY) | Reichert | Wenstrup |
| Kinzinger | Renacci | Westerman |
| Knight | Rice (SC) | Williams |
| Kustoff (TN) | Roby | Wilson (SC) |
| LaHood | Roe (TN) | Wittman |
| LaMalfa | Rogers (AL) | Womack |
| Lamborn | Rohrabacher | Woodall |
| Lance | Rooney, Francis | Yoder |
| Latta | Rooney, Thomas | Yoho |
| Lesko | J. | Young (AK) |
| Lewis (MN) | Ros-Lehtinen | Young (IA) |
| LoBiondo | Roskam | Zeldin |
| Long | Ross | |
| Loudermilk | Rothfus | |

NAYS—185

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Delaney | Kennedy |
| Aguilar | DeLauro | Khanna |
| Barragán | DelBene | Kihuen |
| Bass | Demings | Kildee |
| Beatty | DeSaulnier | Kilmer |
| Bera | Dingell | Kind |
| Bishop (GA) | Doggett | Krishnamoorthi |
| Blumenauer | Doyle, Michael | Lamb |
| Blunt Rochester | F. | Langevin |
| Bonamici | Duncan (TN) | Larsen (WA) |
| Boyle, Brendan | Ellison | Larson (CT) |
| F. | Engel | Lawrence |
| Brady (PA) | Eshoo | Lawson (FL) |
| Brown (MD) | Espallat | Lee |
| Brownley (CA) | Esty (CT) | Levin |
| Bustos | Evans | Lewis (GA) |
| Butterfield | Foster | Lieu, Ted |
| Capuano | Frankel (FL) | Lipinski |
| Carbajal | Fudge | Loebach |
| Cárdenas | Gabbard | Lofgren |
| Carson (IN) | Gallego | Lowenthal |
| Cartwright | Garamendi | Lowe |
| Castor (FL) | Gomez | Lujan Grisham, |
| Castro (TX) | Gonzalez (TX) | M. |
| Chu, Judy | Gottheimer | Lujan, Ben Ray |
| Cicilline | Green, Al | Lynch |
| Clark (MA) | Green, Gene | Maloney, |
| Clarke (NY) | Grijalva | Carolyn B. |
| Clay | Gutiérrez | Maloney, Sean |
| Cleaver | Hanabusa | Matsui |
| Clyburn | Hastings | McCollum |
| Cohen | Heck | McEachin |
| Connolly | Higgins (NY) | McGovern |
| Cooper | Himes | McNerney |
| Correa | Hoyer | Meeks |
| Costa | Huffman | Meng |
| Courtney | Jackson Lee | Moore |
| Crist | Jayapal | Moulton |
| Crowley | Jeffries | Murphy (FL) |
| Cummings | Johnson (GA) | Nadler |
| Davis (CA) | Johnson, E. B. | Napolitano |
| Davis, Danny | Kaptur | Neal |
| DeFazio | Keating | Nolan |
| DeGette | Kelly (IL) | Norcross |

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| O'Halleran | Rush | Thompson (CA) |
| O'Rourke | Ryan (OH) | Thompson (MS) |
| Pallone | Sarbanes | Titus |
| Panetta | Schakowsky | Tonko |
| Pascarella | Schiff | Torres |
| Payne | Schneider | Tsongas |
| Pelosi | Schrader | Vargas |
| Perlmutter | Scott (VA) | Veasey |
| Pingree | Scott, David | Vela |
| Pocan | Serrano | Velázquez |
| Polis | Sewell (AL) | Visclosky |
| Price (NC) | Shea-Porter | Walz |
| Quigley | Sherman | Wasserman |
| Raskin | Sires | Schultz |
| Rice (NY) | Smith (WA) | Waters, Maxine |
| Richmond | Soto | Watson Coleman |
| Rosen | Speier | Welch |
| Royal-Allard | Suzuki | Yarmuth |
| Ruiz | Swalwell (CA) | |
| Ruppersberger | Takano | |

NOT VOTING—13

| | | |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Arrington | Kuster (NH) | Rokita |
| Beyer | Labrador | Sánchez |
| Deutch | Messer | Wilson (FL) |
| Jenkins (WV) | Pittenger | |
| Jones | Rogers (KY) | |

□ 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.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 112, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 112

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

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on June 10, 2018, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1630

CELEBRATING MT. VERNON EXPLORATORY SCHOOL'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Mt. Vernon Exploratory School's 25th anniversary.

For 25 years, the teachers and faculty members have strived to uphold their mission of character, competency, and rigor for all by investing in each student who walks through their halls. The school's commitment to supporting students and families has helped the Hall County School District earn the title of "Most Caring Place on Earth."

Mt. Vernon Exploratory holds a special place in my family's heart. My wife, Lisa, has taught at Mt. Vernon since it opened in 1993, and all three of our children have attended the school.

We have enjoyed watching the school grow with each new academic year. From acquiring its charter school status to acquiring a new curriculum that addresses the modern students' needs, Mt. Vernon has cultivated a constructive environment for its students.

I stand with the Mt. Vernon Trojans in celebrating this new milestone for the school and wish the faculty and students well as they finish the school year.

Go Trojans.

RECOGNIZING MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, throughout Military Appreciation Month, I join with my fellow Americans to remember the brave servicemen and -women who gave the ultimate sacrifice for this Nation and to honor the servicemembers who are still answering the call to duty today.

New Mexico is the proud home of over 16,000 patriotic servicemembers, who operate the premier military installations at Kirtland, Cannon, and Holloman Air Force Bases, and the Army's White Sands Missile Range.

Thank you for all that you do to keep our country safe and safeguard the freedoms and values that we all cherish.

I also want to recognize the devoted spouses, children, sisters, brothers, and parents of our men and women in uniform for their unending support. This month is dedicated to their service as well.

I hope everyone in this Chamber and those watching at home will take the time to thank a servicemember and their loved ones who continue to sacrifice so much for our country.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK

(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 want to recognize National Charter Schools Week.

Minnesota was a pioneer in the charter school movement, opening the Nation's very first charter school in St. Paul in the fall of 1992.

Charter schools are tuition-free, independent, public schools that are open and welcome to all students, no matter ability or need. They are governed and operated jointly by licensed teachers, parents, and community members.

Today, more than 56,000 Minnesota children are educated every day in charter schools, many of them from low-income families. A child's ZIP Code should not determine the outcome of their education.

As co-chair of the Charter School Caucus, I am pleased with the bipartisan work we have been able to do to strengthen charter schools and enable the replication of successful charter programs nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the great work being done in charter schools across the country and thank the teachers and community leaders who work so hard educating their children.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES ARE SKYROCKETING

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs are forcing families to make impossible choices every day.

No one in America should have to decide between putting food on the table and paying for the lifesaving medication their children need, but pharmaceutical corporations will keep raising their prices for one simple reason: because they can.

There are a number of things that we can do, and number one is negotiate prescription drug prices under Medicare; number two, shed light on the pharmaceutical corporations' drug pricing system; number three, end patient system abuse by eliminating tactics that thwart competition; number four, allow safe importation of prescription drugs from other countries; and number five, ensure access to affordable drugs through fair trade agreements.

Lukewarm pharma-friendly approaches just won't work. Failing to

take truly meaningful action could mean the difference between life and death.

RECOGNIZING SECOND LIEUTENANT B. LOUISE BODDIE DAWSON

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the life and service of 99-year-old Second Lieutenant B. Louise Boddie Dawson, a driven, strong, and remarkable constituent.

A graduate of Freedman Hospital Nursing School in Washington, D.C., Louise proudly served our country during World War II as a nurse in the Army. For her dedicated service, she earned the American Campaign Medal and the World War II Victory Medal.

It was through the Army that Louise met her husband, Lieutenant Colonel Emmett C. Dawson, Jr. The Dawsons married on September 3, 1949, and moved to Sewickley, Pennsylvania, where Louise worked as a nurse until the start of the Korean war.

Always caring for people and wanting to serve better, Louise worked as a head nurse at the former Dixmont State Hospital in Kilbuck Township, while studying psychology at La Roche College.

Louise led an exemplary life of hard work and selfless service towards others. She instilled this work ethic in her daughters, telling them you never fail until you quit and by setting an incredible example for them to follow.

God only knows how long Louise will remain with us, but we always remember her extraordinary life witness to serve, be kind, and persevere.

CONGRATULATING FRANKLIN THOMAS SYLVESTER, JR.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Franklin Thomas Sylvester, Jr., on his recent graduation from the University of Connecticut Medical School, where he excelled in his clinical training. Franklin, at 25 years old, is now preparing to embark on the next phase in his preparation for life as a medical doctor.

I am proud to say that the city of New York will be welcoming Franklin as he heads to Mount Sinai Kravis Children's Hospital, where he will do his residency training in pediatrics.

I commend Franklin and all those who are graduating this spring from medical school. As an African-American male, Franklin's accomplishment has an additional significance. Research shows that diversity in the medical field is critically linked to better outcomes, and we also know that there isn't enough diversity in a profession that so often makes a difference between life and death.

Franklin recently said: "Pediatrics is where I can make the most difference. From children's health to their social issues, that is where I want to make an impact where I can."

With that kind of compassion and commitment to his profession, Franklin will serve the children of New York and this Nation in ways that make us all proud. I hope that today some young person listening to my remarks will look to Franklin as an inspiration and strive to similar accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Nurses Week, a celebration of our dedicated healthcare professionals throughout our country.

National Nurses Week begins each year on May 6 and ends on May 12, which is the birthday of Florence Nightingale, widely considered the founder of modern nursing.

National Nurses Week was first celebrated in 1954, in honor of the centennial anniversary of Ms. Nightingale's renowned humanitarian mission during the Crimean War.

In 1982, President Ronald Reagan signed a proclamation officially proclaiming May 6 as the national day of recognition for nurses.

During my time in Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege to meet with nurses and nursing associations from central Pennsylvania and to hear from them about their critical work around the Commonwealth. The tremendous impact that these nurses have on our entire medical system through their passionate work never ceases to amaze me.

I am extraordinarily grateful that Pennsylvania ranks fourth among all States in the number of professionally active nurses, with nearly 220,000 currently serving our great Commonwealth. Hospitals and medical clinics certainly couldn't operate without them. Their tireless dedication to the well-being of our children, parents, spouses, and friends supports and strengthens our local communities every single day.

I would also like to thank the families, educators, and medical facilities that have allowed these wonderful healthcare professionals to flourish in their selfless vocation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LISA PATTERSON

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Lisa Patterson. Lisa attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Lisa was very active in her community. She coached softball teams, served as the president of the St. John Fisher's PTA and was active in her church.

Lisa was married to her husband, Robert, for more than 20 years, and they enjoyed running a hardwood floor business together. Lisa and Robert had three children together—Robert, Jr.; Amber; and Brooke—and had one dog named Holly Wolf.

Lisa was warm and caring to everyone she met. She had an infectious energy and a fierce love for her family.

I would like to extend my condolences to Lisa Patterson's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the entire country grieve with you.

RECOGNIZING MUSKEGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Muskegon Community College, a national leader in 2-year higher education institutions.

MCC, located in Muskegon, Michigan, offers classes at state-of-the-art facilities throughout the west Michigan region.

Under the leadership of my friend President Dale Nesbary, the students, faculty, and staff have all collaborated to reach great heights. As a result of these efforts, MCC was recently ranked the top 2-year college in the State of Michigan.

MCC has excelled, in part, by emphasizing academic achievement, investing in high-quality facilities, and developing apprenticeship training programs. Last year, graduates of the nursing program ranked first in the country on the registered nursing licensing exam, achieving a 100 percent first-time pass rate.

Currently, MCC is seeking to build on its success by investing in the most significant facilities upgrades in its history.

Through its unique apprentice training program, students work to earn a skills trade certificate, with the option to complete further classes to achieve an associate's degree.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in honoring Muskegon Community College as they continue to raise the bar and provide high-quality educational opportunities for students in Muskegon County and all across west Michigan.

HONORING ROGERS HIGH SCHOOL WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor northwest Ohio's own Rogers High School women's basketball team

on their monumental achievement of winning the Division II State Championship. This breaks a nearly 37-year drought in women's basketball State titles for the city of Toledo.

The joy of their victory is shared by everyone in Toledo: the students, coaches, families, friends, teachers, and loved ones. The city even honored the Rams with a ceremony at Promenade Park.

Well deserved, Rams.

Each member of this team has now chiseled their name into the history books. What a great start for this young generation of future leaders, the players who worked so hard for this.

Go Rams. You have made Toledo proud, as you set your sights on excellence.

I include in the RECORD an article written for the Toledo Blade titled, "Toledo Celebrates Rogers Girls Basketball State Champions."

Thank you, Rams.

[From the Toledo Blade, Apr. 21, 2018]

TOLEDO CELEBRATES ROGERS GIRLS BASKETBALL STATE CHAMPIONS

(By Lauren Lindstrom)

The whooping cheers, celebratory signs, and ample crowd Saturday made one thing clear: Toledo loves its championship-winning Lady Rams.

Rogers High School girls basketball players were feted with a parade through the streets of downtown Toledo and a rally at Promenade Park, where they basked in the admiration of their ardent and vocal fans.

The team won the Division II state championship game March 17 in Columbus with a 51-37 victory against Gilmour Academy in Gates Mills, Ohio. First-team all-state guard Zia Cooke scored 33 points, sealing the first girls basketball state title for a Toledo team since 1981.

"I want to thank you for all of the Toledo support," said Miss Cooke, a junior point guard who also thanked her coaches, teammates, and parents. "Toledo may be a small city, but our fan base is bigger than most. Man, it's a blessing to be a state champion in 2018."

Miss Cooke teared up when talking about her grandmother, who died late in the team's season.

