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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, February 1, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID G. VALADAO 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 3, 2017, 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, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

PRESIDENT TRUMP’S FIASCOS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 weeks, we have lurched from one fiasco to another, played out on a national and international stage. There were press briefings and Presidential statements filled with official lies. We have witnessed tragedies, late night firings, policy changes, and clarifications, also known as backtracking, and then we have come back for another round of fiascos.

We are told we will not have a National Security Council as we always have had, one with the top minds of the intelligence community and the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. No, instead, we will have a nationalistic security council, with Breitbart’s Steve Bannon and his personal experience as a former Navy officer right there in the situation room. I am not feeling safer already.

The President has acted to criminalize immigrants and to make every immigrant an equal priority for deportation. Trump actually buried a requirement in his executive order to count, every week, the number of crimes committed by immigrants and to have the government officially tally every single week the number of Mexican rapists, criminals, and drug dealers—the ones Donald Trump has been talking about since he launched his campaign.

But interestingly, by law, the Federal Government and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention cannot conduct research into how many people are killed by guns—that is outlawed—and how we can prevent gun violence—that is outlawed. No, the NRA and its wholly owned subsidiary, the Republican Party, has outlawed that. But the new immigrant rape report is ripped from the headlines of Breitbart and other rightwing websites, except that now it is the basis of government policy. We are really getting a lesson in who is and who is not a criminal in this post-“1984” world of newspeak.

We all know that there are millions of undocumented immigrants from all over the world, but this administration keeps whipping out that Mexican thing. Let’s face it, the people thinking up these policies think all Latinos are Mexican and all Mexicans are immigrants. So if you are an immigrant from Mexico, except for a few good ones, you are a criminal, a rapist, or a murderer.

Millions and millions of people who the President wants to deport are people with traffic violations. They drove without a license in many States because the State in which they live and pay taxes does not issue driver’s licenses to them. They are moms and dads who once back after they were deported because that is what moms and dads tend to want to do: to be with their children, watch them grow up, nurture and love them. And Trump’s targets include young people and teenagers who are listed on a “gang registry” because a local cop thought they dressed or acted like they might be in a gang.

But if you hire maids or nannies and do not pay the proper amount of Social Security and FICA taxes, or if they are undocumented immigrants and you don’t pay the taxes, you are not called a criminal. No, you are called a Cabinet Secretary. In fact, we will put you in charge of the budget, including Social Security, the one you failed to pay.

Or you can run the Department of Commerce, yes. If your business engages in the shady business of foreclosing on grandmas and widows, you get to be the Secretary of the Treasury.

If you close down the Department of Energy, that is what you want to do, close down the Department of Energy, guess what you get to do. You get to run it.

If you oppose public schools, you get to be Secretary of Education.

And if you have opposed every inch of progress for civil and human rights in this country with every fiber of your being—inigrant rights, gay rights, basic civil rights for people of color, basic protections to make sure that everyone’s vote counts equally—well, in that case, guess what you get to do, you get to run the Department of Justice, the agency ultimately charged with making sure everyone gets equal protection under the law.

Up is down, down is up, and it is only his second week.
I feel our new President has some learning to do, and a lot of that learning has to do with the three branches of government, like what the executive branch should do when a Federal judge tells them to stop doing something they shouldn’t be doing in the first place.

I think the new President has a lot to learn about the freedom of religion, the separation of church and State, and how our refugee policies work. I think the people of Chicago could teach him a lot about the Fourth Amendment and its ban on unreasonable search and seizure and the illegality of holding immigrants in jail without a warrant.

So I am offering to give the President my copy of the Constitution, autographed by Khizr Khan, the father of a U.S. Army captain killed in Iraq in 2004, who asked a question I don’t think any one of us knows the answer to. That question is: Has the President ever read the Constitution? I am proud I will be standing with Mr. Khan and other leaders of different faiths later today at a press conference on the actions taken by our new dear leader.

We can all see through the emperor’s new clothes and his Chinese-made tie, and the view isn’t pretty. Mr. Speaker.

MUSLIM REFUGEE EXECUTIVE ORDER

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, just hours after the President’s misguided executive order, counterproductive to the anti-American, anti-Muslim ban was signed, we saw the effects, chaos erupted at airports around the country, including in my own district at Chicago O’Hare. Green card holders were held in legal limbo. Refugees fleeing violence and persecution were sent away before boarded flights, enduring years of thorough screening and vetting.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time we have turned away innocent people seeking safety in our country. In 1939, the German ocean liner St. Louis Manifest and its 937 Jewish passengers, almost all Jewish refugees, were turned away from the Port of Miami and sent back to Europe. Of those passengers, 254 were murdered in the Holocaust.

We all bear a responsibility to learn from the evils of history so that we will never make the same mistakes again. It is our turn to step up and warn the President not to make the same mistakes as history so that we can be on the right side of history. Because who can possibly forget the photo of Alan Kurdi, the 3-year-old Syrian boy who was washed up on a Turkish beach. Or Omran Daqneesh, the 5-year-old Syrian boy covered in blood as he waited for emergency workers after being rescued from a building in Aleppo hit by an airstrike. These devastating images have become symbols of the refugee crisis.

We cannot let them symbolize our inaction, too.

The President’s executive order creating this Muslim ban undermines the foundational ideas of this country, a Nation founded by immigrants with the understanding that they had the opportunity, and a better life to all who seek it. Making good on one of his most extreme campaign promises, the President signed this order with little or no input from his own national security advisers or from specialists at the State Department, Homeland Security, or the Justice Department, once again signaling his strong and continued dismissal of facts, evidence, and advice from seasoned experts.

Contrary to the President’s misguided belief, Islam is not the issue, and his decision to go after Muslims instead of terrorists only fuels our enemies’ propaganda. The President’s Muslim ban undermines our national security goals and is counterproductive to the anti-American, anti-Muslim ban... Arafat said, “The ban jeopardizes our strategic partnerships with allies in the Middle East who are on the very front lines in the fight against ISIS. Asylum seekers and foreign nationals have provided invaluable assistance in a variety of roles overseas. I agree with Senators MCCAIN and GRAHAM, who said this ban will become ‘a self-inflicted wound in the fight against terrorism.’ Ultimately, this order is likely to increase terrorist recruitment than to deter it.

Outrage over this ban extends far beyond national security and counterterrorism experts. For example, we are seeing sharp criticism from business leaders across the country, including CEOs of companies like Google, Apple, Facebook, and Airbnb. They recognize that immigrants play a huge role in fostering our Nation’s entrepreneurial spirit, advancing new technology, creating startups, all which spur innovation and economic activity across the country.

Universities and academics across the country are also grappling with what the President’s restrictions mean for their students and for scholarship and academia more broadly. Students benefit from the inclusion of all world views, which provide us with a deeper understanding of science, the arts, economic policy, national security, and all other aspects of life.

Let’s be clear. My own city of Chicago has been and will continue to be home to an immigrant and refugee community from all around the world, and we are forever enriched and grateful for the contributions that make this country great. I, along with the majority of American people who took to the streets to make their opposition heard loud and clear, demand that the administration rescind this shameful order before even more grave and lasting damage is done.

Let’s call a spade a spade. Despite the White House’s insistence that this is not a Muslim ban, the policy laid out by the President will almost exclusively impact Muslims. In fact, the President went so far as to point out that this administration will prioritize the admittance for Christian refugees. If this is not a religious test, then what is?

Refugees of all faiths, creeds, race, and national origins have looked to America as a beacon of freedom. So long as this ban is in effect, that light shines less brightly. We will not etch a new inscription at the base of the Statue of Liberty. Instead, her glove will continue to welcome those who are tired, poor, and yearning to be free, just as it always has.

TRUMP’S REFUGEE EXECUTIVE ORDER: SEPARATING FACT FROM FICTION

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my fervent support for President Trump’s executive order: Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry.

I, along with many other Members of Congress, have been speaking out for more than a 1 1/2 years about the dangers posed by our U.N.-run refugee resettlement program. I applaud President Trump for following through on his promise by imposing strict vetting for some countries that President Obama labeled in 2016 as countries of particular concern for terrorism.

Liberal activists and politicians are leveling baseless assertions about the Trump policy only to see a lazy and complicit media parrot their claims without exercising due diligence to validate it. To me, this is fake news. And in this incident, it is the mainstream media that is pushing this misinformation. Let’s separate myth from fact and inject a little common-sense into this national dialogue.

Friday’s executive order does a few things: It pauses the entry of all refugees for the next 120 days; it caps refugee admissions for fiscal year 2017 at 50,000; it stalls, for 90 days, the admission of foreign nationals from seven countries that President Obama labeled as countries that are well established as terrorist hotspot countries; and it puts priority on highly persecuted religious minorities when the refugee program resumes.

The media has echoed the protesters’ assertion that this is somehow a Muslim ban. They are flat-out wrong. Remember, it was President Obama who created this seven-country list, not President Trump.