"She was my drive to do better, and she still is my drive to be a better person in life," she said. "I made this promise to her, and I kept it."

Rogers head coach Lamar Smith reveled in his team's underdog status.

"They said we couldn't bring this home, we've been hearing it: Rogers is done, Toledo can't win a state championship," he said. "Well, we proved them wrong. I'm very proud of these ladies."

Those who spoke Saturday highlighted not only the players' athletic successes but also their status as role models for younger students.

"It's important as a city that we celebrate our successes; that we have pride in Toledo, pride in TPS, pride in where we come from," said Toledo Public Schools Superintendent Romules Durant. He lauded the girls' success on the court and in the classroom.

"Our ladies represent what Toledo is all about," he said. "The minute they begin to think they can count us out we continue to keep fighting . . . these are our leaders today, our leaders tomorrow, and more importantly [they're] leading the city of Toledo as we move to the future."

Toledo Mayor Wade Kapszukiewicz presented the team with a key to the city and congratulated the players and coaches.

"For an occasion this historic and a moment this important, we're going to go to the big guns," he said as he presented the key. "Post it with pride and—no pressure—let's do this again next year."

Members from the 1981 Libbey High School team were on hand to celebrate the next generation of champions.

"They are going to have a lifetime of memories," said Ann Strong, a center forward and class of 1981. "We still talk after 37 years about our state championship win. They have a lot to look forward to and talk about for years to come. It's a great feeling."

RECOGNIZING TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, this week is Teacher Appreciation Week.

Teachers inspire millions every day by instilling knowledge, evoking creativity, and motivating students of all ages in the quest for lifelong learning.

Those who have answered this special call to serve in this wonderful profession are among the hardest working and most innovative in our communities. Teachers are special people who lay the foundation for developing critical thinking skills in our children that will serve them throughout their lifetime.

Many of us remember well the teachers who made a big difference in our lives and even encouraged us to take our chosen career path.

I am forever grateful to the teachers who have changed my life, from my kindergarten teacher, Mrs. LePage, to my third grade teacher, Mrs. Huerling. These people have inspired me every day as I think about those wonderful days in elementary school.

Interesting, my son is also a graduate of the same high school and elementary and junior high as I, the New Hartford High School, and graduated some 30 years after I did.

During this week, let's take time to remember teachers and their selfless work and dedication. Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing and honoring the thousands of teachers across the 22nd District and the Nation for their love and dedication to this noble profession and this calling that will never be forgotten.

□ 1645

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS CRISIS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, prescription drug prices are rising at an unprecedented rate, unsustainable for most American families. In fact, Americans pay double what people in other countries pay for prescription drugs.

Our per capita prescription drug spending is higher than any other country. That is why last July, Democrats outlined a bold new plan to give

the American people a better deal on prescription drug costs. Our plan cracks down on price gouging, allows Medicare to negotiate discounted prices, and requires new levels of transparency for big drug companies.

But more than 10 months since Democrats offered a way forward, President Trump and Republicans are still silent. Instead of addressing this crisis, the President and his allies in Congress have made the problem even worse. They tried to take away healthcare from 23 million Americans on more than one occasion. They gave the pharmaceutical industry a huge tax cut, and they made it even harder for working men and women to get ahead.

Democrats are putting the needs of working people first, ahead of big pharmaceutical companies, and we are going to keep fighting until the American people get a better deal on prescription drugs.

GOODWILL INDUSTRIES WEEK

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the week of May 6 through May 12 as Goodwill Industries Week.

This week is about the people of Georgia who value hard work and support the right of individuals to provide for themselves and their families. Some members in our communities require additional education, job preparation, skill training, and support services to reach the goal of self-sufficiency.

Goodwill has a rich history of providing essential services for these people to be productive members of our community since 1902. Since 1965, in southeast Georgia, Goodwill has provided community-based services, including career counseling, GED preparation, financial education, resume preparation, and more.

In this time of low unemployment, it is more important than ever for us to reach out to the unemployed and give our businesses the workforce they need to succeed.

Thank you to the employees of Goodwill Southeast Georgia for everything you are doing to keep our national economy strong, and for maximizing individuals' contributions to self, family, and community.

ADVANCE PAROLE

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, on September 5, 2017, President Trump terminated the DACA program, disrupting the lives of nearly 800,000 hard-working DACA recipients. On that same day, the administration decided

to no longer allow DACA recipients to travel abroad under the authority of advance parole.

In the past, DACA recipients have been allowed to take short trips out of the country for humanitarian, educational, or employment purposes. This is no longer the case, and the consequences have been devastating.

In January of this year, the father of my constituent, Mayra—a college student and Dreamer—died in Mexico. She immediately gathered the necessary paperwork, including her father's death certificate, and applied for advance parole. Her request was denied, and then denied again.

Mayra was unable to pay her last respects to her beloved father due to the unconscionable decisions made by this irresponsible and heartless administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to immediately reverse this harmful directive.

DISASTROUS IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Trump for withdrawing the U.S. from the disastrous Iran nuclear deal.

Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons—and ballistic missiles capable of delivering them—is a serious threat to its neighbors in the Middle East, as well as eventually the U.S. But the 2015 Iran nuclear deal, hatched by John Kerry and the Obama administration, does little to curb that pursuit.

The fact is, there aren't nearly strong enough measures in place to actually hold Iran accountable for compliance with the deal. It is too bad the Obama administration has already traded billions of U.S. and foreign dollars in exchange for promises Iran clearly has no intention of keeping. We can't get those dollars back either.

Of course, now Iran isn't even using this money for its economy, as reported. Much of it is being funneled directly to active terrorist organizations around the Middle East.

This deal was a danger from the start, and it lets Iran off the hook. We must do better. We must negotiate better than has been done.

THREATS TO SNAP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be leading this Special Order hour on the SNAP program and the current threats against it in the farm bill.

SNAP, of course, is America's most important antihunger program, serving

more than 42 million Americans and delivering improved economic, health, and nutrition outcomes for millions of our families, reducing poverty and food insecurity.

To kick us off tonight, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Washington, PRAMILA JAYAPAL, my distinguished colleague.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his continued leadership on these Special Order hours, and also for his leadership in the Progressive Caucus, and on the Judiciary Committee.

I am here to talk about SNAP because I am sort of dumbfounded that we are where we are. I serve as the vice ranking member on the Budget Committee, and I saw firsthand how a Republican tax scam, the tax cut, was pushed through in favor of the top 1 percent and the largest corporations, creating a transfer of wealth from the middle class and working people to the wealthiest; creating what will be a \$1 trillion deficit according to the Congressional Budget Office next year; and then coming back and saying somehow we don't have enough money to feed our kids.

That, to me, is really not just ludicrous, but it is outrageous, and I am deeply saddened by it because the program that we are talking about is the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—that is what SNAP stands for—and it feeds 42 million American families across the country. This is a target of our colleagues on the Republican side, using the farm bill to take this crucial program away from Americans who need it the most. The bill would strip critical food assistance from unemployed and employed workers by shortening the time limits to be eligible for SNAP for millions of people.

My home State of Washington in 2016 received \$1.1 billion in SNAP funding, and there and across the country, as I said, 42 million families benefit from this critical program. These are workers and families who face low wages, unreliable schedules, underemployment, and unstable incomes. They all rely on SNAP to buy groceries and put food on the table.

So we are talking about stripping food assistance from families and individuals with children under 6 if they can't consistently work 20 hours a week. And it would strip food assistance for a whole year if that requirement isn't met.

Cutting SNAP is not magically going to reduce the deficit, a deficit that was dramatically increased by our Republican colleagues when they passed the tax scam, and so this is just an attempt to take resources from the most vulnerable and to leave these 40 million families stranded on the side of the road.

The American Dream isn't just about individuals lifting themselves up by their own bootstraps. It is the idea that we are all better off when we are all

better off; that we need to lift up every person, and make sure every person has bootstraps to be lifted up by.

Today, my office received a call from Dave in my district who works at our University District Food Bank, and he called just imploring Congress not to allow this to happen. Our community food banks in red and blue districts across the country will not be able to keep up with the need if we gut SNAP. Yesterday, I met with Aaron from Food Lifeline, who knows from experience that for every one meal provided by a food bank in our community, SNAP provides 12.

Yesterday, I spoke at a rally and we had a constituent of mine—a woman named Tina—who came out from Washington State. She is a single mom. She has got a 9-year-old kid, and she was just begging and pleading for us to please keep this program.

The reality is that SNAP is one of the most cost-effective public assistance programs. It quickly and directly gets food assistance to those who need it. So why would we wage a war on that program or a war on poor people by cutting these essential benefits?

Mr. Speaker, I know that Mr. RASKIN shares my deep commitment to make sure that we provide these essential benefits for families across the country, and I believe that there are colleagues on the other side who will share this commitment once they understand what this is doing to poor folks in their districts who just need a hand up; kids who need food on the table—fruits, vegetables, healthy foods—so that they can grow and nourish their bodies and their souls, and help contribute to our economy. And that is what SNAP does.

So I urge all of my colleagues on the Republican side to join us Democrats in fighting for our kids and fighting for nutrition, and fighting for this critical program.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman JAYAPAL for her terrific leadership on the SNAP program and for defending the ability of all of our families to not send their kids to bed at night hungry. That is really what this is all about.

People on the SNAP program receive an average of only \$1.40 per meal, and in order to get assistance, of course, they have got to complete a detailed application process with meticulous documentation of their name, their legal status in the country, their identity, their income, their address, and so on. Ninety percent of participants are in households with children under the age of 18, or with elderly people, or with individuals with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield next to our distinguished colleague from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I have just a few observations. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is a good program. It is the number one food assistance

program our country has. And it has gotten families through tough times, for sure. The truth is, most people who use SNAP aren't on it very long. They find themselves in a rough patch. They use SNAP. They get off.

Programs that impose artificial timelines and kick people off or deny them or have work requirements, ignore the fact that people do not get on SNAP to stay on SNAP unless they are too young, too old, or too sick to work.

Generally, people are trying to get jobs. The irony of this is that from a Republican standpoint, it seems like they are happy to give really, really rich people money without any expectations. And, yet, if a low-income person needs some help, money from the government, now all of a sudden we have got to put all kind of restrictions and all kind of waits on it.

Why does help and assistance from the government not ruin rich peoples' worth ethic, but it seems in the Republican mind to ruin the work ethic of working people and low-income people? It is totally ironic. It must be premised on the myth that somehow species of humanity are different from one another, and they are just not. People are the same.

I want to just point out as well, that if you really want to do something meaningful, why don't we pass legislation that would stop fast-food companies from conspiring with each other to restrict wages? There are two bills that got introduced. One is an antipoaching law that means that the employers can't come together and agree that they are not going to hire each other's workers if they leave looking for better pay, and the other one is a provision that would ban this process of noncompete clauses for people who work in fast-food.

These two bills together conspired to restrict the pay of working people. They keep wages down. What if we did real antitrust legislation and stopped huge companies from dominating the entire market, creating a single buyer, a monopoly, which then has the power to hold people down?

I just got through talking to some employees at Toys-R-Us. Their company was bought by some private equity firms. A lot of debt was piled on to them. The bonuses were given out to the top management. They took off on their golden parachutes. The company goes through bankruptcy, and now it is closing 800 stores and laying off 30,000 people.

The bottom line is: SNAP helps people in tough economic times. If they are able-bodied, I am sure they want to work. They don't need these punitive kicks to go to work. They just need an opportunity to get back up on their feet. These programs are insulting, demeaning, unnecessary, and they shouldn't exist.

If we really want to give working people an opportunity, let's increase the minimum wage to \$15 an hour. Let's support the Employee Free

Choice Act which can give them a voice on the job so they can negotiate with their employers for better wages.

It seems like Republicans don't want to do anything to meaningfully change the lives of working people, but, work requirements, drug tests, all this sort service moralistic stuff, it doesn't work. It is a waste of money and there are way better ways to do what you say you are trying to do.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) very much. He makes an excellent point which is, more than two-thirds of SNAP participants are in families with children, and in the majority of those, you have at least one working adult in the house.

□ 1700

So despite efforts to portray this as some kind of welfare, we are talking about millions of Americans who are working but still can't afford to feed their families. That is what the SNAP program is about. It is about helping working families meet the basic nutritional standards of our people.

We are the richest society in the history of the world, and we can certainly support working families, through the SNAP program, to benefit from the great bounty that is the agricultural output of the United States of America, which is the breadbasket of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to our colleague from California, NANETTE BARRAGÁN. I thank Ms. BARRAGÁN very much for joining us.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

When we talk about SNAP, I often think about my own childhood. When I was a kid, I remember my parents needing some assistance. We would get a bag of groceries that had block yellow cheese in it; it had things we could use to make some food. It was temporary. It was to get us through a tough time.

SNAP is our Nation's cornerstone antihunger program, providing millions of American households with access to food assistance. Children living in these households are also eligible to receive free school meals, ensuring that they are not worried about going hungry when they should be free to focus on their academics.

In California alone, 4.1 million people rely upon SNAP, with 74 percent of participants being part of families with children and half of participants already being part of working families. In my district, California's 44th Congressional District that covers areas like Compton, Watts, and San Pedro, 17 percent of households depend upon SNAP to assist them in feeding their families. SNAP not only provides families in need with vital nutritional assistance; it also helps to stimulate local economies. For every dollar invested in SNAP, nearly \$2 are generated in economic activity.

That is why the current efforts to “reform” SNAP are so misguided. These include the recent Harvest Box proposal, which would reduce or eliminate a SNAP recipient’s access to nutritious products like fresh produce and meats, taking away their right to choose how best to fulfill their family’s specific nutritional needs. Additionally, the recently unveiled farm bill expands work requirements for SNAP. This would make it harder for our most vulnerable to access food assistance, knocking them back down when we should be offering them a hand up.

I am proud to support SNAP, and I will continue fighting with my colleagues to ensure that no American has to struggle to put food on their table.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. BARRAGÁN very much for her leadership in defending the SNAP program. She talked about California. I just want to add to her point, a point about my home State in Maryland, where the SNAP program reaches 684,000 residents of my State, which is more than 1 in 10 people who live in the State.

Nationally, of course, it is 42 million people who participate in the SNAP program, which is 13 percent of the total population. And that is not a stagnant, permanent pool of Americans; that is a transient group because people move in and move out according to their economic circumstances.

The SNAP program is a reflection of our investment in ourselves as a people and our determination that here, in the wealthiest country on Earth, nobody should be sending their kids to bed at night hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I want to thank my colleague from Maryland for yielding to me so I might speak on an issue that is very important to all of us.

I want to speak on behalf of the 43 million people who are SNAP recipients, many of whom are working each and every day. I want to talk about the fact that those are individuals whom we consider working poor. Mr. RASKIN mentioned that SNAP was a reflection of something. SNAP is a reflection of the fact that we have so many jobs that don’t pay adequate wages. SNAP is a reflection of the raw deal that our citizens are getting under an administration that would choose to give trillions of dollars worth of money to those people who are already rich, asking nothing in return for that horrible tax scam, and, at the same time, asking those at the lowest income spectrum in the entire United States of America to work so that they can be supplemented with meals that are \$1.40 a meal.

That is hypocrisy. That is disgusting. We should not even be having a discussion about whether or not we should be eliminating, reducing, or changing a SNAP benefit. We should make sure that there is adequacy for every child

and every family to not go hungry in this country; and, at the same time, we should be looking at giving our citizens who have had a really raw deal over these last couple of years a better deal, a better deal with better wages that we would like to proffer so that individuals wouldn’t have to work and get supplemental food assistance as well.

Better jobs. Better skills. Better opportunities.

I am going to close very shortly on this. I was at a hearing today on the issue of SNAP and what we were planning to do with SNAP and what were the recommendations for the SNAP program. And I heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle some very disgusting insinuations or accusations about people who were on SNAP who were perhaps sitting on their porch drinking a cup of coffee or whatever. And the assumption was that that person was sitting on his duff as opposed to out there working, and he was a recipient of SNAP. You know nothing about that person’s situation. But that person probably was a member of the minority class.

And we talk about getting a job. Well, I said to those people who came and testified today at our hearing: You have come here with some Pollyanna idea that this country is a country of equality. Well, it may have been working towards equality, but we are experiencing a period right now where we have the greatest sense of inequality we have had in decades, in hundreds of years.

We are underemployed. We are unemployed. The people who are working every day for wages to bring home are the ones who are paying for every tax break that is given to the 1 percent in this country. You can give millions and millions of dollars in the State of New Jersey even to the wealthiest 1 percent and ask nothing in return. If you are an individual, you are asked nothing in return. If you are a corporation, you are not even asked to create a job, a training opportunity, or to increase wages.

Do not talk to me about those people who are on SNAP and what they should be doing. Talk to me about what America should be doing for all of its people, because we are all members of the human race. Some of us just weren’t born rich. Some of us just don’t have the opportunity to go around with a silver spoon in our mouth.

This Congress should be ashamed of itself for not taking care of the needs of those who simply need government to recognize that it represents everybody, not just the very wealthy. I thank Mr. RASKIN for the opportunity.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. Coleman for her comments. She has made some very important points, and I wonder if I would pursue a couple with her before she goes, perhaps have a moment for colloquy.

The first is the point she was making about the growing economic inequality in the country. That is something that

has been on the minds of Americans, at the very least, since the Occupy movement took place after the 2008 mortgage meltdown crisis, which cost 11 million Americans their jobs, 12 million Americans their homes, and created an economic dislocation panic across the country, which thankfully President Obama and his administration moved to address, unleashing 60 straight months of economic growth and expansion in the country.

Today we have an administration which vowed to drain the swamp when it came to Washington. It seems like they have moved into the swamp and they are just draining the treasury instead: \$1.5 trillion added to our budget deficit from the tax scam giveaway, which you referenced.

I wonder if she would reflect for a moment on the relationship between a vision of government, which is that it is a money-making operation for a handful of people, and growing inequality and poverty among other parts of the population.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for raising that issue. I think that that is one of the most prominent issues that people of this country need to understand.

Government has a significant role. That role is to protect the opportunities, rights, and privileges of all people, to create the level playing field. What we have experienced in this administration, in this Republican-controlled Congress, is that we care not. We prioritize the value of human beings based upon how much money they are worth or how much money they can get.

So we are taking resources that should not be taken out of our treasury; we are then giving them in heaps and piles to the very, very wealthy; and then we are talking about deficits that are being created and how we need to make up those deficits. And how do we look to do that? Well, we look to do things like reduce the benefits of Medicaid, mess with Social Security, take away SNAP from people who need supplemental nutritional assistance.

We talk about this America not being one America anymore. This is an America of the haves and the have-nots. Never have we seen this tremendous diversity or disparity between the very, very, very wealthy and those who are struggling.

And those who are struggling get this. My colleagues think of poor people as lazy people who are not doing what they can do. We are poor people in this country—hungry, homeless people—because of our policies, because of our budget, which is the greatest reflection of our priorities and our values. Our values are askew right now, and we need to make sure that we are looking after that responsibility for which we were elected.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, let me ask Mrs. Coleman one final question before she goes. She made a point before which I thought was profound,

which is that millions and millions of people on the SNAP program are working, but they are not making enough money to support their family in a dignified way, in a way that lives up to even the most minimal expectations for health and nutrition. That is what the SNAP program is all about. In a way, you could view the SNAP program as a subsidy to the employers of these people because we are taking care of them because their salaries don't.

Now, I could understand someone saying: Let's get rid of the SNAP program and make those employers pay a real living wage to these people, or let's make them pay a full living wage and give them all healthcare. But that is not the proposal that we are getting from our friends from across the aisle. They want to reduce the SNAP program at the same time that they don't want to increase the minimum wage and give people benefits.

I wonder if she could just explain what the theory is about how these people are going to survive.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that it isn't so much a theory of survival as it is the possibility of not surviving at all. I think that we are finding ourselves in a situation right now where those who have less have the rawest deal they have had in a very long time. And I am proud to associate myself with my Democratic colleagues in this caucus who want a better deal for those people.

We want wages that you can live off of, that you don't have to rely upon assistance from anyone in order to be able to put food on your table, put a roof over your head or heat in your home. We want to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to learn and to have a good job. So we want to see investment in jobs, in training, in apprenticeships, in opportunities to do better.

We could do better with an infrastructure program that not only makes sense because we have a crumbling infrastructure on so many levels, but it also generates jobs. Generates jobs, which generates good incomes. Good incomes generate a desire to purchase. Desire to purchase helps to build our small businesses. We are looking in the wrong places, and we need to look at where we can grow our economy.

Our economy doesn't grow when we just simply continue to enrich the rich to be richer and richer and richest and to put that money overseas somewhere or anyplace that they want to put it but not to invest it in this country, in this economy. We need a better chance for everyone. We need a better deal for all of our citizens.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. Coleman for her strong voice and for participating in tonight's Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, ROSA DELAURO, who has been one of Congress' leading cham-

pions for the security of America's working people and for building an American middle class that includes everybody.

I am thrilled that Ms. DELAURO could join us, and I yield to her now.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman RASKIN and my other colleagues here this evening as we talk about what is going on in the lives of families in our country today.

I rise to defend the Food Stamp program and to denounce the severe and immoral—I view them as immoral—cuts by the majority's farm bill.

□ 1715

You know, everyone knows that millions of people are struggling in this country. The biggest economic problem we have is that people are in jobs that just don't pay them enough money; they can't pay the high cost of healthcare; they can't afford to put food on the table; they don't take vacations; they don't take retirement; they are barely making it.

And with regard to hunger, it is truly remarkable. Over 15 million children, nearly one in four in our country, live in the heavy shadow of what is going on in working families today. In my district, the Third District of Connecticut—Connecticut is the State that is statistically the richest in the Nation, and that is because of Fairfield County and a whole variety of other issues. But one in seven people in my district don't know where their next meal is coming from. People want to talk about that, they put a nice term around it, "food insecure." That is not food insecurity. It is hunger—hunger in the United States of America.

So, you know, the social safety net programs are vital tools for reducing poverty and hunger, and the food stamp program is one of the most powerful programs we have for ending hunger in the United States. Last year, our Nation's largest nutrition safety net, food stamps, prevented 42.2 million people from going hungry. That includes 20 million children, 4.8 million low-income seniors, and 1.5 million low-income military veterans.

Men and women who go to fight, sacrifice their families, and, in a number of instances, their lives, their families can't make it, and they are on food stamps. And what the farm bill would do was jettison those military families. The country needs to know about this. The food stamp program works. It is for those who need it the most. It has been successful in alleviating hunger and supporting our economy.

In 2014, the program lifted 4.7 million people out of poverty, including 2.1 million children, and it has lifted more than 1.3 million children out of deep poverty. And the benefits go well beyond childhood years, as my colleague knows. We know that there is an 18 percentage point increase in the likelihood of completing high school with disadvantaged households who have had access to the SNAP program, evi-

dence of significant improvements in health and economic self-sufficiency among women.

It is efficient. More than half of the benefits go to households in the deepest poverty. Over 70 percent of all the benefits go to households with children. But, you know, it would appear that our Republican colleagues appear to be more interested in reducing SNAP than in reducing hunger.

We talked—a few minutes ago, you were talking about the tax bill—\$2 trillion tax cut—83 percent of those tax cuts to the richest, wealthiest Americans and corporations. My gosh, I will bet those folks are eating well every day. I bet they have three squares or more, when we have families who are barely able to put food on the table.

Let me just give you a couple of notes about who is benefiting from the farm bill and the several loopholes.

The farm bill eliminates means testing. Now, we all know that the food stamp program, they are means tested, asset tested. They can't be over a certain amount of money in income. They can't have more than a certain amount of dollars in assets. This farm bill allows millionaires and billionaires to get subsidies. It eliminates the means test for some of these folks.

You have, under current law, family members, like siblings and adult children, are eligible for subsidies, but—and that is regardless of whether or not they live or work on the farm. What the House bill does, they make cousins, nieces, and nephews eligible for the subsidies as well. It doesn't limit subsidies to one person per farm.

Quite frankly, as the President proposed, it doesn't require work. It doesn't create work requirements for farm subsidy recipients. And, you know, a number of these folks, they don't till the soil, they don't work the land, they live in Manhattan, and they still get a subsidy. They don't have to work the land for that.

And what we are talking about, food stamp recipients do work, for the most part. And what the farm bill has done is it has said, as well, that funding in the bill only works out to be \$30 per person per month for job training. What kind of job training is that? So that the bill, which requires working, underfunds job training in order for people to be able to go to work.

One other statistic. The bill increases price guarantees by up to 15 percent. It fails to reduce crop insurance premium subsidies from 62 percent to 48 percent, as, quite frankly, the President proposed. It extends insurance company subsidies. It provides \$1.5 billion in annual subsidies to crop insurance agencies, to insurance companies, most of whom are foreign based.

The country needs to know this. And at the same time, they want to deny food to the children in this country. It is unspeakable, the direction that they are going in. It does not reflect the values of this great Nation.

So, you know, if we are serious about reforming in the farm bill, they would

have included limits on agricultural subsidies. And, by the way, the crop insurance program, there are no eligibility caps, no payment limits. You know, it is all bets are off.

I want to end with thanking my colleague for doing this. I am going to continue, as I know he is. I am going to continue, and I know he is going to continue to stand up against what are unconscionable attacks on America's poor working families.

You know, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Stand up. Stand with us. Let's ensure that Congress does not endanger families and children by decimating our hunger programs. We need to strengthen the SNAP program. We need not be sabotaging it.

I thank the gentleman for organizing this Special Order tonight. We need to be speaking here morning, noon, and night about what this administration, what this Republican majority Congress is doing to low-income families. The food stamp program is seniors, the disabled, and children.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. DELAURO, and I would ask if she would be willing to stick around just for a little colloquy.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I will.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, Ms. DELAURO made some really striking points, and I wanted to explore them a little bit more.

The tax bill, as we know, created a windfall bonanza of hundreds of billions of dollars for the wealthiest corporations and the wealthiest people in the country. Eighty-six percent of the benefit from the tax cut went to 1 percent of the people.

The interesting thing to me was that because it went overwhelmingly to investors, and one-third of the investment in our companies is held by foreigners, a third of the benefit of this tax cut just left the country. It went to foreign investors in Saudi Arabia or China or Mexico or wherever it might be.

Now, does it make sense for us to confer this extraordinary bonanza on the wealthiest people in the country and wealthy people abroad, and then turn around and start cutting the major antihunger assistance program we have got, the SNAP program? I mean, what is the morality of that? What is the logic of that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, there is no morality. That is it. It is immoral, and we have an obligation and a responsibility. And it is not just a social responsibility. This is a moral responsibility to make sure that in the land of abundance and an abundance of food, that we are going to look at jettisoning millions of low-income families and creating for them a situation where they cannot access food for themselves or their families, I ask the question: Who are we? It is immoral the direction that they are going in.

And with the farm bill—if you wanted to just look at the farm bill—you talked about the tax bill, and we know what direction that went in and who are the beneficiaries there. But again, this farm safety net is filled with loopholes. The top 3 percent of farms, or about 60,000 farms in the United States receive roughly 40 percent of all farm subsidies. Many farms receive more than \$1 million in subsidies annually. They don't pass any income test. They pass no asset test. The largesse is overwhelming.