If it were a Muslim ban, then why doesn’t it include restrictions on the other 40 majority Muslim nations? That makes no sense. That is because this is a targeted approach to deal with the threat posed by terrorists who oppose freely in these failed states and pose a direct threat to the American people. There is absolutely nothing in this executive order that says anything
about banning any particular group of people.

Another shortsighted fallacy being propagated is that President Trump is the only President to ever implement restrictions on refugee admissions. Conveniently forgotten is the fact that in 2011, President Obama stopped processing refugees from Iraq for 6 months after a terrorist plot was uncovered involving two Iraqi refugees who had come into the United States.

Previous Presidents of both parties have responded to global threats with refugee admission limitations, so characterizing Trump’s actions is unprecedented, is simply fiction and a gross demonstration of partisanship.

As ISIS has infiltrated the ranks of refugees in Europe, the President is similarly responding to global threats with the appropriate safeguards as he sees fit.

This is something that he should be praised for—not condemned.

The notion that the executive order is inherently un-American must be addressed as well. After all, America is the land of the free and the home of immigrants who have been a safe harbor to millions fleeing persecution around the world since her inception.

But in order for this to continue, we must be vigilant to protect our homeland.

America is the greatest Nation in the world, and if we let up on our pursuit of the highest national security standards, we will see this greatness slip away—to the detriment not only of all American citizens, but to the entire world.

Finally, I must address the false notion that having a Christian ethic demands that we accept all refugees with open arms. Well, if that is the case, why aren’t we opening the doors wide to the 60 million refugees worldwide rather than only a fraction of 1 percent?

As a follower of Jesus Christ, I do believe that we should help those in need around us, and that America should be involved in helping the displaced and persecuted whenever we can.

Perhaps a more compassionate approach might be to take the money that we spend settling one refugee in the United States and, instead, for the same service, provide for 12, for a dozen, refugees in a safe haven near their own home countries.

Just as a father’s primary responsibility is to care for his own children, the chief role of the President and other national leaders is to ensure the best interest of the citizens under their charge.

If President Trump were to overlook the safety of the American people, it would simply be an abdication of his own responsibility that the American people do not want him to do.

It seems the President’s opponents have cherry-picked particular Bible verses to suit their own political agenda, while ignoring other basic Biblical concepts of stewardship and responsibility out of sheer political convenience.

To conclude, the hysteria surrounding this national security executive order is deeply misplaced.

After all, the main provisions of this executive order are temporary in nature and are in line with what many Presidents in the past have done.

ISIS presents one of the most extensive and immediate threats to our Nation, and we do want our President to take every precaution to make sure that Americans are safe.

This—not the false narratives of Trump’s opponents—must be the focus of the national dialogue, and we must share in what he is doing.

**NSC APPOINTMENTS TO PRINCIPALS COMMITTEE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce the Protect the National Security Council from Political Interference Act.

I would like to thank my House colleagues who have signed on as original cosponsors of this legislation.

I have worked at the Department of Defense, and I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. I believe that the most solemn responsibility of Federal policymakers is to keep the American people safe, and to do so in a way that is faithful to the moral and ethical principles that have made this country exceptional, and a force for good in a dangerous and unpredictable world.

Within the complex Federal bureaucracy, the National Security Council is, arguably, the most important institution when it comes to debating and deciding issues related to homeland security, foreign policy, intelligence collection, and the national defense. Choices about whether to deploy men and women into combat are made during the meetings of the NSC or its main subgroup, the Principals Committee.

So, too, are decisions about how to defend the homeland against terrorism and how to support our allies and counter our adversaries across the globe. The NSC’s deliberations are so serious because the stakes are so high.

Since the creation of this body by Congress in 1947, Presidents from Truman to Obama have prescribed the organizational structure and role of the NSC according to their personal preferences within the broad parameters set by Congress. This is how it should be. The NSC is a policymaking instrument, and the President is entitled to utilize this instrument in the manner that the President sees fit.

However, historically, there has been a bipartisanship that the NSC debates should be divorced from the world of electoral politics. The Presidents of both parties have sought to establish an NSC policy process that is not contaminated or perceived to be contaminated by political considerations.

Josh Bolton, chief of staff to President George W. Bush, may have put it best when explaining why President Bush excluded political counselor Karl Rove from all NSC meetings: ‘‘. . . the President . . . knew that the signal he wanted to send to the rest of his administration, the signal he wanted to send to the public, and the signal he especially wanted to send to his military, is that, ‘The decisions I’m making that involve life and death for the people in uniform will not be tainted by any political decisions.’ ”

I am filing this bill because I believe that President Trump's directive organizing the NSC breaks from this longstanding, bipartisan tradition of constructing a wall to separate national security policymaking from domestic politics to the greatest extent possible.

Specifically, the President's directive authorizes the Assistant to the President and Chief Strategist Stephen Bannon to be a permanent member of the NSC and to attend all NSC and Principals Committee meetings. Mr. Bannon’s role in the administration has a strong political component. Indeed, it appears unprecedented for a political counselor so deeply enmeshed in politics to serve as a permanent member of the NSC.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, described Mr. Bannon's appointment as a radical departure from any National Security Council in history.

Therefore, my bill will amend Federal law to ensure that no individual, whose primary responsibility is political in nature, shall be designated as a member of the NSC or be authorized to regularly attend meetings of the NSC or the Principals Committee. This language would apply to Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents alike. Our men and women in uniform, our intelligence and homeland security professionals, and our citizens should feel secure in their knowledge that the critical decisions made by the NSC are free from political considerations. The American people deserve a national security policymaking process that inspires confidence, not cynicism.

Therefore, my bill amends the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize any National Security Council in his or her inception.

To conclude, the hysteria surrounding this national security executive order is deeply misplaced.

To conclude, the hysteria surrounding this national security executive order is deeply misplaced.
Accordingly, my bill will express the view of Congress that the DNI and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, given their importance to national security, should have a standing invitation to attend all PC meetings. I invite my colleagues to support this legislation which seeks to protect the NSC from political interference, and to ensure that the President receives the best possible advice from his national security experts—experts who will recommend actions because they are in the best interest of the American people and not because they are politically expedient.

### FAREWELL TO SCOTT GRAVES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I just came back from the organizing committee meeting with my good friend from California for the House Agriculture Committee. I appreciate the opportunity to work with the gentleman as well as all of the folks who serve on that committee that really provides policy to our Nation’s agriculture industry.

It is about making sure that Americans have access to affordable, high quality, and safe food. I actually look at the Agriculture Committee as well as having a dual mission of making sure that the rural economies of our Nation are robust or successful.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to say thank you and farewell to Scott Graves, staff director of the House Agriculture Committee, an individual who served well for many years.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, there is a right way to do business here in the House. Scott Graves has understood what it takes to manage the Agriculture Committee, the chairman’s personal affairs and agenda. But he also has found time to help out members of this committee from both sides of the aisle.

Knowing is one thing; execution is everything. I have always been impressed with the way we have been able to work on the committee in a bipartisan manner for the good of agriculture, and 320 million Americans have benefited from safety, innovation, and forward thinking of the agriculture industry.

Under Scott’s leadership, he made this look easy. Now, as he embarks upon the next step in his career, I wish Scott the healthiest, his wife, his little boy, and his little one to be born later this year.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has a slogan on every road sign entering the State, and the sign reads, “You’ve got a friend in Pennsylvania.” Well, I don’t have to travel far, but realize this holds true for me and all of my staff, you’ve got a friend in Pennsylvania.

### SNAP HELPS LIFT PEOPLE OUT OF POVERTY

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition for the 115th Congress, I am confident that we must work to ensure that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program known as SNAP is meeting the needs of those that it is intended to serve.

The House Agriculture Committee hearings have highlighted how nutrition matters and the specific ways that vulnerable populations are well served by a strong, sound, and reliable food program.

SNAP serves a diverse population who share a common need for nutritional support beyond what is available based on personal means, family support, and community resources.

Now, according to a 2015 USDA report, 42.7 percent of SNAP recipients are children, while single parent households are more susceptible to food insecurity, especially those who are single mothers. Two-parent families also struggle, at times, to put food on the table.

Children whose households face food insecurity, face both negative developmental and health consequences.

A child’s future success goes beyond what any single government program can or should provide. SNAP is not the only means of breaking the cycle of poverty, but it certainly plays a key role in increasing food security for children.

Mr. Speaker, for me, SNAP is not merely a food program, but a pathway that works to lift people out of poverty. It is a tool for the better health and development of our children who deserve no less.

### ALI FAMILY AND EXECUTIVE ORDER

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a 12-year-old girl Emon Ali, who is stuck in Djibouti. Emon and her father, Ahmed Ali, who is an American citizen, are in Djibouti because of President Trump’s flawed executive order to ban travel to the United States.

The Ali family is like many immigrant families throughout our country, including my own, who came to the United States in hopes of achieving the American Dream.