And the share of subsidies, the largest farms claimed, has increased from 11 percent in 1991 to 34 percent in 2015. You know, they are consistent. Watch what they do in the tax bill. Watch what they do in the farm bill and who benefits. Who has benefited from the tax—the tax scam, which is rigged for the rich? And now we have a farm bill, which is rigged for the rich.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to Ms. DELAURO that that came out of the Agriculture Committee, as I understand it, on a party line vote.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, he got that right.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, this used to be bipartisan. It used to be a bipartisan commitment, and now, suddenly, it fell apart with no participation from Democrats. It comes flying out with the idea of targeting the SNAP program. What is going on here?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RASKIN makes such a good point. Let me just tell you. I looked very, very hard at this issue over the number of years that I have served here. I served on the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. I chaired that committee for awhile, so I have spent more than 25 years focused in. And the issue of hunger in the United States has become a passion for me, and I tell you why.

I published a book not that long ago called, "The Least Among Us: Waging the Battle for the Vulnerable." And when I did the research for this book, this is what I found: that the social safety net program and the food stamp program was crafted by Democrats and Republicans. George McGovern, Bob Dole, they took a commission across the country.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, they are both from farm States.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, that is right. And they said there is a serious problem of hunger in the United States. They came back to Washington, and Democratic Members and Republican Members came together to say that this challenge—we have to address this crisis of hunger in the United States, and therein lies the genesis of nutrition programs crafted by men and women who came here who understood what their job was and they understood what the power of this institution is.

Unfortunately, we do not have those giants in this body on both sides of the aisle—the people who have left—and I am so proud of our Democrats who have stood together on this farm bill and said: No. This is wrong. We are not going to be complicit in leaving millions of people hungry in the United States.

Robert Kennedy took a commission across this country and went and found children and babies who were hungry and came back, and, again, on a bipartisan basis, helped to craft the programs that we have today. These were men and women who understand and understood why they were elected to the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

□ 1730

Unfortunately, so many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have either forgotten their purpose here or never understood their purpose here.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on something Ms. DELAURO said, which I think is very important.

She pointed out that it was Senator Robert Dole, a Republican from Kansas; and Senator George McGovern, a Democrat from South Dakota, who came together and said: We have this extraordinary agricultural bounty and surplus in America.

We could be feeding the entire world. Certainly we could be feeding the people of America. Most people are able to afford it, but not everybody, and not at every point in their life. We should make sure that, in the wealthiest society that has ever existed, everybody has the opportunity to eat three meals a day for \$1.40.

Ms. DELAURO said that we don't have the giants that we had then. I don't know if that is true. I consider the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) a giant.

But I think what has changed is the public philosophy that is governing in Washington. I think there is a public philosophy that survives in town, which says that government is a money-making opportunity for the President and a handful of people: the President's friends and the people who surround the President. People are actually making money coming into government.

Whereas, the traditional ideal—the one I think Ms. DELAURO invoked with Senators Dole and McGovern and the new deal and Franklin Roosevelt—was government is an instrument of the common good to benefit everybody to advance the general will.

What has happened to our concept of government in America?

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I tracked in my research the Food Stamp program and child tax credits, bipartisan; equal pay for equal work, bipartisan; Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, when the votes came, they were done in a bipartisan way, the votes were bipartisan.

Now we seem to have lost that sense that the challenges are there for us to take on, on both sides of the aisle, to put aside differences for that common good. That is what we need to get back to. That what we are not about is humiliating people and demeaning people so that we think that that will make them go out and try to work to do a better thing, to tell them that there is no hope for them when they look to Washington and to government.

Mr. Speaker, that is a slap in the face to the years and the work that so many on both sides of the aisle did in Congress, and that is what we have to get back to. That is what should be entrusted to us, as we look at each of these areas that people face in our country.

People want jobs. We define ourselves by our jobs. We get our self-confidence from our jobs. People want to work. Your family looks up to you when you have a job. And, when you don't, you are embarrassed to tell your kids: I don't have a job.

These great people who served said: We need to come together to work on these issues.

For me, that is what I want us to get back to. That is what I try to work at, as you do, every single day. To have people understand that, in times of difficulty, we are accountable to one another, and we have a responsibility. We are not a society that said it is every man or woman for himself or herself, particularly in challenging times.

That is what our social safety net is all about. It reflects the great values of this country. I believe we can get back there. I believe that we can. We were there before, and we are going to get back there again.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for what he is doing here tonight.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for her leadership, for her vision, and for her writing. It is incisive and useful for us all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RASKIN for putting this Special Order hour together. I thank him for his commitment and for his concern.

I join all of my colleagues in opposing what is being proposed in terms of this farm bill.

Three weeks ago, my Republican colleagues on the House Agriculture Committee sat silently while Chairman CONAWAY introduced a partisan farm bill. Then they allowed him to preach about the many reasons why he feels that SNAP should be transformed from a feeding program to a work program, uninterrupted.

Then they voted for this flawed bill that takes food off of the tables of veterans, seniors, and children. Now they want to pass it through the House and push it forward with their agenda to starve our Nation's most vulnerable.

My Republican colleagues ought to be ashamed of this because Proverbs 22:9 says: "The generous will themselves be blessed, for they share their food with the poor."

I have said it once, and I will say it again: I don't believe that the Lord is pleased with what we are considering in this bill.

In my home county of Mecklenburg, North Carolina, more than 162,000 people are considered food insecure. Worse, 50,000 of those are children.

In my community, more than 55,000 families depend on SNAP to help put food on their tables. No one should wonder where their next meal will come from. But, sadly, this is a reality for many, many people.

Last year, North Carolina Republicans introduced a bill on the State level that would have a similar impact to this partisan farm bill. Analysis of that bill shows that roughly 130,000 North Carolinians will lose their SNAP benefits if this bill passes, including 50,000 children.

Nationwide, the impact of this bill would even be worse: kicking 2 million people out of the program and causing an estimated 265,000 children to lose free or reduced lunch at school. So, no work, no eat?

If we are lawmakers and we aren't protecting our Nation's children, then I don't think we deserve to be here.

Republicans continue to push the idea that we need entitlement reform just to appease the Speaker. Well, I understand the Speaker has announced his retirement, and I would like for us to just retire the idea that this so-called reform is just numbers on a page because it is not. Real people depend on SNAP programs and, without it, they will go hungry. No one can expect to work if they are hungry. No child can expect to learn if the child is hungry.

More than \$8 in \$10 in nutrition assistance go to households that include a child, a senior, or a person with a disability. Additionally, many working Americans depend on SNAP to make ends meet in expensive cities where earning the minimum wage doesn't pay all of the bills. People work two and three jobs a day at minimum wage, leave work, and go to a food bank to eat.

Additionally, many American families depend on SNAP. Working hard is not enough if you don't make enough.

Instead of punishing working Americans, let's address the cause of the issue, and let's raise the minimum wage to a living wage.

Mr. Speaker, I join my Democratic colleagues in urging Chairman CONAWAY to scrap this flawed bill and return it to the drawing board. We can, and we should, craft a bipartisan farm bill that benefits all communities.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. ADAMS so much for her insightful remarks. Before Ms. ADAMS leaves, I would like to ask her a question.

Working in Washington and coming here several days a week, as Members

of Congress do, we are often treated to the spectacle of lifestyles of the rich and famous and political corruption. We see Scott Pruitt, the EPA chief, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on first-class air travel with a security detail of a dozen people, something nobody has ever seen before for an EPA chief. He built, I think it was, a \$40,000 soundproof booth in his office in order to make secret phone calls.

Last night, we saw on TV, or pick up the paper this morning to read about, millions of dollars flowing into an up-till-now secret bank account that Michael Cohen had. Part of it was used as a slush fund to pay off a porn star, who had a relationship, allegedly, with President Trump. But then hundreds of thousands of dollars flowing in from one of the oligarchs in Russia with U.S. corporations involved.

There is a lot of money in this town. The power elite seems to have a lot of money, and gave hundreds of billions of dollars back to the wealthiest corporations and people in the country in the most recent tax legislation. Yet they get through with that, and then they turn and they want to pound the SNAP program, which is used to give a modicum of dignity and security to the poorest people in the country so that they can feed their families.

What is going on here?

How is it possible that we can see one kind of America operating in the Halls of power with the wealthiest people in the country, and another for the working people of the country who are trying to get by?

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. RASKIN is so absolutely right. I think that is why people have generally lost faith in their government.

I mentioned a Scripture from the Bible, but there are 3,000 references—more than 3,000—that speak to how we should treat the poor. We are, I think, being derelict in terms of our duties. Yes, there seems to be a lot of corruption going on. We are not placing our priorities on the people. We are putting profits over people. That is so unfortunate because we were elected to serve everyone, including the poor.

The poor will be with us always. We have a responsibility to reach out and to give a helping hand, a help up. We are not talking about people who some folks think are lazy and they are not working. They are working, and they are the caregivers of the children.

Children live in poverty because their parents do. We must ensure that we can help those adults who help our children. We want our children to go to school and we want them to do well. Children will not do well if their stomach growls because they are hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. RASKIN is right. We have two worlds here: the haves and the have-nots. It is time to give something to those who have not.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, three-quarters of SNAP benefits go to families: households with children in them. That should be what people think of when they think of the SNAP program.

We heard a lot today in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing that was referenced earlier, basically about lazy people sitting around. I tried to alter the image a little bit. I said: You can have lazy people who get a paycheck in public housing and they spend all day watching TV, tweeting, and filing for bankruptcy. You have lazy people in the middle class. You have rich lazy people and you have poor lazy people.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, there are probably some lazy folks in here, too.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be able to eliminate laziness, but maybe we can take care of hunger in America so that kids don't go to sleep without food.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. ADAMS for her leadership and her strong voice on these issues. It is very impressive to see how hard she has been fighting.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for those comments.

One of the reasons that I wanted to serve on the Agriculture Committee was because of the issues that are impacted not only in my district but throughout this Nation. Having so many people who are food insecure gave us an opportunity, I think, to do good in this farm bill. It is my understanding that we have never had a bill that was not bipartisan, and I think we need to think about that. The citizens of this country are looking to us to do what is right because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my district, I have urban, suburban, and rural. I have urban places like Rockville, Maryland; I have suburban places like Bethesda and Silver Spring; I have rural places in Frederick County like Middletown and Carroll County. I have sort of the full gamut of America in my district, and there is poverty in all of them. There are people struggling in all of them, just like there are people who have become very prosperous in all of them.

But our job, I think, as Representatives in Congress, is to keep the country unified and see what that beautiful, magical phrase in the beginning of the Constitution "We the people" means. For us to stand together in all of our magnificent diversity of ways of life and different kinds of communities that we have across the country, what is it that binds us together?

I think the goodness of the American people is that we are invested in the success of everybody, not just this or that group, not just our business buddies, not just our partners, not just people in our political party, but we are invested in the success of everyone, and that is our job.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. RASKIN is exactly right. Hunger is not a partisan issue.

□ 1745

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. ADAMS for participating.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my distinguished colleague.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted, if I might say, to be with Professor Raskin today, and I would like to use that terminology, or Congressman RASKIN, but it means that he gets into both the theory, the practice, and the passion of an idea. That is what teachers do. They try to instruct their students to look at the holistic concept of a theory.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of food stamps is not a theory, but it has passion in the loss of such. It has a broad landscape of impact. It certainly has a theory of which I don't adhere to, and that is that Americans who have asked for a hand up are the ones deserving of the brunt of an enormous tax cut that has created an enormous deficit that was not asked for by the top 1 percent, who are getting the major aspect, or major benefit, of this tax cut.

As a member of the Budget Committee, we took pains, the Democrats, to parse through the ultimate negative impact of the \$1.4 trillion-plus tax cut.

During the Obama administration, we discussed a corporate rate reduction. Many of us would have considered that on the idea of job creation, coming from the early thirties, if you will, down to about the mid-twenties. We did more than—when I say "we," this bill did 21, unasked for by any corporate entity, which added, again, insult to injury as it relates to those families, disabled, and seniors, children who are dependent upon these programs.

We have many Americans who are dependent upon means-tested programs, 70 percent. The supplemental nutrition program, unlike the 21 percent corporate rate reduction for taxes, is \$1.40 per person.

One of our colleagues in the other body, Senator BOOKER, as we all know who are familiar with him, and I think maybe we should join in that effort, spend that much per meal, all of the Members of the House of Representatives, because what we are dealing with today is the farm bill.

The farm bill takes to shutting down the SNAP program and to cutting it drastically, and to ignore and underfund important programs because we find ourselves in a predicament of the deficit, the tax cut, and what choices do we make.

The decision to limit SNAP is not limited to red States or blue States. Eighty-five of the top 100 counties of individuals receiving SNAP benefits are rural communities, and many of them are, in fact, Republican represented.

The disastrous changes to SNAP would jeopardize the food security of 42 million people, including 30 million children, 4.8 million low-income seniors, and 1.5 million low-income military veterans.

So in conclusion, I came to the floor today to ask the question: Why in the farm bill?

There is something about having a little seniority in this House. I can remember that of all the bills in this Nation that came out of this House and Senate—and I might say, joyfully, because I have been supported by the Farm Bureau. I come from a State of ranchers and farmers. We used to take pride in having that nexus between farmers and the SNAP program and the continuity of such.

So here we are. We have breached it. We have blown it up for no reason other than to pocket the money for the tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing us together. I ask my colleagues to vote against the farm bill, because that would be standing up for maybe a better pathway of that bipartisan farm bill that we have had over the decades to make a difference in the lives of all Americans.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. JACKSON LEE for her really profound and important remarks tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I would close out our session here by just making an observation about the importance of this SNAP question.

It is important legislatively because our friends across the aisle have broken from a bipartisan tradition going back a very long time now in the passage of the farm bill just to make it a partisan power grab and a push over everybody else in the body, but it also goes to the question: What kind of government are we going to have? Will this be government for the few or will it be a government for everyone?