As Americans, we know that the Statue of Liberty is a symbol of freedom and new beginnings for immigrants past and present, and it is a symbol around the entire world for the values that America holds.

Since the founding of our country, immigrants from all over the world have been coming to the United States to make a better life for themselves and their families, or to escape persecution.

Mr. Ali and his wife immigrated to the United States and earned their U.S. citizenships in hopes of achieving that American Dream.

They had been making a living in my district and are supporting their two daughters in Los Banos, California. But they have also been living in sadness because their 12-year-old daughter, Emon, was born in Yemen before the civil war.

For 6 years, the Ali family has been working through the appropriate channels to get their daughter a visa so she could gain U.S. citizenship and be reunited with her family legally. On January 26, after years of going through a thorough vetting process, Emon finally received her immigrant visa after 6 years. You could call that extreme vetting.

One day later, on the 27th, President Trump turned the Ali family’s and hundreds of other families’ lives upside down by signing an executive order to impose a travel ban to prohibit refugees and others from coming to the United States. That is not the American way.

Hours after this executive order was signed, Emon and her father went to the airport in Djibouti to board a plane, planning to travel to the United States. That is not the American way.

The immigrant visa issued to Emon would have given her status as a lawful permanent resident upon entering the U.S. And since she is 12 years old and both of her parents are U.S. citizens, Emon would have immediately been eligible to file for U.S. citizenship.

President Trump’s executive order is preventing this legal process from taking place and is putting Emon and her father in harm’s way while they wait in Djibouti.

In the past 48 hours, the Trump administration has been defending this executive order, saying it is not a travel ban of a ban on refugees. So I would like to ask the President: How is this executive order not a ban on refugees or individuals who have been legally approved to enter the United States? It certainly is a ban for Emon. And how is keeping this 12-year-old girl out of the United States from joining her family making America safer? It is not making Americans safer.

Extreme vetting was in place during both the Bush and Obama administrations. We just didn’t call it that by name.

This travel ban is flawed, both in its lack of adherence to American values and its technical execution, which is banning Emon from coming here, and it would possibly be ruled unconstitutional.

A bipartisan group of national security experts agree that the executive order does not make Americans safer and could potentially put our country at greater risk for terrorist attacks. I agree with them.

Since September 11, 2001, we have focused a bipartisan effort to improve
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American security for Americans both at home and abroad, and by and large, it has been very successful.

It is our first constitutional duty to ensure the national defense and the safety of Americans, but I think President Trump’s executive order is doing the opposite. The executive order will create a rallying cry for Islamic extremists around the world to say that America is now engaged in a war against the religion of Islam. No good can come from that. It is clear that this executive order is putting Emom and her father in harm’s way in Djibouti.

So, Mr. President, Secretary Kelly, I appeal to your compassion and to your common sense. This 12-year-old girl, Emom, has been extremely vetted for 6 years or whatever you would like to call it. She is not a threat to our country. Let her join her American family.

My staff and I are working diligently through the appropriate channels with the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State to bring Mr. Ali and his daughter home as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

RECTIFICATION FOR MERRICK GARLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Beto O’Rourke) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in April of 1963, literary history was made when Dr. King published his letter from the Birmingham jail.

In that letter, Mr. Speaker, Dr. King proclaimed: “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.” Mr. Speaker, these words were true then and they are true today. Injustice anywhere is still a threat to justice everywhere.

And, Mr. Speaker, when the Republican leadership decided to hold up Merrick Garland, they did more than hold up a nominee. They did more than prevent him from being heard. They did more than approve him such that he could become a Justice on the Supreme Court. They did more than prevent President Obama from having the opportunity to appoint a nominee to the Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker.

When they held up Merrick Garland, they held his justice. They hijacked justice and prevented the American people from having the opportunity to hear of the credentials of Merrick Garland so that he could receive just consideration. They didn’t have to approve him. They had him by the sense of justice. They should have given him the opportunity to be heard.

They hijacked justice. When you hijack justice, this type of injustice cannot go unchecked. We cannot allow the legitimization of that hijacking to take place today.

If we move forward with the nominee being proposed by the Republican leadership by the President of the United States, this would be an effort not only to legitimize, it would legitimize the process that they employed to hijack justice.

I refuse to stand with those who would hijack justice. The American people refuse to stand with those who would hijack justice. The American people are demanding that a just system be in place.

The only way a just system can be in place is for what happened to Merrick Garland to be rectified. This is not retaliation that I am speaking of. This is not retaliation. This is rectification.

There has to be rectification for what happened to Merrick Garland, and rectification requires that the Senate take up Merrick Garland. I believe the American people want the Senate to take up Merrick Garland so that he, too, can receive justice; so that this country can receive justice; so that the American people can receive justice; so that they can hear about Merrick Garland’s credentials.

Yes, the current nominee has great credentials, Merrick Garland. There are many adjectives that can be used to describe the current nominee, but there are many great adjectives that can be utilized to describe Merrick Garland.

Merrick Garland deserves his day. Without his day, we cannot go forward in a just way. So I encourage the American people to do that which is just; contact those who have a voice in this and say to them: Do not approve any nominees that hijack the opportunity to appoint a nominee to the Supreme Court, hijacked a nomination, hijacked an opportunity. Hijacking cannot be tolerated.

Dr. King was right; injustice anywhere is still a threat to justice everywhere. But he also went on to say immediately thereafter that life is an “inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly.”

This hijacking that took place last year is going to impact all in this country indirectly because every person in this country will be subjected to the rulings of a Supreme Court with a nominee that will have an asterisk by his name because his opportunity exists as a result of a hijacking that took place.

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere, and we ought to realize that this injustice cannot be tolerated and must be rectified. It is not retaliation. It is rectification.

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

DO NOT DESTROY THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Ms. DeLauro. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share a story that has weighed heavy on my heart.

The President speaks about keeping America safe. He speaks about building a wall. He speaks about deporting undocumented immigrants. His rhetoric of hate and fear is causing millions of families unspeakable pain. This is happening in every community across our country and it is happening in my community.

I want to share a letter I received from one of my office’s most dedicated interns one week after the election. This young man was such a positive force in my office. He took on tasks with a smile. He had an instatiable appetite for learning about our government. He was one of the finest interns our office has ever seen.

I was proud to have him to be one of the people that the administration interacted with when they contacted our office. But a week after the election, this young man, Sergio, went home. He left me this letter, which I will read to you in its entirety because Sergio tells his own story better than I ever could:

“Dear Representative DeLauro:

“I was honored to intern in your Washington office and learn more about the government of the United States, and more specifically responding to constituents. I had the opportunity to walk through the long tunnels that connect the congressional buildings to the Capitol I began to envision myself working in the District of Columbia upon graduation. But like for many people, the election results have forced me to take a different path.

“After the Presidential election, all the stability that had allowed my family and me to become part of the American life was turned into fear and doubt about our future. Not only has the President-elect vowed to deport millions of undocumented immigrants, but he also promised to remove the DACA program. For this reason, I had to return to New Haven and assist my family as we figure out which decisions are the best to take moving forward. Thus, I am sorry to inform you that I will no longer be able to continue my internship in your Washington, D.C. office.

“I want to express that while I am in constant fear questioning whether I will be able to complete my undergraduate degree, or if my U.S.-citizen sister will be separated from us, I am not giving in. My best memory working in your office was running into an old employer who came to the office for a Capitol tour. Reflected on the aspirations I had working as a busser to get myself through high school, I remember your persona always providing me with hope. That hope has grown exponentially as I reminisce on the times you listened into the stories, welcomed all your interns with such gratitude and enthusiasm.

“With infinite gratitude, Sergio.”
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How does this promising young man’s fear make us safer? How can we stand idly by while his family navigates un-speakable anxiety and pain? How can we live with ourselves if we let these hateful policies stand?

Sergio is a bright young man dedicated to public service, and now he is a young man questioning his future and the future of his family. This story breaks my heart; it should break yours.

President Trump’s executive orders are not just anti-immigrant; they are anti-American. Most of our families, including my own, came to this country as immigrants.

My father came through Ellis Island in 1913 as an immigrant from Italy. He was in school, and he had to leave school in the seventh grade as he was 11 years old because his teachers and his classmates laughed at him.

He got himself an education, served his country in the United States military for 8 years, served on the City Council in New Haven, worked as hard as he could along with my mother, whose mother and father came from Italy before her. They scrimped and they saved to give me the finest education. And as an immigrant family, they could only dare dream that I would sit in the United States House of Representatives and be here today.

It is the American Dream. It is what this Nation is all about as we stand under this dome in this building, the seat of our democracy.

Do not let any individual, any political party destroy that American Dream. Our country is made richer by immigrants. We have always welcomed men, women, and children to our shores so that they can build a better life and build a stronger nation.

The President’s executive orders are an insult to our country’s roots and our values. Instead of unifying us, he threatens to further divide us.