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE ZELL MILLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of a former mayor, of a former Georgia State senator, of a former Governor of Georgia, and of a former United States Senator representing the State of Georgia, Mr. Zell Miller.

Zell Miller passed away on March 23 at the age of 86. He was born on February 24, 1932, in Young Harris, Georgia, in Towns County. He was born to Birdie Bryan and Stephen Grady Miller.

When Zell was 17 days old, his father died. His widowed mother raised her

son and daughter, Jane, alone in Young Harris. Located in the north Georgia mountains, Miller's mother built a home for herself and her children with rocks she had hauled from a nearby stream.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and privilege of attending Young Harris College, and I am very familiar with this area and I was blessed to hear about these stories.

I have always heard about the story of how Ms. Miller hauled these rocks up from the stream to build her home. It was that experience, that house, that became symbolic of Zell Miller's rugged independence.

After he graduated from Young Harris College, Zell Miller continued his education at Emory University in Atlanta; but shortly after he arrived there, he found that he wasn't really focusing on his studies. In fact, in one of the many books that he wrote, "Corps Values," he writes about waking up in jail in Young Harris drunk as a skunk. He tells that story in that book. I have read the book, and I remember that story.

Well, shortly after that experience, he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps, in 1953. Later, he attributed much of his success to both the discipline he learned as a marine and the independence that he learned from his mother.

He married Shirley Carver in 1954, and the couple had two sons.

In 1956, he enrolled at the University of Georgia, where he earned a bachelor's and a master's degree in history.

In 1959, he took a teaching position at Young Harris College and returned to his hometown as a professor of history and political science.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Georgia delegation are here tonight, and I am going to yield to them. I am going to pause. I am going to continue on and tell you about the rest of this outstanding gentleman's life, but at this point I am going to pause and I am going to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), one of my fellow delegation members from Georgia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative CARTER from Georgia's First District, for organizing this hour to honor one of Georgia's great leaders, former United States Senator and Georgia Governor Zell Miller.

Governor Miller's leadership in our State led to the creation of something that we hold near and dear to our hearts, and that is the HOPE Scholarship. This scholarship program has helped generations of young Georgians build a bright future for themselves, and that, in turn, has led to a stronger State for our people.

In addition to the HOPE Scholarship and many other policy accomplishments, Governor Miller truly embodied the term "public servant." He devoted his life to serving our fellow Georgians and sought to leave our State better than he found it.

At his funeral, Governor Miller's grandson read a list of 14 life lessons that the Governor had written to mark his 70th birthday. This list included a number of important lessons that he wanted to pass along to his family and to others, and it included such things as reminding folks not to smoke, that it killed his friends way too early. It reminded people to be polite, to be on time.

One of the lessons that struck me in particular and I think really describes how Zell Miller sought to live his life reads this:

Search for your niche. It may take years, although often it occurs early in life. There is something out there that you can do better and easier than everybody else. You will have a knack or talent for it. Find it. It is there. And when you do, others will beat a path to your door to get you to do it for them.

Governor Miller certainly found his niche in his lifetime, and that niche was serving his fellow Georgians. Using his talents, he created a program that helped thousands of students achieve their dream of a college education, a legacy that will live on through each successive class of HOPE scholarships.

We are eternally grateful for his service and his commitment to our great State and to ensuring that future generations will have greater opportunities.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned something about the HOPE Scholarship. Zell Miller was known as Georgia's education Governor. He was the founder of the HOPE Scholarship, and as the gentleman noted, it resulted in a number of students who have been able to complete their college degrees and their college careers as a result of the Zell Miller Scholarship and the HOPE Scholarship.

Before I recognize the next speaker, I want to continue on what I was sharing with you about Zell's early life and the fact that, after he got out of the Marine Corps, he went to Young Harris College and he was a professor of history and political science. But he was something else. He was also a baseball coach. He coached baseball at Young Harris College.

I had the privilege of talking to some of his former players. In fact, we just had homecoming up at Young Harris a few weeks ago, and I had the opportunity to talk to Don Harp, a retired Methodist minister who has served for many years on the board of trustees at Young Harris College. He was one of the best baseball players to ever come through Young Harris.

He was telling me a story about how he was a catcher on the baseball team. They had a lead in the game, and he was calling the signals. They were ahead by one run, with two outs, in the top of the ninth inning. They were about to wrap it up. He said he called for two sinkers in a row. Sure enough,

he got two strikes on the batter and had an 0-2 count. He said then he decided he would call for a fastball. So he called for a fastball, and sure enough, the batter hit it right up the middle, two runs scored, and they got behind by one run.

He said he went back to the bench after that inning. He said they were behind by one run, and he went back to the bench, and he said Zell Miller was coaching and he was sitting on the bench. He said he motioned to him. He said: Come over here.

He said he came over there and he sat beside him, and he said Coach Miller looked at him and he said: If you ever make another call like that, you will be sitting here by me the rest of this game.

He said he understood right then exactly what he was to do.

I also remember talking to one of my colleagues that I served with in the Georgia State Legislature in the Georgia House, Mickey Channell, who played baseball for Zell at Young Harris College. Mickey was from Greensboro, Georgia.

Mickey told me: I didn't get to play very much, but I remember this one time that my dad traveled up to see me and traveled up to see me play, and Zell knew he had come.

He said: Zell let me start that game because he knew my dad was there.

I could tell how much that meant to Mickey, and he had always remembered that.

That is just a glimpse of what we are talking about when we are talking about this great man, this great Georgian, this great American.

In his early political career, as I mentioned, he was a mayor. He was mayor of Young Harris. He held that position for 2 years, and then he was elected as a State senator. He represented the areas up in north Georgia—Towns County, Union County, Rabun County—as a State senator.

A few years after that, he took a leave from his teaching responsibilities at Young Harris College, and he actually went and was executive secretary for then-Governor Lester Maddox during the time that Lester Maddox was Governor from 1968 to 1971.

□ 1800

During the 1970s, Zell Miller was twice named as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention, once in 1972, and again in 1976.

In 1971, he was appointed as Executive Director of the Democratic Party in Georgia, and he served in that capacity until 1973, when he became a member of the State Board of Pardons and Paroles. He served on that board until 1975.

Then in 1975, Zell Miller became Lieutenant Governor of the State of Georgia, and he actually held that post longer than anyone has ever held that post. He held it for 16 years.

In 1980, he ran for statewide office. He ran for the United States Senate,

but he lost in the primary to then the incumbent, Senator Herman Talmadge. Over the next 10 years, as Lieutenant Governor, he really worked on his leadership skills. As Lieutenant Governor, he was the Presiding Officer in the State Senate.

As I mentioned earlier, I had the honor and privilege of serving in the Georgia State Legislature for 10 years; and the stories that we heard, as Members, about Zell Miller as the Lieutenant Governor, and the famous Tom Murphy, who served for so many years as Speaker of the House of the State of Georgia, and the battles that those two would have, Zell as the leader of the Senate and Tom Murphy as the leader of the House. The stories are still told in the Georgia State Legislature and the Georgia State Capital about the battles between these two giants of Georgia politics.

In 1990, Zell ran for Governor of the State of Georgia. He was in a tough race in the Democratic primary. He faced Andrew Young. He won that primary, and then he was elected. He was elected as Governor of the State of Georgia; actually defeated JOHNNY ISAKSON, who now serves as our Senator here, our senior Senator in the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, before I go on and tell you about his Governorship, I will pause again and yield to another one of my colleagues from Georgia, Representative DAVID SCOTT, and I will have a story to share about his brother-in-law in just a minute and Zell Miller. I look forward to hearing about him because I know he has got some great stories about "Give 'em hell Zell."

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, well, my friend, you got that right.

Zell Miller was my friend, my partner, and my mentor. I got into politics quite a little bit early, just as I graduated from the Wharton School of Finance, University of Pennsylvania, and landed in Atlanta. Two years later, getting down there—you mentioned Andy, getting in his campaign. And then 2 years later, there I am winding up in the Georgia House of Representatives.

So my story intersects on so many different angles and ways with that of Zell Miller, and I can truly stand here and tell each of you that I truly loved this man, and I still do; and I would not be standing here as a Member of Congress if it weren't for that friendship, that partnership, and that mentorship with Zell Miller.

Let me, perhaps, I think, as I tell you about this, I am thinking of a scripture that best sets the story for this great man; that evolves everything, the history and the steps, the many positions, all that he had done.

Before I get to that scripture, Zell Miller helped me. I mean, I got there as a young person. I got over in the Sen-

ate. My two Senate officemates, one was Paul Coverdell, the other Julian Bond. And with us three, Zell Miller called us three his three horsemen.

It was then that he was laying the foundation for that vision, for the HOPE Scholarship. Zell Miller appointed me to be chairman of the Senate Higher Education Committee; first African American at that position.

But more than that, he appointed me at that position at a time when he was giving birth to one of the greatest public affairs programs in Georgia history, the HOPE Scholarship. And for me to be there as the chairman of the Senate Higher Education Committee, in that pivotal position, and then to be able to go across Georgia in churches and schools and help sell the HOPE Scholarship and what it meant, and then that paved the way for me to later become Rules Chairman with Zell's endorsement.

So there I was, as Rules Chairman; as you know, Buddy, nothing gets on that calendar if it don't get through the Rules Committee. And I was there to make sure none of those bills—because you know it was tough. They had other bills coming to try to remove the HOPE Scholarship.

So let me just conclude by sharing with you what his life meant to me and, I think, to the Nation and the world is best captured in God's first psalm.

Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, or sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in the law of the Lord he does meditate day and night. And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of waters, bringing forth his fruit in his due season. And none of his leaves will ever wither, and everything, everything, whatsoever he does, shall prosper.

Such a man was Zell Miller. God bless you, Zell Miller, and I thank God for sending Zell Miller our way.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for sharing that. And I want to share one other thing before I call on the next speaker.

I mentioned that Zell Miller was the baseball coach at Young Harris College when he was a professor up there and on the faculty there. Well, they discontinued the baseball program for a long time. And then, when Zell was Governor, they actually restarted the baseball program, and Zell had a big role in that. In fact, he—two stories I want to tell you real quickly.

He invited us all to the Governor's mansion, those of us who were supporting the baseball program and trying to get it started up. And to kick it off, he had none other than Hank Aaron and Mickey Mantle at the Governor's mansion as a benefit to getting the Young Harris College baseball program started again.

Not only has that program started again, but it has been very, very successful, producing players such as Nick Markakis, who plays for the Atlanta Braves now, who played at Young Har-

ris College; Charlie Blackmon, playing for the Colorado Rockies; just a few of the many players that went to Young Harris who are playing in the major leagues right now.

I also want to share with you very quickly his love of baseball because, again, when he was Governor, Phil Niekro, the great knuckleball pitcher of the Atlanta Braves, was inducted into baseball's Hall of Fame. Zell actually hosted a trip to the Hall of Fame in Cooperstown during the time that he was being inducted, and my wife and I and my two oldest sons were honored and able to go on that trip.

I can remember being at the Hall of Fame with Zell Miller, and I can remember the emotions, and how proud he was of a Georgian, of Phil Niekro, of an Atlanta Brave being inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame. Just another one of the great memories that I have of Zell Miller.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), another member of our delegation, to share with us his remarks.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CARTER for putting together this Special Order to honor someone who probably everybody in Georgia has been touched by in some way or another.

Of course, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of what we all consider a true legend in the State of Georgia, former Governor Zell Miller. He was known for his quick wit, and he had a deep love for the State of Georgia and, of course, obviously from the mountain area in north Georgia. He was always willing to do what was right for our State, the State that we all love to call home.

Zell Miller's service to our country began at a young age and, as was mentioned, he served in the United States Marine Corps, where he later attained the rank of Sergeant.

Upon returning home from his military service, Zell received degrees, as has been said, in history from the University of Georgia, and would eventually use that education to teach college at his hometown in Young Harris, Georgia. I did not know that he was the baseball coach, but I was glad to learn that.

After only a few years of teaching, Zell was called to run for public office, as was said, as Mayor, State Senator, Lieutenant Governor, and later Governor, then U.S. Senator. It is hard to imagine who has had a greater impact on the lives of Georgians.

Zell was one of those true conservatives. As Governor, Zell Miller will be remembered for his great accomplishments, as we mentioned, of the HOPE Scholarship program, and funding it with the Georgia Lottery, which has surpassed \$10 billion in total financial aid assistance to Georgia students. Let me repeat that: \$10 billion in total financial aid assistance to Georgia students.

Because of the HOPE Scholarship, Georgia higher education is now a national leader in entry requirements and graduation rates.

A quick story about the University of Georgia. On visiting that campus, we learned—and this was when we were doing our higher education bill, and we were told that graduation rates were 55 to 60 percent across the country. Well, in visiting the University of Georgia now, that has been under the HOPE Scholarship since Governor Miller served his term, we learned that the entry requirement, Buddy, was 1,300 on the SAT, and you had to be at the top of your class to get into the University of Georgia. And the student body is 80 percent of Georgians. They only accept 20 percent from out of State, so you can imagine how much more difficult it is to get into the University of Georgia out of State.

But the amazing statistic is that the graduation rate is 95 percent; and those students either get a job upon graduation, or go on to higher education; an amazing accomplishment for the University of Georgia, and largely because of the opportunities presented to Georgians through the HOPE Scholarship.

Because of the HOPE Scholarship, like I said, Georgia is now a national leader in education. Zell Miller will always be known as the “Education Governor,” and he helped build a foundation that, of course, our State enjoys today.

During his tenure, he also played a pivotal role in bringing the Children’s Medical Center to the Medical College of Georgia at Augusta University. We have a special attachment, our family does, as many families across the State of Georgia do, to the Medical College of Georgia.