I stand with Sergio and the millions of people like him whose futures are in flux because of this administration’s misguided policies.

Do not destroy the American Dream.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois for 5 minutes. Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of National Catholic Schools Week and to recognize the outstanding contributions that Catholic schools have made and continue to make to our Nation.

As a proud graduate of St. Symphorosa Grammar School and St. Ignatius College Prep and as a strong supporter of Catholic education, I have introduced H. Res. 57, honoring January 29th as National Catholic Schools Week. I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for working with me on this resolution and on other issues.

Following his Catholic faith, Mr. SMITH is one of our greatest defenders of freedom and human rights around the world.

This year marks the 43rd anniversary of Catholic Schools Week. Since 1974, Catholic Schools Week has celebrated the important role that these institutions play in America and their excellent reputation for providing a strong academic and moral education as well as teaching community responsibility and outreach.

This year’s theme, “Catholic Schools: Community of Faith, Knowledge, and Service,” highlights the values that are the centerpiece of a Catholic education.

Today, over 2 million elementary and secondary school students are enrolled in more than 5,400 Catholic schools. These students typically surpass their peers in math, science, reading, history, and geography in the NAEP test. The same is true for SAT scores. And the graduation rate for Catholic high school students is 90 percent, with 85 percent of graduates enrolling in a 4-year college. As we continually hear disturbing reports about our national test scores, these statistics are truly remarkable and should be commended.

Notably, the success of Catholic schools does not depend on selectivity. These academic achievements are realized by students from all walks of life. Catholic schools accept 98 percent of students who apply and are highly effective in providing a quality education to students from every socioeconomic category, especially the disadvantaged and underserved urban communities.

Over the past 30 years, the percentage of public school students enrolled in Catholic schools has more than doubled, and today they constitute about one-third of all Catholic school students. In times of economic hardship, Catholic schools can provide an affordable alternative to other forms of private education.

In addition to learning reading, writing, and arithmetic, students also learn responsibility and how to become persons of character and integrity. America’s Catholic schools produce graduates with the skills and integrity needed by our businesses, governments, and communities, emphasizing a well-rounded educational experience and instilling the values of giving back to the community and helping others. That is why “service” is in this year’s Catholic Schools Week theme. My own decision to pursue a career in public service was fostered, in part, by dedicated teachers throughout my formative years at Catholic schools.

I celebrated Catholic Schools Week last week at a number of schools in my district. I visited St. Barbara Grammar School, which is located in the Bridgeport neighborhood of Chicago. I met with Principal Nicole Nolazco and the student council, and I spoke to and took questions from an all-school assembly.

I visited Everest Academy in Lemont, where Principal Lori Broncato and Father Jason gave me a tour of the quickly growing school, and I answered questions from students before the whole school wowed me with an impressive version of the song, “America.”

Finally, I visited my alma mater, St. Symphorosa, in the Clearing neighborhood in Chicago. I met with Principal Kathy Berry and Father Idzi and spoke to students about my experiences at St. Sym and how my Catholic education made it possible for me to serve in the U.S. Congress. There are just three of the many wonderful Catholic schools in my district that are part of the Chicago Archdiocese and the Joliet Diocese.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating and thanking Catholic schools across the country, which provide first-class, well-rounded educations and contribute so much to our Nation.

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 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

We thank You that we are a nation fashioned out of diverse peoples and cultures, brought forth on this continent in a way not unlike the ancient people of Israel. As out of a desert, You led our American ancestors to this promised land where they declared their independence and constituted a new nation founded upon unalienable rights given to us by You, our Creator. Bless our Nation with wisdom, knowledge, and understanding, and bless the Members of this people’s House. Renew in us the adoption by Your Spirit that we may affirm our freedoms, not only with the conviction in the way we understand others, but in ourselves by actions proven beyond words.

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

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined The Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.
Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. DINGELL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

1 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will enter into 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

UNDOING JOB-KILLING REGULATIONS

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, many times, people ask me: Just what is it about regulations that kills jobs? That is what we are involved in this week is undoing some of those regulations. I will be introducing one today to unwind a regulation that the BLM recently put into place.

What happened is, over a year ago, for the first time in 40 years, we allowed Americans to export oil. We are diminishing the trade deficits—that is, we are making our economy stronger—by shipping to South American countries and to countries all over the world. It is good for American jobs. Then the BLM comes in and puts its onshore oil and gas order No. 3 rule, which will make it more difficult for us to produce oil off of public lands. It simply shouldn’t be there.

We are introducing legislation today that will reject that as a bureaucratic entanglement of job creation in the country. That is as simple as we could be. We look forward to the support of the Members of the House.

EXPAND AND STRENGTHEN SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week in 1940, the first Social Security check was issued. Since then, it has been one of our Nation’s most impactful and successful programs.

Social Security is based on a simple premise: if you work hard, you should live a dignified retirement. It has been a critical lifeline for America’s seniors, veterans of our armed forces, families pulled out of poverty because of this program.

In order for Social Security to continue to fulfill its promise, Congress and the administration need to work together. I am concerned that the new administration may wish to dismantle Social Security as we know it. The President’s choice for Budget Director has a long track record of calling for raises in the retirement age and of lowering Social Security benefit payouts. In 2011, when my Republican colleagues proposed cuts to Social Security, the nominee argued that the cuts were not rapid enough. This is unacceptable.

We cannot afford to weaken Social Security. We should expand and strengthen this program. We need to make Social Security more generous and increase the benefits so that today’s and tomorrow’s retirees get the dignified retirements that they have earned. This is also good for economic growth, higher wages, higher demand, higher economic growth, and opportunity.

MUSSLIM AND REFUGEE BAN

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give voice to my constituents and their families whose whose worlds have been turned upside down following President Trump’s executive order last Friday, which they feel is directed at Muslims. If American citizens, who have been flooded with calls, with messages; and no matter where I am in the district, people are scared and terrified.

I cannot convey to this House enough the feelings of individuals who have gone through a stringent vetting process, who hold green cards, who are official legal residents—in some cases, even citizens—who are afraid that someone is going to knock on their door at 3 a.m. and take and deport them from this country. They are real people.

The Detroit headlines are full today of stories of an Iraqi whose mother died, who had served with the military in Iraq, and was trying to bring his mother back. He is an American citizen. Another is a doctor whose wife is in Qatar and had taken her baby home—both here legally.

We all care about keeping this Nation safe. We also have to protect the fundamental pillars of our Constitution.

MIAMI LIGHTHOUSE DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

(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 to commend the Miami Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired, an amazing nonprofit service organization which is located in my congressional district, on its recent Diamond Anniversary Celebration of 85 years of service.

The Miami Lighthouse has served south Florida since 1931, offering essential programs and experiences for all of those who have visual impairments.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Vision Caucus, I understand the importance of the mission of the Miami Lighthouse: to provide vision rehabilitation, eye health services that promote independence, to collaborate with and train professionals, and to conduct research in related fields.

Mr. Speaker, organizations like the Miami Lighthouse form the backbone of our civil society.

Congratulations to my dear friend Virginia Jacko and all of the staff and many volunteers of the Miami Light- house as they continue their life-changing work into their 86th year.
TRUMP WHITE HOUSE’S POLICIES

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give voice to millions of Illinoisans who are outraged by President Trump and his disastrous first week in office. He has already managed to achieve a 50 percent disapproval rating. Here is a recap of his first week:

He closed the White House telephone line, has attacked the health of millions of families and started the process to repeal the ACA—something that experts estimate will kill 43,000 Americans a year, has put politicians and politics between women and their ability to make their own healthcare choices.

His Cabinet is stocked with a foreclosure king, a billionaire lobbyist, and someone rejected from the Federal bench for racially charged rhetoric.

He capped off last week with the unconstitutional and un-American Muslim ban that makes us less safe. It was so awful that it achieved bipartisan condemnation. Even our allies are starting to retreat from us. More than a million U.K. citizens signed a petition to keep President Trump from visiting.

As we face new and emerging threats, can we afford to allow this administration to alienate us from long-held allies? Mr. Speaker, it is time to get serious about the Trump White House’s policies.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING CHIEF SPECIAL WARFARE OPERATOR RYAN OWENS

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to honor Ryan Owens, a Navy SEAL from Peoria, Illinois—my hometown—who paid the ultimate sacrifice for his country over the weekend in Yemen.

Ryan Owens, with his elite counter-terrorism unit, SEAL Team Six, was fatally wounded during a night raid against al Qaeda in Yemen. The Department of Defense reported that the raid was a success but that the price was steep, which was not in vain and that evil we face as we wage the war against terrorism.

My thoughts and prayers are with Ryan’s grieving family this week: his father, his wife, and his children. I pray that they will take comfort in knowing that his death was not in vain and that neighbors, community, and Nation are joining them in mourning his death and in remembering his life. Ryan Owens will be posthumously awarded with the Purple Heart.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would ask the House rise in a moment of silence to pay tribute to Navy SEAL Ryan Owens for his exceptional service to our country.