Our 12th grandchild was born 8 weeks premature. Her first year of life she spent in that Medical Center, off and on, to deal with being born premature. Our family, among many families in the State of Georgia, thank Zell Miller for his foresight in bringing the Children’s Medical Center of Georgia to the 12th District. It means so much to the health and welfare of families in that area.

□ 1815

Zell Miller established Georgia as a State to watch, and his hard work paid off. Georgia has been named, for 5 years running, as the number one State to do business. You don’t attain that rating unless you have one of the top education systems in the country.

Zell Miller was the Governor who gave Georgia hope. He will be dearly missed, and his legacy will live on forever. I am one person that is glad that I knew him, and I thank him for what he has done for my family and for fellow Georgians.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

Before I yield to our next speaker, I want to mention one of the things that

Zell was famous for, and that was that he wrote a number of books. He was an author.

In fact, the first book he ever wrote in 1976 chronicled, really, him growing up in the mountains. The name of the book was “The Mountains Within Me.”

That book had a very special meaning to me, personally. You see, he talked about Young Harris College, and he equated Young Harris College to being like a shoe factory because things are coming out of there in pairs. That meant a lot to me, because that is where I met my wife. She was my chemistry lab partner. We came out as a pair and we have been a pair, and in September it will be 40 years.

He also wrote a number of other books. I mentioned earlier that he wrote the book about his experience in the Marine Corps, “Corps Values: Everything You Need to Know I Learned in the Marines.” He wrote that in 1996. There are 12 chapters in that book, and each chapter is devoted to a particular trait that he developed during his years in the Marine Corps, for instance, courage, neatness, discipline, and pride.

He also wrote another book, “Great Georgians,” that was published in 1983.

Another one that he wrote was “They Heard Georgia Singing,” about all the famous singers who came from the State of Georgia—a great book. By the way, in that book he chronicles two musicians who came from Young Harris College, Ronnie Milsap and Trisha Yearwood, both Young Harris College alums.

As you can tell, I am very proud of Young Harris College. It is my alma mater. It changed my life. Zell Miller changed my life.

I will go on later, but before I do, I want to take this time to yield to another Georgian who is here with us to pay his respects, Representative Hank Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend BUDDY CARTER for yielding to me.

For the record, I want it to be known that it was he who called me yesterday to find out what color suit and tie I was going to wear.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Georgian and a great American, former Georgia Governor and U.S. Senator Zell Miller, who died at the age of 86 in March.

He was a north Georgia mountain boy of humble beginnings, who was raised by a single parent after his daddy died when he was just 2 weeks old. He was raised in a house that his momma built with her own hands.

Former Presidents, Governors, and dignitaries from all over the country and the world have honored Mr. Miller, who launched the State’s HOPE Scholarship and led Georgia into the 21st century.

He was a true statesman, who served Georgia and his country as, first, a

United States Marine, then as mayor of Young Harris, later serving as a State senator, thereafter as Lieutenant Governor, and then as Governor, and finally as United States Senator.

Zell Miller dedicated his life to public service. He was a man physically compact and a bit short, but he walked tall and he walked strong, and he left a towering legacy.

A small town mountain boy from the little town of Young Harris, Zell Miller made a big impact on the affairs of Georgia and, indeed, the affairs of the Nation.

Zell Miller left a huge impact on Georgia’s judicial system. He literally changed the face of the State bench.

I include in the RECORD an article I found of particular interest from the Fulton County Daily Report, dated March 23, 2018, by managing editor Jonathan Ringel. The article is entitled, “The Late Zell Miller Diversified the Bench.”

THE LATE ZELL MILLER DIVERSIFIED THE BENCH

(By Jonathan Ringel, March 23, 2018)

The news today that former Georgia governor and U.S. senator Zell Miller has died at age 86 prompts us to look back on the mark he left on Georgia’s legal system—that of being the first governor to appoint a large number of minorities and women to judge-ships.

As a staff reporter here, I wrote the following article, which was published Dec. 28, 1998, a few days before the end of his eight-year tenure as governor.

The Zell Miller Legacy: Diversity on the Bench

When he leaves office next month, Gov. Zell Miller will have appointed 37 percent of Georgia’s 287 trial and appellate court judges. Those numbers include four of the 10 judges now on the state Court of Appeals and five of the seven state Supreme Court justices.

Moreover, Miller changed the face of the state’s bench, carrying out his pledge to concentrate on diversity.

Twenty-five of Miller’s appointments have been black. Forty-two have been women. Eleven have been both, meaning he has added 56 black and female judges to the bench in eight years.

According to Miller’s office, Gov. Joe Frank Harris made 76 judicial appointments in his eight years before Miller. They included 10 black and 11 women, totaling 18 black and female judges.

Even before hearing those numbers, attorneys and court watchers say diversifying the bench will be Miller’s legacy to the law of Georgia.

“That’s a major impact,” says former Attorney General Michael J. Bowers of the judicial statistics.

Criminal-defense lawyer John R. Martin, a harsh critic of Miller when it comes to mandatory minimum sentencing laws, calls Miller’s diversifying the bench “remarkable.”

“That is amazing,” says Paula J. Frederick, immediate past president of the Georgia Association of Black Women Attorneys.

Miller looks at his role in diversifying the bench as ironic.

Appointing judges, he says, was “the one aspect of being governor I had never thought about” throughout 16 years of being lieutenant governor.

He says he had lots of plans on taking office—such as starting the lottery-funded

HOPE scholarship, but being a nonlawyer, "I had not thought about the judiciary."

That changed when he took office in 1991, because, along with the keys to the Governor's Mansion, Miller inherited a tricky piece of litigation.

In 1988, state Rep. Tyrone Brooks, D-Atlanta, the American Civil Liberties Union and other plaintiffs had filed a voting rights suit against the state. They attacked the picking of judges in circuitwide at-large elections, claiming the system was discriminatory because blacks typically were outvoted by the white majority and that most judges were therefore white. *Brooks v. State Board of Elections*, No. CV288-146 (S.D. Ga., filed July 13, 1988).

They also alleged that, since 1964, the state should have been submitting laws creating new judgeships for review by the U.S. Justice Department, under the federal Voting Rights Act.

On the review issue, a special three-judge panel of the U.S. District Court in Savannah agreed with the Brooks plaintiffs. So when Miller took office, the Justice Department was holding in limbo 48 established judgeships and other judgeships created since the litigation began.

"There was a cloud hanging over the judiciary," recalls Troutman Sanders partner Norman L. Underwood, a former Court of Appeals judge.

Miller asked Underwood to head the Judicial Nominating Commission, which since the days of Gov. Jimmy Carter had screened judicial applicants and recommended shortlists to the governor.

Miller reconstituted the commission, saying he wanted to open up the process for minorities and women. He eliminated four of the five guaranteed slots for representatives of the bar, leaving only the one for the current bar president as an ex-officio member.

Miller allowed the speaker of the House and the lieutenant governor to pick one nonlawyer each for the commission, and he added the attorney general.

The rest of the picks—three lawyers and two nonlawyers—remained Miller's.

According to Miller's 1991 executive order, the commission must always include one woman and one member who is Black, Hispanic, Asian-Pacific American, Native American or Asian-Indian American (Daily Report, Feb 13, 1991).

"The loss of the bar seats was a bit of a disappointment," says Albany litigator William E. Cannon Jr., the current bar president, who disagrees with Brooks' argument at the time that the bar's majority control of the commission perpetuated a "good of boy network."

Underwood says there might have been a perception the prior commissions were not focused on diversity.

That said, the first commission, including three black members and one woman, went about its work.

Later that year, two seats opened up on DeKalb Superior Court, which had no black members.

Faced with mixed race and gender shortlists sent by the commission, Miller chose Michael E. Hancock, then chief judge in DeKalb Recorder's Court, and DeKalb State Court Judge Linda Warren Hunter, who were both African-American.

Considering that more than 40 percent of DeKalb County is black but the Superior Court had no black judges, Underwood says, "I think the governor just sensed that's unacceptable."

Miller won't discuss any specific decisions. But he says his first appointments of minorities and women encouraged more of each group to apply.

Other factors were at work, as well.

Frederick, a deputy counsel to the state bar who made a shortlist for a state court position, notes that women and minorities have graduated from law school in much greater numbers over the years, adding to the available pool for Miller.

In addition, the Brooks case loomed over Miller's picks throughout most of his administration.

In June 1992, after six weeks of negotiations prompted by U.S. District Court Judge Anthony A. Alaimo, Miller and Brooks hammered out a historic settlement. (Daily Report, June 19, 1992)

To end the case, Miller agreed to appoint 30 black judges and adopt the so-called "Missouri plan of judicial selection, in which judges are appointed and then undergo periodic retention elections.

But in March 1994, U.S. District Court Judge B. Avant Edenfield of Savannah refused to approve the settlement, ruling that Attorney General Mike Bowers lacked the authority to make such sweeping changes to the state's judicial election system and that the requirement to appoint black judges would violate the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution. (Daily Report, March 9, 1994)

Brooks appealed unsuccessfully for three years, finally dismissing the case last year. (Daily Report, June 23, 1997)

Robert J. Proctor, who has brought numerous legal challenges to affirmative action policies around the state and opposed the Brooks settlement, says, "I think Gov. Miller implemented the settlement anyway."

Miller came close, appointing 25 black judges. While about 28 percent of Georgia is black, 20 percent of Miller's appointees were black and 33 percent of his appointees have been female.

Brooks says, "I think there's greater trust in the judicial system now."

Clayton County District Attorney Robert E. Keller says, "The bench must represent a cross-section of society," and credits Miller for his appointments.

But Proctor, a past chairman of the conservative Southeastern Legal Foundation, says judges should not be picked on the basis of race or gender.

"That whole concept is just abhorrent to me," Proctor says.

He adds that Miller's picks do not represent the proportions of the number of black or female lawyers in the state.

The state bar keeps records only on gender, says spokeswoman Jennifer Davis. She says 28 percent of the 29,523 members of the Georgia bar are women.

Miller responds, "I don't think I've done anything in my eight years as governor that pleased Bob Proctor." (Not true, says Proctor, who calls Miller's second term "taxpayer-friendly.")

Miller adds, "You don't choose anybody because they're a female or a minority," noting that there were many times lawyers who were considered front-runners for posts because they were women or minorities did not get the job.

Besides, he adds, "I only got very qualified individuals on the shortlists."

Underwood recalls an opening in a circuit that stretched 90 miles from one end to the other. Miller picked a lawyer who lived in the part of the circuit where there wasn't a judge, and Underwood speculates, "In that case, the factor on the governor's mind was geography."

Fulton Superior Court Judge Cynthia D. Wright was Miller's executive counsel for his first term.

She says, "When you appoint a judge, you have to factor in a whole lot of subjective qualities."

"It is not an objective process."

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Zell Miller was the first Governor to appoint a significant number of minorities and women to the Georgia bench. Zell Miller should be remembered for actually desegregating Georgia's courts. As the Daily Report article outlines, by the time Zell Miller left the Governorship in December of 1998, he had appointed 37 percent of Georgia's 287 trial and appellate court judges. Those numbers include 4 of the 10 judges on the State court of appeals, and 5 of the 7 State supreme court justices.

Zell Miller appointed an African American female as the first African American to ever serve on the Georgia Supreme Court. Twenty-five of Governor Miller's appointments were African Americans; 42 of his judicial appointments were women; 11 were African American women, meaning he added 56 Black and female judges to the bench in his 8 years. It is a fact that Zell Miller appointed more African Americans to judgeships in Georgia than all previous Georgia Governors combined.

In addition, Governor Zell Miller appointed an African American to serve as Georgia's Attorney General, making that African American the first African American State attorney general in the Nation. It is a remarkable record for any Governor, let alone one from the Deep South.

One of the first counties where he began to diversify the bench is my home circuit, the Stone Mountain Judicial Circuit. As Governor, Zell Miller appointed as State labor commissioner the first African American to ever hold a nonjudicial constitutional office in Georgia, and Zell Miller appointed more African Americans to more State boards than any other Georgia Governor.

As executive secretary for Governor Lester Maddox from 1968 to 1971, Zell Miller was credited with exerting a moderating influence on Governor Maddox, a segregationist, and spurring him to appoint Blacks to his administration, which he did.

As Governor, Zell Miller led an unsuccessful effort back in 1993 to remove the Confederate battle emblem from the State flag, and he pushed legislation providing more money for public schools and scholarships for high school students. In fact, Governor Miller raised teacher pay in Georgia by 6 percent for 4 successive years—4 successive years, 6 percent each year. By the time he stepped down after his second term of Governor, Zell Miller was one of the most popular politicians in Georgia's history, leaving office with an astounding 85 percent approval rating.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia's First Congressional District, my friend, BUDDY CARTER, for inviting me here this evening to provide a few remarks about the passing of this Georgia lion, Zell Miller, who did a lot of good for our State and for our people, and I truly appreciate him for that.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for sharing his thoughts.

Before I yield to our next speaker, I want to speak just for a second on a couple of things about the time that Zell spent as Governor of the State of Georgia.

As you just heard Representative JOHNSON mention, and I think it is important to understand, when he left office, he had an 85 percent approval rating. Who in the world gets an 85 percent approval rating? He was the most popular Governor in the Nation when he left office.

But I do want to share with you that that was not always the case. It was tough because, after all, we are talking about "Give 'Em Hell Zell."

You have heard many of the speakers mention the HOPE Scholarship. And, again, we are talking about Georgia's education Governor here, the father of the HOPE Scholarship. But remember, the HOPE Scholarship came about as a result of the Georgia State Lottery, which there were a lot of people who were opposed to that.