STOP THE MUSLIM AND REFUGEE BAN

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, just hours before President Trump’s inauguration, I met a young woman in my district from Djibouti who was named Fozia. Fozia had worked with our military as an interpreter. She came to the United States for the freedom and safety she could not find in her home country; but as a Muslim and immigrant, the rhetoric she heard during the election made her question whether she was welcome here.

Since President Trump has issued his backdoor ban on Muslim immigrants and a halt on all refugees, I have thought of Fozia often as well as thousands of other refugees and asylees who have undergone arduous journeys and thorough vetting to make Maine their home.

These good people have enriched our State in many ways—raising families and filling a vital need in our aging workforce. They live in New England cities with French names that were built by Irish laborers, reminders of the many generations of immigrants who came here for a better life and who helped make our country great.

President Trump’s order is likely unconstitutional, but without a doubt, it is un-American. This Congress is guilty of the same sin if we don’t do everything in our power to stop it.

PRESIDENT’S EFFORTS ARE BEING DISTORTED

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, approximately 58 percent of the people who voted for Mr. Trump in November can accurately say he lied to get by on $4 or less a day. This means roughly 4 billion of the 7 billion in the world are living in extreme or very great poverty.

If we simply opened our borders, probably several hundred million would come here over the next 2 or 3 years. Our entire infrastructure—our schools, hospitals, jails, sewers, roads—in fact, our entire economy could not handle it. This means roughly 4 billion of the 7 billion in the world are living in extreme or very great poverty.

We have allowed far more immigration than any other country over the last 50 years—many millions. No other country has even come close. But we must enforce our immigration laws.

The great majority of the American people want border security. President Trump’s immigration order was not a Muslim ban. It did not even apply to 9 of the 10 largest population Muslim countries.

The President’s efforts are being completely distorted. He is simply trying to do what the people want.

TRUMP’S IMMIGRATION POLICIES POPULAR

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for days the media has saturated the news with stories savaging President Trump for his immigration executive order.

The President wants to protect Americans by temporarily halting the admission of refugees from seven countries considered security threats to the United States.

Despite the media’s heavily biased coverage, the American people still agree with the President. A USA Today poll found that 53 percent support “registering immigrants from Muslim-majority countries.” Only 41 percent oppose it.

Even the poll was slanted against the President. The question asked implied that all Muslim-majority countries were affected, which is not true. It also used the word “register,” which has negative connotations and besides is not accurate.

A more factual question that inquired about stricter vetting of refugees from the seven countries that pose security risks likely would have garnered even more support for the President’s executive actions.

The media did everything they could to turn the public against the President, but it didn’t work. The American people are smarter than the media thinks.

REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

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

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support a permanent repeal of the medical device tax.

The more than 7,000 medical device companies in the United States contributed hundreds of billions of dollars to our economy every year, employing over 400,000 Americans and creating lifesaving technologies that benefit patients around the world.

Many of these device manufacturers are based in my district in and around Warsaw, Indiana, and we are proud that Warsaw is often called the orthopedic capital of the world.

The vast majority of medical device manufacturers employ fewer than 50
people, with many generating little to no sales revenue. This is what makes the potential reinstatement of the 2.3 percent excise tax on medical device sales so harmful. This misguided tax would subject the medical device industry to one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world and eliminate thousands of jobs.

Repealing this tax has broad, bipartisan support in both Chambers of Congress, and I urge my colleagues to make eliminating this tax a top legislative priority in 2017.

RECOGNIZING CHANCELLOR KEITH CARVER

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

Mr. KUSTOFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chancellor Keith Carver and celebrate his appointment as chancellor of the University of Tennessee at Martin.

I have known Dr. Carver for more than 30 years, and I could not think of anyone more deserving of this prestigious role. We met during college at the University of Mississippi. And during that time, I was always impressed by his energy, his creativity, and his focus. Most importantly, he was and certainly still is an incredibly strong leader; and that is the most important part.

I believe that Dr. Carver is the right person at the right time—a time when this university needs strong, responsible leadership.

I am so excited for the town of Martin, for the University of Tennessee system, and the entire Volunteer State in this prosperous new era under Dr. Carver’s strong leadership. I can’t wait to see what great things we can accomplish together.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 41, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 40, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 71 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 71

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 41) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to “Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers”: All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sic. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 40) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Cостello of Pennsylvania). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying resolutions.

Before us is a resolution of disapproval that restores constitutional rights and empowers individuals with disabilities. Many of us know someone who struggles with a disability. We know friends or family who have mental challenges. We know these people, and we know they deserve the same constitutional protections as everyone else.

That is why this resolution is so important. It ends discrimination against individuals with disabilities. It restores due process rights of court-appointed Social Security Administration judges.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration’s last-minute regulation to strip disability benefit recipients of their constitutional rights is deeply troubling.

The regulation at hand declares that just because an individual needs assistance in managing their disability benefits, they are also unfit to own a firearm. But this kind of thinking is discriminatory, forcing those with disabilities to choose between their constitutional rights or their disability benefits turns back the clock on disability rights.

This regulation singles out a single constitutional right to strip away from a group of Americans. It doesn’t make sense.

Why take away one right and not others? Why not also strip those citizens of the right to vote or the right to trial by jury or the right to free speech?

In this country, your rights can’t be limited without due process. This regulation limits a constitutional right and only offers the recourse of appeal after the decision has been made. When it is easier to have your rights stripped away than to have them restored, it means your due process rights have also died in the process.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution restores the due process rights of individuals with disabilities. This resolution also protects the Social Security Administration. The agency’s job is to administer benefits to Americans, not adjudicate cases concerning constitutional rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am also worried that this resolution will divert precious Social Security Administration resources from vital agency tasks. We trust the agency to fulfill our commitments to seniors and those with disabilities. This regulation distracts from those sacred promises.

I thank Mr. Johnson and my colleagues for their hard work on this resolution. We need to pass it.

Mr. Speaker, we also need to pass the joint resolution of disapproval for the Dodd-Frank section 1504 regulation. This resolution restores competitiveness to American energy companies. It allows American companies to comply with foreign and domestic laws, and it protects American energy companies to report their payments to foreign and domestic governments. And the actual cost of compliance is projected to be less than 0.5 percent of revenue for domestic companies and less than 1 percent for foreign companies.

Section 1504 of Dodd-Frank requires companies to report their payments to our government or foreign governments related to oil, natural gas, and mineral extraction. After reporting this to the SEC, the agency publishes these disclosures. This process is costly and unfair to American businesses. By forcing disclosure of project-level sensitive business information, American energy companies will face a disadvantage against government-owned energy companies. Since government-owned companies control three-quarters of the world’s oil supply, this regulation could drastically impair the competitiveness of American companies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time expired, making the point of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution replaces Section 1504 of Dodd-Frank with a 3-year pilot program. It allows American energy companies to comply with foreign laws and build trust with foreign governments.

There is no time constraint on the pilot program. This resolution also淄 华尔街日报
Mr. Speaker, today's legislation is only a few weeks old, and we have already ushered in a process that is alarmingly restrictive. Sadly, it has become routine in this House for the majority to close down the process, rush bills through the House without regular order, enforce the rules for Democrats but not for Republicans, and insist on spending all of our time on partisan legislation instead of working together to find bipartisan compromises and solutions to the real problems facing American families and workers.

Mr. Speaker, today's legislation makes clear that the Republicans are eager to repeal protections put in place to help the American people. We should be working to expand opportunity for hardworking families and strengthen safeguards to put the American people first, not corporations, not wealthy CEOs, not big donors, and not special interests, but the people ought to come first.

It is intended to save lives. Every year in the United States, more than 21,000 people kill themselves, and mental illness is also an important factor. A gun is used in the majority of these cases. There are 75,000 dealing with the most severe mental illness. These are people who need help, not access to a dangerous weapon like a gun.

I think this rule is a critical step, but we must close the online gun show loopholes, and we must ensure universal background checks. I think we ought to bring to the floor a bill that says that if the FBI and our security agencies have put you on a terrorist watch list and tell you that you are too dangerous to fly on an airplane or buy a gun, you ought not to be able to go out and buy a gun.

But under the way this House is run, we do not even put those things to the floor for a debate. The Republican leadership and the Republican Rules Committee blocks it so that there can't be real deliberation on the House floor.

But rather than just ask people about the time, why can't you have a debate on this? Why can't you have a vote on it? I have to explain to the House Rules Committee, run by nine Republicans, says
no to everything, says no to every idea that they don't absolutely embrace. And that is not the way Congress should be run.

Mr. Speaker, even if you disagree with me on the value of this rule, I think that enough interest that there ought to have been hearings. There ought to have been that opportunity to deliberate and to talk about it and what the impacts are. But no, nothing. We don't have the time. So here we are.