Remember I told you about being at Young Harris College? Young Harris College is a Methodist school. There were a lot of people who supported Zell who were opposed to what some considered to be gambling. Zell pressed on. He knew how important it was. That was his tenacity. That was his ruggedness. He didn't let that get in the way, and thank goodness he didn't.

In 1992, he was very important to Bill Clinton's campaign to secure the Democratic U.S. Presidential nomination. He played an important role in that.

In fact, he also spoke at the Democratic National Convention. That is where they had the posters all throughout the convention that said, "Give 'Em Hell Zell." They were distributed among the delegates, as Miller gave a speech that was critical of U.S. President George H.W. Bush's administration. Later that year, he also actively campaigned for Clinton, and Clinton carried the State of Georgia.

Representative JOHNSON also mentioned something that is very important to remember as well. Zell was not easily elected to his second term. That is because he took it upon himself to do the right thing and to try, although it was unsuccessful at that time, to change the State flag of Georgia and to take the Confederate emblem off of that State flag. Later it was done, many years later, and I can remember Zell saying: Well, we might not get it passed. It might not be attributed to me, but maybe I will get an asterisk.

Well, I don't know if he ever got an asterisk, but I am going to give him an asterisk tonight. He deserves an asterisk for that effort.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to another great Georgian, another member of our delegation, Representative SANFORD BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the First

District of Georgia for yielding to me and for hosting this Special Order to honor my friend and mentor, Zell Miller.

Mr. Speaker, Zell Miller was a titan in Georgia, the man that I was humbled and honored to call a friend and a mentor. He was an extraordinary statesman, a true public servant.

He served as a sergeant in the Marines, the mayor of Young Harris, a Georgia State senator, Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and U.S. Senator for the State of Georgia.

Now, as a newly elected State representative of the 94th district of Georgia in 1977, I had very little to do at the State capitol after the session ended and my committee meetings were over.

Somehow, I found myself hanging out in the office of the Lieutenant Governor, where his press secretary was from my hometown of Columbus, who was on loan from the Columbus Ledger-Enquirer to serve Lieutenant Governor.

I got to know Zell. I got to learn from his example. And from him, I even developed an appreciation for country music. I witnessed in Zell Miller a public servant with extraordinary integrity, courage, and character.

□ 1830

Fourteen years later, he became Governor, and I became a member of the Georgia State Senate. In that term as a State senator, I was appointed to be the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Education, K-12 Subcommittee, and I got to work very closely with Zell Miller because, after all, he was the education Governor.

That year, Georgia was the beneficiary of a windfall as a result of a lawsuit with some utilities, and there were several million dollars that were unexpectedly put into the State coffers. Zell Miller had to make a determination of how the State would spend that money. And being the farsighted visionary that he was, he decided that we needed to bring our State into the computer age, and so he used it to create a computer network, statewide, to enhance the educational opportunities for our colleges and universities and our State's public libraries.

He established the Galileo computer network, which provided the groundwork for distance learning and for telemedicine. I was very proud as the chair of the Education Subcommittee of the Georgia State Senate to work with him in making that happen. Not only that, but we worked to establish pilot programs that year for teaching foreign languages in elementary schools.

Zell Miller will perhaps be best remembered for the HOPE Scholarship, as you have heard, which helped to establish scholarship money and to direct money raised from the State lottery to the college tuition for Georgia students. To date, the program has provided over \$10 billion in scholarship funds to 1.8 million eligible Georgia

students. These investments in education are continuing to pay dividends for the State of Georgia.

Zell Miller was a true servant, and he was an advocate for Georgia. He was an advocate for humankind.

My wife, Vivian, and I offer his wife, Shirley, and their family, friends, and loved ones our most sincere condolences for their loss, but we are all so grateful that he touched our lives.

In closing, I just want to quote the words of a poem that I think is so fitting as we remember the life of Zell Miller:

The tree that never had to fight
For Sun and sky and air and light,
But stood out in the open plain
And always got its share of rain,
Never became a forest king
But lived and died a scrubby thing.
The man who never had to toil
To gain and farm his patch of soil,
Who never had to win his share
Of Sun and sky and light and air,
Never became a manly man
But lived and died as he began.
Good timber does not grow with ease:
The stronger wind, the stronger trees;
The further sky, the greater length;
The more the storm, the more the strength.
By Sun and cold, by rain and snow,
In trees and men good timbers grow.

Zell Miller was good timber. He left his mark on Young Harris; he left his mark on Georgia; he left his mark on our Nation; and he left his mark on the world.

Lives of great men all remind us: "We can make our life sublime, and, departing, leave behind us footprints on the sands of time." Zell Miller has left some big footprints, and we and the world are better because he passed this way.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for sharing with us his experiences and how special they were.

Before I yield to our final speaker, I want to go over very quickly about the last part of the 46 years of political service that Zell Miller had that he served.

In 1999, after he finished his last year as Governor, his second term—and he was term limited—he went back to Young Harris College, the University of Georgia, and Emory University as a teacher. The following year, then-Governor Roy Barnes appointed Zell to the United States Senate after Senator Paul Coverdell died. Four months later, he ran for that remaining 4 years on that 6-year term, and he was elected a Senator from the State of Georgia, and he served in that role.

He pledged at that time to carry on the conservative tradition of the late Senator Coverdell, who was a Republican, of course, and he did that. He co-sponsored then-U.S. President George W. Bush's 2001 tax cuts and was adamantly in support of President Bush on the issues of homeland security and the deployment of troops to Iraq at the start of the Iraqi war.

You will remember, also, that he wrote another book, "A National Party No More: The Conscience of a Conservative Democrat." It became a national

best seller in the months before the Presidential election that year. And, of course, in 2004, Democratic Senator from Georgia Zell Miller did something that I am not sure anyone else has ever done. He spoke as a keynote speaker at the 2004 Republican National Convention.

In January of 2005, he retired from the United States Senate and he returned to Georgia. He resumed his teaching career and continued to write. In fact, in 2005, he wrote, "A Deficit of Decency."

In 2008, Zell B. Miller Learning Center was established at the University of Georgia and dedicated in his honor. In 2017, Miller's family announced that he suffered from Parkinson's disease and he was retiring from public life.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to pause now and yield to another member of the Georgia delegation, one of my good friends. He and I served together for 10 years in the Georgia General Assembly. He is truly one of my best friends here in Washington, and I value our friendship. I know that he has got a lot of experience with and a lot of stories about Zell Miller as well.

I yield to my friend, Representative BARRY LOUDERMILK.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank my good friend Representative CARTER from the great city of Savannah and the great State of Georgia for his vision to have this time to honor a true statesman, a legend in the State of Georgia, Zell Miller.

It is sad that we wait until someone has left this life to sing their praises and to recognize the tremendous impact that they have had not only on our lives, but our children and their future lives. That really defines Zell Miller.

I never had the opportunity to work directly with Zell Miller or even serve with Zell Miller, although I served with other Governors, but I knew of Zell Miller. I think that says a lot about someone that, even though you don't personally know them but you know of them, signifies the impact that they are having on lives.

Zell Miller's death was a tremendous blow for a lot of people in our State. I knew of him from my involvement in politics, and I knew as Representative CARTER said, that he was one of the few, if not only, to be a keynote speaker at both the Democrat and Republican National Conventions. That means he was truly bipartisan.

What does that mean? Well, it doesn't seem to mean a lot today, but what it meant back then was: I care more about the people of the State. I care more about the people of this Nation and defending the rights and liberties and those things from which I believe in than I do a single party.

That was Zell Miller.

If you were to go to the place where Zell was laid to rest, you would see a headstone. As you see on most headstones, you will find the date of his birth, February 24, 1923. There will

be a dash, followed by the date of his death, March 23, 2018. What is interesting, it isn't the date of his birth or the date of his death that matters, but it is the dash in between those dates that really matters.

I think it is important that we ask ourselves: What are we going to do with that dash? Because we have all been given a dash. Zell Miller used that dash for the good and the rights of people. You see, his dash continues today as, literally, thousands of Georgians were able to complete or actually receive a college education because of his vision for the HOPE Scholarship, which is still alive and well today. That dash is part of their lives and their future and their children's lives.

Another part of that dash in Zell Miller's life was the titles that he obtained. I believe titles say a lot about us and say a lot about what we do. His titles included mayor, because he was mayor of the town of Young Harris. He was Lieutenant Governor. He was Governor.

Another title that he proudly used, as my good colleague BUDDY CARTER uses, he was a Georgia Bulldog. And for those of you who aren't from Georgia, it is not d-o-g. It is d-a-w-g, dawg.

But also, from knowing of this incredible gentleman, there is another title that I believe if we were to talk to him today, it wasn't mayor, Lieutenant Governor, Governor, or even U.S. Senator that he would be most proud of of his accomplishments. It would be that of a United States Marine.

You see, his dash is a dash that is living on because of the lives that it affected for so many people. And while so much has been said about Zell Miller, let me close my remarks by saying this: There are very few people today who, across our globe or even across our country, can be categorized as a true statesman. One of those is Paul Coverdell. When Paul Coverdell died in office, the Governor of the State of Georgia at that time looked for another statesman to fulfill that seat that was vacated by Paul Coverdell's death, and that statesman was Zell Miller.

If there is one thing that we can gather from all of these tremendous stories that we heard about Zell Miller today, it is that he loved his country. He loved his State. He loved the people of this country. He loved his God, and he fought for those principles and ideas that he believed in. Even though he may have disagreed with others on certain policy issues, Zell Miller was a statesman who believed in liberty. He believed in freedom for all, and his life is a legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that one day when I am laid to rest that that dash between my birth and my death will just have a portion of the meaning of that of Zell Miller.

HONORING THE INMAN FAMILY

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank, again, my dear colleague and friend from Savannah,

Georgia, for yielding me this time and allowing me to honor another Georgian who passed 18 years ago.

It was 18 years ago, in June, as Georgia heat blanketed the Inman family as they packed their car for a family getaway in the mountains of north Georgia. It was the Friday before Father's Day when Billy and Kathy Inman, the parents of their son, Dustin, and their family dog set off to go on a fishing trip for the weekend. As they headed north, making their way along the wooded, hilly highways that make up that part of my home State, they stopped at a traffic light in the little town of Ellijay, Georgia.

□ 1845

As they waited for the light to turn green, the Inman family's lives were suddenly and tragically changed. Traveling well over the speed limit at 62 miles an hour, a car driven by Gonzalo Harrell-Gonzalez slammed in the rear of the Inmans' vehicle. The tremendous impact knocked Billy and Kathy unconscious.

Kathy, Dustin's mom, remained in a comma for 5 weeks. When she finally regained consciousness, she learned that the injuries she sustained in that wreck were so severe she would be wheelchair-bound for the rest of her life. But more tragically, she was told the heartbreaking news that her son, Dustin, was killed by that tremendous impact. Within seconds, their lives were forever changed by the driver who slammed into the rear of their car.

And while Kathy would not recover from her injuries nor would they ever see the smiling face of their dear son again, they could at least ensure justice was served. But soon they would learn that even that would slip through their hands.

The car that killed their son, Dustin, and permanently disabled his mother was driven by Gonzalo Harrell-Gonzalez, a man who had illegally entered this country. Although illegally in this country, Gonzalez was able to obtain a valid North Carolina driver's license, using his Mexican birth certificate and a Mexican Matricula Consular ID card.

When local law enforcement went to the hospital to take Mr. Gonzalez into custody, they found that he had escaped the hospital. As a fugitive from justice, he continued to evade U.S. and local law enforcement and soon emerged back in the streets in Mexico.

Even though the location of Mr. Gonzalez is now known by U.S. and Mexican law enforcement, the family has not been able to get justice for his crime. Under our treaty with Mexico, Mexico does not recognize vehicular homicide as an extraditable offense.

The Justice Department has informed the Inman family that there is nothing else they can do—nothing. After 18 years of grieving the loss of their son and adjusting to a life of permanent disability for Mrs. Inman, Mr. Gonzalez is still evading justice and has yet to pay for his crime.

The tragedy can have easily been avoided if Congress had taken the border threat and security seriously years ago. This car wreck would have never happened, and Dustin would likely still be with us today. Because of the severity of their injuries, Billy and Kathy were not even able to attend their own son's funeral.

Billy will tell you that, yes, he blames the driver of the car for the death of his son—his hunting buddy—but he also blames the government for ignoring our open and porous borders and for allowing someone who was here illegally to obtain a driver's license.

While there have been many speeches given in this Chamber on immigration, we have yet to be able to have a vote or even have a debate on what the majority of Americans are demanding, what the President has committed to, and what we as a legislative body should do, and that is to secure our borders.

How many more innocent victims such as Dustin Inman, Kate Steinle, and Sarah Root—and the list goes on and on—must die before we start taking the safety and security of American citizens seriously and prioritize securing our borders?

Not only are our borders a thoroughfare for human trafficking, they are also a distribution channel for cartels that smuggle contraband, dangerous drugs, and weapons that make their way into our communities. They are a portal for dangerous gangs such as MS-13 that bring terror, drugs, and murder to our streets.

For too long, we have chosen partisan politics over doing what is reasonable and right, and we put our families' livelihoods at tremendous risk. It is beyond time to take action. It is time for Congress to act. It is time for us to enforce our laws, and it is time to secure our borders, not for our own political victories, but for families such as Billy and Kathy Inman.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that, and I am thankful that the Georgia delegation was able to pay our respects to a great Georgian, to a great American, Zell B. Miller.

Mr. Miller's knowledge and his broad experience in Georgia enabled him to be one of the most popular and successful leaders ever for this State. With the passing of Zell Miller, Georgia has truly lost one of its most important servants.