Mr. Speaker, the other bill before us is a naked attempt by Republicans to undo anticorruption rules. The rule that they are so upset about would require energy companies on the U.S. stock exchange to disclose payments they make to foreign governments for access to their natural resources.

Now, there are reasons for this. It is important that there be transparency. We heard all about the plans to drain the swamp, but President Trump and the Bush administration are doing all they can to turn the swamp into a cesspool.

Putting aside all of his conflicts of interest that I think, are on a collision course with corruption, I mean, revealing things like this, is just a bad idea. The House and Senate are trying to roll back regulations like this one that are aimed at increasing transparency and fighting corruption.

ExxonMobil heavily lobbied against this rule. And now, with former ExxonMobil CEO Rex Tillerson on the cusp of becoming our country's new Secretary of State, Republicans are proposing to kill this anticorruption rule that benefits Big Oil. That is reckless, and it is irresponsible.

When this rule was enacted as part of the Dodd-Frank bill in 2010, the Big Oil lobbies strongly fought against it in court, but Congress fought back to assert America's traditional role as a global leader in fighting corruption. America delivered results. The European Union promptly moved to enact nearly identical legislation, as did Canada with support of its global mining companies.

But now, Big Oil is back seeking repeal of the rule so their payments can be kept secret from the American people. They claim they will be at a competitive disadvantage to foreigners, or they will have to reveal commercially sensitive information.

But the European Union and Canada in the same disclosure system, the playing field is now level and the companies already filing have suffered no commercial harm, nor revealed vital secrets. The fact is, this won't cost a single American job, and the only thing oil companies will need to do differently is report their numbers.

Aside from Big Oil, those most eager to repeal this rule are automakers in places like Russia, Iran, and Venezuela, oil wells, gas fields, or copper mines, and who's watching the money secret from their citizens. Why should we do their bidding? Why should we be in league with them?

On top of that, this rule is our most affordable and effective way to fight corruption abroad. We cannot afford to betray our own principles and severely undercut our allies in Europe and Canada. It would cost countless lives over the long run and endanger our security. We need to put American interests first, ahead of the special interests, ahead of the corporate interests, and retain that important rule.

Obviously, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the repeal of these two rules. Vote yes on what you got to do. But I urge you to vote “no” on this rule.

And I ask you to vote “no” because it should be a principle vote.

This place is becoming so closed up, so restrictive, that this is not a deliberative body anymore. We are not talking about things anymore. It is basically whatever the leadership wants, whatever Donald Trump wants, you bring to the floor, rubber stamp it, and that's it.

I don't care what political party you are in, nobody who got elected by the people of this country should stand for that kind of process.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate my colleague from Massachusetts raising the issue of a thoughtful process and whether this legislation was rushed to the floor.

I think it is worth noting that the original legislation, which this rule seeks to amend, became law in a time when my colleague was in the House and his party was in the majority. The NCIS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 was introduced in the House on June 11, 2007.

The bill was moved by Congressman CONEYERS under suspension of the rules and passed by the House on June 13, 2007. There was no markup in the Judiciary Committee. There was no meaningful debate on the floor. The bill was rammed through the House in 3 days without any thought to the potential consequences of its passage. It passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

I did not see others standing up to leadership at that point in time. In its implementation, we are seeing the consequences. They involve the stripping away of constitutional rights and due process. They involve the elimination of due process rights. They involve discrimination against individuals with disabilities.

As for the point that this rule that we are now debating somehow encourages corruption, the fact is that this regulation puts U.S. companies at a competitive disadvantage to state-owned entities abroad that are not subject to SEC regulation.

Additionally, it costs hundreds of millions of dollars in compliance costs for U.S. businesses. The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act already prohibits bribes to foreign governments to obtain or retain business. These are legitimate payments being made to foreign governments, the payments that we are discussing here, and we should still prosecute any corruption to the full extent of the law.

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

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

With regard to the NICS bill, I have a very different version of history than the gentleman does, including one that represents a bipartisan compromise with the Bush White House.

So I have a very, very different recollection of history than he does on that. And on the other bill, it is all about corruption, and it is all about giving Big Oil what they want.

At the end of the day, the two interests that are most happy with the repeal of this rule are Big Oil and Russia. And if that is where we believe that we ought to be using our energy to help then go ahead and vote to repeal it. Again, I think that this process speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and, if they do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative LOFGREN’s bill to overturn and defend President Trump’s immoral, unconstitutional, and discriminatory executive order banning Syrian refugees and suspending immigration from certain countries.

President Trump’s executive order flies in the face of our Nation’s values. It compromises our national security by providing terrorist groups with a recruiting tool. This executive order needs to be overturned, and, if we defeat the previous question, we will bring up legislation to do just that.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote against this previous question so that the bill to overturn President Trump’s ill-advised ban on travel can be addressed.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote against this previous question so that the bill to overturn President Trump’s ill-advised ban on travel can be addressed.

There has been a lot of dustup and discussion about this, but, really, if you read the order, it is very clear what it does. It suspends entry for 90 days of all immigrants—that is green card holders—and nonimmigrants from seven Muslim majority countries. It also suspends all refugee admission for 120 days.

There has been a lot of discussion about the Middle East refugees, but if you look at last year, most of the refugees who came in were from the Congo and
also from Burma. Those individuals who have suffered—they have been tor-tured—are going to stay in the refugee camps at least for 120 days, and, obvi-ously, this disrupts the program. This will be a much longer end to the refu-gee program.

Now, there is an exception, and the President has said he wants to let Christian refugees in, and the order itself says minority religions. There is a problem not only with violating the law because the Immigration and Na-tionality Act prohibits discrimination based on nationality and on religion, but also the premise is that Christians who had been persecuted were not ad-mitted as refugees. That is simply false. That is false. There were large numbers of refugees who have been per-sented, including Christians. This order violates the Immigration and Na-tionality Act. It also violates the Con-stitution. That is why my bill should be brought up.

I am going to give you just two exam-ples. One is General Talib al-Kenani, who is an Iraqi four-star general who is commanding an elite, American-trained counterterrorism unit that has led the fight against ISIS for the last 2 years and who children were moved to the United States because staying in Iraq was too unsafe for them. He is now unable to visit his family in the United States. He told CBS News: "We thought we were partners with the American friends, and now we realize we are just considered terrorists."

How does this help the fight against ISIS?

I want to give you another example. Remember the Yazidis? The Yazidis were being persecuted by ISIS. We re-member that they had been isolated at the top of a mountain in Syria; and when President Obama was in office, he ac-ted. We bombed ISIS and we saved the Yazidis. And now is what Mr. Obama said: "When we have the unique capabilities to avert a massacre, then I believe the United States of America cannot turn a blind eye. We can act, carefully and responsibly, to prevent a potential act of genocide. That's what we're doing on that mountain."

I mention this because there is an in-dividual, a Yazidi woman, who had been the only Yazidi person—woman—in the Iraqi parliament, Vian Dakhil. One week after the President's an-nouncement, she was injured in a heli-copter crash during a mission to de-liver humanitarian aid to the Yazidis who were trapped in the siege by ISIS. She has received awards in London, in Dubai, in Vienna, and in Geneva for her hu-man rights work. Ironically, she was sup-posed to come to Washington, D.C., next week to come to the U.S. Capitol to receive an award from the Tom Lan-tos Human Rights Commission. Now, we remember our late colleague, Tom Lantos, a member of Congress, who survived the Nazi concentration camps, and we have established this humanitarian prize in his memory.

This valiant woman now can't come to Washington, to the U.S. Congress, to receive the Tom Lantos Human Rights Prize because of President Trump's ban on individuals coming from Syria.

This is a ridiculous situation. It is il-legal. It is unconstitutional, it is con-trary to our rules, and it doesn't make any sense. So I would hope that we can defeat this previous question and that we can do something responsible: stand up for the rule of law, stand up for the Constitution, stand up for the common sense, and over-turn this executive order.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Does the gentleman have any other speakers?

Mr. BUCK. I am waiting for one. I do not have a speaker now, but the gentle-man's eloquence would be welcome at this point and any way that the gentle-man would like to inform us on im-portant issues.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, as my distin-guished colleague, Ms. LOFGREN, stat-ed, we want to defeat the previous question because we are horrified, quite frankly, by the trumping that President Trump's executive orders on immigration have had on a lot of good, decent people, many of whom have al-ready been vetted. We have students who have been held up who have stu-dents who have been hurt. We have peo-ple who have been caught up in this mess, and we have people coming to get human rights prizes. I could go on and on and on, but we need to correct this. We are better than this.

I would suggest to my Republican friends, rather than circling the wag-ons to try to defend the indefensible, they ought to join with us and defeat the previous question so that we can actually do the right thing and over-turn this trumping, misguided, and discriminatory policy.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gen-tleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues, the gen-tleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who sits on the Rules Committee, and Mr. BUCK, who is handling this first rule as a mem-ber of the Rules Committee today. Mr. BUCK is from Windsor, Colorado. He is a second-term Member and is doing an awesome job not only on his homework duties of recognizing how important it is for Members to understand what we are talking about, but we are doing things, but also enunciation of rules that we are talking about that were promulgated by an administration.