Zell Miller was a personal mentor to me. Young Harris College changed my life, as I mentioned earlier. Zell Miller changed my life, as he changed the lives of so many Georgians, of so many Americans. I am so grateful for the wisdom that he shared with all of us. His family remains in my thoughts and prayers, but his policies, his ideals, and his legacy will live on in the State of Georgia for years to come.

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

THE PLIGHT OF THE ROHINGYA MUSLIMS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the unspeakable suffering of the Rohingya people. We must do all we can to shine a spotlight on their plight. Last night, the PBS NewsHour presented an hour-long documentary about the brutal campaign against the Rohingyas led by the Burmese military. At times it became intolerable to continue watching footage of young men being beaten, listening to the accounts of young girls and women being raped and killed, and seeing human remains shoved into mass graves.

The facts are well known. Since August last year, nearly 700,000 Rohingya Muslims have fled the violence in Myanmar to neighboring Bangladesh, where they are being housed in deplorable conditions and face an uncertain future. Some of the conversation lately has focused on returning the Rohingya Muslims to Burma, resettling them to a remote island or some third country. However, I believe the most pressing conversation today must be for the Burmese military and civilian government led by Aung San Suu Kyi to confront the issue head-on.

The Burmese leadership must acknowledge ethnic cleansing and acts of genocide that have been inflicted on the Rohingya people. As recently as March, a senior Burmese official reportedly made a series of comments designed to deny or downplay any violence and atrocities against the Rohingya Muslims, saying the vast majority remain in Burma, and "if it was genocide, they would all be driven out."

He went on to declare that the Burmese Government "would like to have clear evidence" of ethnic cleansing and genocide. That clear evidence already exists. Even as Burma has denied international investigators the ability to enter the country to gather evidence of such crimes, the United Nations' fact-finding mission found "concrete and overwhelming" evidence of "human rights violations of the most serious kind, in all likelihood amounting to crimes under international law."

The investigative team found widespread and systematic "State-led violence" and had "numerous accounts of children and babies who were killed, boys arrested, and girls raped."

Various rationales have been suggested for the failures of the Burmese Government to acknowledge and act upon atrocities against Rohingya Muslims. It is said that Aung San Suu Kyi does not control the military and there is a danger that the military would use the present crisis as a way to dismantle the civilian government. It is said that the civilian government is working within a deep traditional bias against the Rohingyas, and some see them as illegal immigrants from Bangladesh.

Others have suggested that pressure on the civilian government could lead to Burma moving closer to the Chinese. Still others point out that talks about the Rohingyas returning to Burma must be afforded time to work out, and the process has only begun.

None of this—none of this—can undermine for a moment the realities of the persecution of the Rohingyas. The PBS documentary "Myanmar's Killing Fields" left no doubt about the extent and nature of the atrocities perpetrated against the Rohingyas. As a U.N. official has stated, it is "a textbook example of ethnic cleansing." Until the Burmese civilian government and military openly acknowledge their role in these atrocities, protection and justice for the Rohingya Muslims will remain out of reach.

There is an overriding need for the Burmese Government and the world to step up to the plight of the Rohingyas. Senator JOHN MCCAIN and Senator DICK DURBIN introduced, on September 7, 2017, a resolution clearly addressing the plight of the Rohingyas. I introduced the same resolution 7 days later.

Subsequent events have darkened still further the plight of the Rohingyas since then. While the basic message in the resolutions remains the same, it would be wise to update them and then that this entire issue be fully and directly addressed by the Congress.

Bishop Desmond Tutu once said: "If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor."

The documentary on "Frontline" last night made it painfully clear that this Congress must not accept neutrality or any shade of it. We must stand tall on the side of justice.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1732. An act to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to promote testing of incentive payments for behavioral health providers for adoption and use of certified electronic health record technology; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition, to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 10, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4754. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Selinsgrove, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0839; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AEA-7] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4755. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class B Airspace Description; St. Louis, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0178; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWA-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4756. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment, Revocation, and Establishment of Class D and E Airspace; Enid Vance AFB, OK; Enid Woodring Municipal Airport, OK; Enid, OK; and Vance AFB, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9378; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-16] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4757. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification and Revocation of Multiple Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Northcentral United States [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9555; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-2] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4758. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31184; Amdt. No.: 3791] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4759. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0902; Product Identifier 2016-NM-188-AD; Amendment 39-19224; AD 2018-06-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4760. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31185; Amdt. No.: 3792] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4761. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31187; Amdt. No.: 3794] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4762. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31186; Amdt. No.: 3793] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4763. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0908; Product Identifier 2017-NM-103-AD; Amendment 39-19238; AD 2018-07-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4764. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0940; Product Identifier 2017-SW-058-AD; Amendment 39-19233; AD 2018-07-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4765. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0285; Product Identifier 2018-CE-010-AD; Amendment 39-19245; AD 2018-07-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4766. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1176; Product Identifier 2017-NM-123-AD; Amendment 39-19237; AD 2018-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4767. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1011; Product Identifier 2017-SW-004-AD; Amendment 39-19232; AD 2018-07-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pur-

suant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4768. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; XtremeAir GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0284; Product Identifier 2018-CE-014-AD; Amendment 39-19246; AD 2018-07-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4769. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0268; Product Identifier 2017-NM-096-AD; Amendment 39-19242; AD 2018-07-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4770. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honda Aircraft Company LLC [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0223; Product Identifier 2018-CE-007-AD; Amendment 39-19230; AD 2018-06-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4771. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0245; Product Identifier 2018-CE-012-AD; Amendment 39-19234; AD 2018-07-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4772. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-2907C; Lake George, FL, R-2910B, R-2910C, and R2910E; Pinecastle, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0103; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASO-1] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4773. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Massena, NY [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0953; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AEA-15] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4774. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace for the following Missouri Towns; Cape Girardeau, MO; St. Louis, MO; and Macon, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9559; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ACE-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4775. A letter from the Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rights to Federally Funded Inventions and Licensing

of Government Owned Inventions [Docket No.: 160311229-8347-02] (RIN: 0693-AB63) received April 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4645. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System (Rept. 115-666). 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. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 3. A bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 8, 2018, in accordance with title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 5714. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require Medicare Advantage plans offered under part C of the Medicare program and prescription drug plans offered under part D of such program to provide information relating to the safe disposal of prescription drugs that are controlled substances to certain individuals enrolled under such plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5715. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for certain program integrity transparency measures under Medicare parts C and D; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5716. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide notifications under the Medicare program to outlier prescribers of opioids; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. BERA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 5717. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to States that have in place laws that authorize the seizure of firearms from dangerous individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself and Mr. HIGGINS of New York):

H.R. 5718. A bill to provide for a technical expert panel to provide recommendations on reducing opioid use in the surgical setting and on best practices for pain management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 5719. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise certain measures used under the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems survey relating to pain management; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 5720. A bill to deauthorize a portion of a project in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 5721. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 5722. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report containing recommendation on how to improve the use of non-opioid treatments for acute and chronic pain management for individuals entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 5723. A bill to require the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission to report on opioid payment, adverse incentives, and data under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 5724. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to clarify the applicability of that Act to recovery facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. ROSKAM (for himself, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 5725. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit to

Congress a report on the extent to which Medicare Advantage plans offered under part C of the Medicare program include supplemental health care benefits designed to treat or prevent substance use disorders; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. COSTA (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 5726. A bill to authorize the use of certain contributed funds for activities relating to operational documents for non-Federal reservoirs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 5727. A bill to establish the San Rafael Swell Western Heritage and Historic Mining National Conservation Area in the State of Utah, to designate wilderness areas in the State, to provide for certain land conveyances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 5728. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to establish an efficient system to enable employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5729. A bill to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. KATKO (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 5730. A bill to require testing and evaluation of advanced transportation security screening technologies related to the mission of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BACON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 5731. A bill to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop a strategy to secure elementary schools, secondary schools, and institutions of higher education from acts of terrorism, active shooters, and other homeland security threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as

fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. SMUCKER):

H.R. 5732. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an investment tax credit related to the production of electricity from nuclear energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 5733. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for the responsibility of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center to maintain capabilities to identify threats to industrial control systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 5734. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for interest-free deferment on student loans for borrowers serving in a medical or dental internship or residency program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 5735. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a demonstration program to set aside section 8 housing vouchers for supportive and transitional housing for individuals recovering from opioid use disorders or other substance use disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BUDD, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 5736. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a pilot program to help individuals in recovery from a substance use disorder transition from treatment to independent living and the workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BOST, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 5737. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 108 West D Street in Alpha, Illinois, as the "Captain Joshua E. Steele Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. DENT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NOR-TON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 5738. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, and the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to require that the value of child's savings accounts be disregarded for the purpose of determining eligibility to receive benefits under such Acts; and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. DOGETT, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 5739. A bill to establish within the Department of Health and Human Services the Prescription Drug and Medical Device Price Review Board to regulate the prices of certain prescription drugs and medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 5740. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to permit the State agency to disclose personal identifying information of a household member to a law enforcement officer who provides such member's household electronic benefit transfer card number for the purpose of apprehending such member who is fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 5741. A bill to require annual reporting on the on the research, development, test, and evaluation capabilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 5742. A bill to provide for a land exchange of Federal and non-Federal land in Whitman County, Washington; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 5743. A bill to prohibit the National Science Foundation from conducting certain studies on relationships between Members of Congress with respect to the sharing of guidance and informative documents; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5744. A bill to prohibit surface occupancy for purposes of mineral leasing or development on certain land located in Plata County, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H. Res. 883. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2018 as "Mental Health Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFazio (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 884. A resolution expressing appreciation of the goals of American Craft Beer Week and commending the small and independent craft brewers of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. Res. 885. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding our national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

190. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 682, urging the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services to select the former Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove and the former Naval Air Warfare Center Warminster and Horsham, Warrington and Warminster Townships for an exposure assessment and study on human health implications of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances contamination; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

191. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial 1008, urging the United States Congress to enact legislation amending the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

192. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 136, urging the Federal Government to provide for continued and expanded access in the Gulf of Mexico in the 2019-2024 National OCS Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

193. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial 1012, urging the United States Congress to enact the Nogales Wastewater Fairness Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

194. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 41, memorializing Congress of the United States to allow for variances of certain projects regulated by the Clean Water Act and the Rivers and Harbors Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

195. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 55, urging the Congress of the United States to pass legislation permitting West Virginia to increase the weight of vehicles permitted to operate on Interstate Highways so that West Virginia may implement a pilot program to study various vehicle configurations and weights; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 3.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth term and conditions governing their use.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 5714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority 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. RENACCI:

H.R. 5715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 grants Congress the power "to regulate commerce . . . among the several States."

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 5716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article I Section 8

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 5717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 5718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 5719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority 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. CALVERT:

H.R. 5720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 5721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 5722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 5724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to amend laws it has previously enacted. This legislation would amend the Fair Housing Act and Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 to restore the power to regulate or prohibit substance abuse recovery facilities in residentially zoned areas to state and local governments. This is consistent with the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which reads: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 5725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article I Section 8

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 5726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of section 8 and clause 7 of section 9 of article I, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5728.

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 Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 5729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 5730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 5731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 5732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 5733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 -To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 5734 .

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Consitution

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 5735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 5736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 5737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 5740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 5741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 14

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 5742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

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 Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 5743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 159: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 233: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 247: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 303: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 395: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 449: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 548: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 750: Mr. COLE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 820: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 846: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
 H.R. 852: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 914: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 980: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 1006: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1187: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. FASO.
 H.R. 1279: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1300: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1377: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 1566: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 1614: Mr. VELA and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
 H.R. 1810: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1874: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 1880: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2069: Ms. NORTON and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 2095: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 2234: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 2358: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 2556: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 2561: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 2598: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2652: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2913: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
 H.R. 2917: Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 3026: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 3057: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3207: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 3303: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 3395: Ms. MENG and Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 3528: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H.R. 3600: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 3635: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 3730: Mr. COLE, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 3760: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3875: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 3918: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 3945: Mr. DEUTCH and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 4018: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 4099: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 4229: Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 4256: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. DELAORO.
 H.R. 4271: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 4275: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 4311: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 4316: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 4459: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 4473: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 4518: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 4525: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 4536: Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 4548: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 4584: Mr. PERRY and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 4601: Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 4647: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 4719: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 4747: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 4819: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
 H.R. 4838: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 4885: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 4886: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 4944: Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 5011: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 5034: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 5067: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BRAT, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 5102: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 5105: Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Mr. GARRETT.
 H.R. 5176: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5191: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H.R. 5197: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5199: Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 5202: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5208: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 5241: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 5244: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5261: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5287: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 5288: Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 5306: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. LONG, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 5408: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 5442: Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 5454: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 5460: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 5473: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5517: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5551: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 5572: Mr. JORDAN.
 H.R. 5624: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 5625: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 5627: Ms. LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 5634: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 5640: Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 5675: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5685: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5686: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5687: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H.R. 5694: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 5698: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H.R. 5710: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H. Con. Res. 10: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Res. 401: Mr. YODER.
 H. Res. 718: Mr. RASKIN.
 H. Res. 785: Mr. PERRY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. HUDSON.
 H. Res. 835: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUDSON, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H. Res. 850: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H. Res. 865: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H. Res. 869: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. SOTO.
 H. Res. 876: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. LEVIN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H. Res. 774: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

101. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Commission of Lauderdale Lakes, FL, relative to Resolution No. 2018-032, expressing opposition to the addition of a question regarding citizenship being added to the 2020 United States Census questionnaire; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

102. Also, a petition of the City Council of South Portland, Maine, relative to Resolve #22-17/18, opposing any plan or legislation that would open the coast of Maine to offshore drilling for gas and oil; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

103. Also, a petition of the City Electors of La Crosse, Wisconsin, relative to a resolution supporting a Constitutional Amendment seeking to reclaim democracy from the expansion of corporate personhood rights and the corrupting influence of unregulated political contributions and spending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.