Mr. Speaker, what we are really here today to talk about is there are some of those rules and regulations where perhaps you didn't go through the process that you should have or where there was really a determination made by the American people that rule-making goes too far. That is why we are here today. We are here today because there is a group of rules that were promulgated that don't work and that did not really come to the committee, so our committee—the balance of what we are going to be in it for the American people. So, in particular, we are here to talk about a Social Security rule that discriminates against individuals with disabilities by denying them their con-stitutional rights.

Mr. MCGOVERN, spoke very clearly about a meeting that we had at the Rules Committee. I think that the witnesses that we had were very specific and that they ques-tioned—including Mr. BUCK, who was most active in his participation in the hearing—to work through the rule that is promulgated but doesn't make sense when you evaluate it. The administra-tion chose to, I think, without due process, take away from a person based using a disability being to do with their ability to effectively con-trol a weapon, but based upon other criteria and to take away a person's Second Amendment rights.

We oppose that. That is one of the reasons why we are here today. This rule that we are going to take away wrongly discriminates against those receiving disability benefits and, I be-lieve, falsely promulgates a stereotype against individuals with mental illness, calling them dangerous. There are peo-ple who do have mental illnesses, there are people who are struggling in life, and there are people who need help and seek help; but that is not a criteria for taking away a person's constitutional right.

We are joined in what we believe by the National Council on Disability. This is what they said in a letter that they sent that was dated January 21 of this year: "There is, simply put, no nexus between the ability to manage money and the ability to safely and re-sponsibly own, possess, or use a fire-arm. This arbitrary linkage not only unnecessarily and unreasonably de-prives individuals with disabilities of a constitutional right, it increases the stigma for those who, due to their dis-abilities, may need a representative payee...."

So what happened is the rule by the administration linked together these characteristics that they think iden-tify a person as but a risk so they take away their constitutional right. We couldn't really relate to anybody that had done this, but it simply sounded like a good idea, I am sure, to people, and that is what they did.

Mr. MCGOVERN. We are not trying to right all wrongs at the Rules Com-mittee, but when you take away somebody's constitutional rights and take advantage of a person because of their disability, I don't think that is fair. I am proud of what Mr. BUCK is doing here. I am proud that we stood up on this issue, and I am pleased to be on the floor not only to support Mr. BUCK,
but people who also live in the congres-
sional district that I represent in Dal-
las, Texas. I have received several calls
from people. While I will not say their	names, they live in Dallas, Texas; Gar-
land, Texas; Wylie, Texas; and Rowlett,
Texas; and they are worried about their
utility bills, their constitutio-
nal rights simply because they have
some help in managing their affairs but
not related to a constitutional right of
owning a weapon.

So I am pleased to do this. There is
no grandstanding necessary. There is
an understanding of some things that
can be written properly and some
things that can’t, and I simply think
they got it wrong, and that is what we
are going to do here today. I thank the
gentleman, Mr. Buck, for allowing me
the chance to speak on this important
issue.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I ask
the gentleman from Colorado if he has
additional speakers or is that the
chairman standing up on this issue.

Mr. Buck. Mr. Speaker, I yield a few
comments before I close, and then I
would like to recognize the chairman
for additional comments.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I re-
sert the balance of my time.

Mr. Buck. Mr. Speaker, I yield my-
self such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of
the Rules Committee for being here
today and just reinforce some of what
the chairman had to say.

As I travel Colorado, I hear from in-
dividuals of all walks of life about the
regulatory burdens that they face, the
burden that has been placed upon them
by their own government and how those
burdens have impeded their life, liberty,
and certainly pursuit of hap-
iness. Small-business owners who
would not open their business today because of
the change in the business climate
find that their tax burden, their regula-
tory burden, and the attitude of Fed-
eral and state such that they could
choose a different path had they had to
do it all over again.

I talked to school administrators
who are, again, facing a pile of paper-
work to comply with school and nutri-
tional rights simply because they have
some help in managing their affairs but
not related to a constitutional right
of owning a weapon.
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some help in managing their affairs but
not related to a constitutional right
of owning a weapon.
RALPH ABRAHAM, for sponsoring this joint resolution. I would also like to point out that my colleague from Colorado is a member of the Second Amendment Caucus, and he has been working hard on this issue.

H.R. 784 would strike down a rule that was finalized by the Social Security Administration just days before the close of the 114th Congress. This rule is yet another example of the previous administration’s last-ditch efforts to attack our Second Amendment rights.

Any attempt to curtail the right of Americans to defend themselves and their liberty is untenable. This scheme is particularly appalling because of whom it targets and how the administration sought to implement the rule.

The rule targets our grandparents, our elderly mothers and fathers who have been awarded disability benefits and have had a family member or guardian appointed to handle their finances. These men and women have worked hard to raise families, worked a job, and paid their fair share of taxes. Now they are being told that, in order to receive their Social Security benefits, they must first surrender the fundamental right to defend themselves. Is this the level of pettiness to which we have sunk?

The House and the American people have soundly rejected gun control in all of its forms year after year; yet this last administration bypassed the legislative process, imposed a rule, and completely disregarded due process in order to strip seniors of their constitutional rights. Our seniors deserve better than that.

This rule is not about protecting anyone. This rule should be seen for what it truly is: awful, politically motivated, and a dangerous infringement on our Second Amendment rights.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am closing. I am not sure where to begin, because I have heard so many fascinating things here today.

The distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee said we are here today to enunciate these rules. I don’t know what there is to enunciate. The only thing to enunciate is this is a closed rule. It is yet another closed rule. There is no opportunity to have any real deliberation, no real discussion. On top of that, there were no hearings on any of this stuff.

No matter what your position is, I have to be honest with you, listening to the gentleman, Mr. MASSIE, just speak. I think it would have been nice if the Judiciary Committee could have actually had a hearing on this and maybe delved into some of the issues that the gentleman raised.

When people say that there is no due process, I would remind them that, under this rule, beneficiaries are notified that this determination is being considered and they are provided a process to challenge that determination. Should the Social Security Administration determine that that record or possession is not regulated, their firearms are restored and the person’s name is removed from NICS. That is what it says.

Now, if there is a way to improve this, I am all for improving it; but by passing this measure here today, you prevent the agencies that are impacted here from ever being able to revisit the issue unless Congress deemed it appropriate.

So we are not trying to fix anything here. Basically, what we are doing is the bidding of the National Rifle Association in an effort aimed at protecting people from gun violence in this country.

The gentleman from Colorado talked about the fact that his constituents want the right to protect their rights for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Well, my constituents want that, too, but they have a right to not have to be victims of gun violence. They have a right to protect their loved ones who may use a weapon against themselves or their family members.

But again, we can have this argument on whether or not we should do more—and I believe we should—to protect people in this country from gun violence, but that discussion ought to have happened in the Judiciary Committee, at a minimum, not in the Rules Committee. I am on the Rules Committee. I admire the intellect of everybody on the Rules Committee, but our expertise is not on judiciary matters.

Similarly, on the other rule that is being repealed, the Financial Services Committee should have deliberated on that. I think there are some serious issues raised by repealing that rule, issues that I think go to the heart of corruption not only here in the United States, but around the world.

When the chairman of the Rules Committee got up and gave his description that somehow the U.S. oil companies are only being singled out, it makes my case why we should have had a hearing. What he just said, in my opinion, does not reflect reality.

The fact of the matter is, I looked at section 1504 of Dodd-Frank. It doesn’t just require all extractive companies in the U.S. It says that all extractive companies, U.S. and foreign, listed on the NYSE or NASDAQ, must publicly disclose the payments they make to governments for oil, gas, and mining resources.

And then, on top of that—and I said this earlier—is that other countries have followed suit. Canada and the European Union and Norway have all passed similar laws. It is not just the United States being singled out. That is just wrong. Maybe, if we had a hearing on the committee, that would have been clear, and this wouldn’t be a point of contention.

The fact of the matter is, it is a simple reporting requirement. It places no limits now restrict the companies can pay money to or how much or for what. It has absolutely no regulatory effect on any aspect of their business operations. There is absolutely no benefit to nullifying this commonsense law unless your objective is to make it easier for corrupt elites to steal money. The rule has no regulatory impact on business operation and does not define illegal or improper payments. It is a simple reporting requirement.

There is a problem with corruption, especially in places like Russia. Now, I know with the new administration, Russia is now in, and we are all supposed to say nice things about Russia. But Russia has a terrible record on human rights, and Russia has a terrible record when it comes to corruption, and we know that. We ought to not just cave to everything that Russia wants, and Russia and Big Oil want this repealed.

So I would say to my colleagues that we can argue about the merits of all of this, and that is fine, but I go back to my original point. This is the rule, and the Speaker of the House talked about the importance of regular order. I have heard my colleagues talk about the importance of regular order. We don’t have regular order. You are all out of order. We end up coming to the floor with legislation that is always under restrictive processes, and most of the time, in this instance, it is completely closed rules. That doesn’t just disadvantage Democratic lawmakers who may have some ideas or may want to raise some issues, it disadvantages Republicans who may want to come to the floor with thoughtful ideas.

I urge my colleagues to absolutely vote “no” on this rule because, again, we are getting into this habit where it is closed, closed, closed, closed, closed, and it undermines the integrity of this House of Representatives. It really is shameful.

Finally, I will urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so that we can have a debate and a vote on overturning President Trump’s awful, discriminatory executive orders on immigration. It jeopardizes our national security. It was carelessly implemented, carelessly put together. It is shameful. It is unconscionable that we are confronted with the mess that we are confronted with.

I know it is uncomfortable to talk about issues that impact the new President who is of your party, but this
is absolutely the right thing to do. And if you want to vote no on these things, vote no on them, but allow us to have the debate and allow us to have the vote. I urge “no” on the previous question and “no” on the rule.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Kentucky for their remarks, and I appreciate the insightful remarks from the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am troubled right now. I am struggling to remember—as the gentleman describes Russia with its terrible record on human rights. I am trying to remember exactly who it was who had the reset button with Vladimir Putin, and I don’t think it was the Trump administration. I could be wrong.

Mr. Speaker, America has come so far in advancing the rights of those with disabilities. We have also fought long and hard to protect our constitutional rights. The rule before us achieves both of those ends. The Obama administration’s last-ditch effort to strip constitutional rights from individuals with disabilities must not stand. We also cannot stand for regulations that place American companies at a disadvantage and place their workers at risk.

The rule before us will undo the costly and dangerous reporting requirements placed on America’s energy companies operating abroad. When we repeal this outdated regulation on American energy companies, they can again fully contribute to the world’s energy economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule and the underlying measures.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule governing debate on H.J. Res. 40, and the underlying legislation, because in a nation that leads the civilized world in deaths by gun violence, the last thing we should be doing is making it easier for persons suffering from a very severe, long-term, mental disorder that makes them incapable of managing their financial benefits and unable to do any kind of work in the U.S. economy, even part-time or at very low wages to obtain deadly firearms.

The Republicans have brought to the floor this week a Congressional Review Act (CRA) of Disapproval to overturn Social Security Administration (SSA) regulations to comply with existing federal law governing the submission of national Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS). H.J. Res. 40, would vacate an important rule issued by the Social Security Administration implementing the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007.

That legislation adopted in the wake of the tragic mass shooting at Virginia Tech, requires federal agencies to report to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) records of individuals who are statutorily prohibited from purchasing or possessing firearms.

The statute was enacted with bipartisan support, and we should stand together to defend efforts to see that it is fully implemented. Let us be clear what a submission vote on this legislation is about: the Republican’s goal is to weaken our firearms background check system. The shootings at Virginia Tech in April 2007 presented the deadliest shooting rampage in U.S. history. On April 16 2007, the violence began around 7:15 a.m., ending in the deaths of 32 students and teachers after being gunned down on the campus of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University by Seung Hui Cho, a student, who later died from a self-inflicted gunshot wound. Only four months prior, on December 13, 2005, Cho had been ordered by a judge to seek outpatient care after making suicidal remarks to his roommates and was subsequently evaluated at Carlton-St. Albans’ mental health facility.

On February 9, 2007, Cho picked up a Walther P-22 pistol that he purchased online, just days before, on February 2 from an out-of-state dealer at JND Pawn shop in Blacksburg, across the street from Virginia Tech.

In March of 2007, Cho purchased a 9mm Glock pistol and 50 rounds of ammunition from Roanoke Firearms for 571 dollars. The attack, resulting from these preventable actions, left 30 people dead and another 17 wounded.

In all, 27 students and five faculty members died as a result of the actions of a known mentally unstable individual who was nonetheless allowed to purchase a firearm. On December 14, 2012, Lenny Pozner dropped off his three children, Sophia, Arielle, and Noah, at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut.

Noah had recently turned 6, and on the drive over they listened to his favorite song, for what turned out to be the last time. Half an hour later, while Sophia and Arielle hid nearby, Adam Lanza walked into Noah’s first-grade class with an AR–15 rifle. Noah was the youngest of the 20 children and seven adults killed in one of the deadliest shootings in American history.

Depending on whom you ask, there were twenty-six, twenty-seven, or twenty-eight victims in Newtown. It is twenty-six if you count only those who were murdered at Sandy Hook Elementary School; twenty-seven if you include Nancy Lanza—Adam’s own mother; twenty-eight once Adam turned the gun on himself. There were twenty-six stars on the local fire-house roof.

On the anniversary of the shootings, the governor of Connecticut asked churches to ring their bells twenty-six times. Americans have spoken and they are outraged by the callous, needless gun related deaths claiming the lives of the children.

To ensure the continued safety of American families, the Gun Control Act of 1968 prohibits certain categories of individuals from possessing firearms, including those who, using outdated terminology, are “adjudicated as a mental defective.” (This is referred to as the “federal mental health prohibitor.”) The 1993 Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act requires federally licensed firearms dealers to run background checks on prospective gun purchasers through NICS. NICS includes records from various databases on individuals who are prohibited by law from purchasing and possessing firearms. In response to the mass shootings at Virginia Tech, prior to which the shooter’s mental health prohibitor should have been, but was not, reported to NICS, Congress in 2007 unanimously approved legislation to adopt the NICS Improvement Amendments Act. As senior member of the House Committees on Judiciary and Homeland Security and Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations, I supported the 2016 Social Security Administration (SSA) rule, which committed the SSA to submit records to the gun background check system for social security recipients prohibited from possessing guns due to severe mental illness.

It is a critical process for enforcing the law that bars prohibited people from passing background checks and purchasing firearms. The only way we are going to prevent guns from getting into the hands of people who should not have them, people who pose a known and documented danger to themselves and others, is through a system based on robust, accurate and complete information. In response to the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 1994 and the rule issued by the Social Security Administration, I supported the 2016 Social Security Administration (SSA) rule, which committed the SSA to submit records to the gun background check system for social security recipients prohibited from possessing guns due to severe mental illness.

It is a critical process for enforcing the law that bars prohibited people from passing background checks and purchasing firearms. The only way we are going to prevent guns from getting into the hands of people who should not have them, people who pose a known and documented danger to themselves and others, is through a system based on robust, accurate and complete information. Under the regulation, only individuals with the most severe mental impairments, who are (1) unable to earn any income due to their mental incapacity, and (2) have been found incapable of managing their own benefits meet the NICS reporting system criteria: those individuals who are prohibited by law from purchasing or possessing firearms to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).

NICS therefore, has been missing records for those prohibited individuals. NICS is only as good as the records it contains.

With those records missing from the system, these individuals are able to pass a background check and complete a purchase even though they are legally prohibited from purchasing guns under longstanding federal law. The SSA regulation closes this gap by committing the agency to begin submitting prohibiting records into the gun background check system. The rule does not impact any beneficiaries who are not already prohibited under law, and does not impact people based on disability findings that have been made prior to the rule taking effect.

Americans have spoken and they are outraged by the callous, needless gun related deaths claiming the lives of the children.

Under the regulation, only individuals with the most severe mental impairments, who are (1) unable to earn any income due to their mental incapacity, and (2) have been found incapable of managing their own benefits meet the NICS reporting system criteria to report the names of certain individuals who are prohibited by law from purchasing or possessing firearms to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).

NICS has evaluated legal, medical and lay evidence and determined that these individuals are not capable of managing their own benefits. SSA estimates that about 75,000 people per year will meet these criteria for reporting to NICS. Disability examiners make the determination based on medical and other evidence, but physicians or psychologists review the evidence and sign off on the cases. An individual who has a diagnosis of schizophrenia, suffers from hallucinations and delusions, and most days cannot care for herself—feeding, dressing, communicating with those around her. Her symptoms and medical history meet the criteria in the listing for schizophrenia.
She receives disability benefits and has a representative payee. She would meet the criteria for reporting. An individual who has significant intellectual disability that prevents him from working at any level (i.e., he is the least capable intellectually), and is unable to understand how to pay rent or use his benefits to buy food. He qualifies for disability benefits and has a representative payee. He would meet the criteria for reporting.

Placing anyone into the NICS as a "prohibited person" is not something we should take lightly, but it is a task that must be done in limited circumstances and as required by statute.

The circumstances addressed by this rule require that we work together on this serious and unfortunate issue.

The Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution of Disapproval would, if passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President, deem the rule to have not been in effect for the past 60 legislative days. The Constitutional provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of the bill, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the Whole for further consideration of the bill. The Speaker of the House and Senate and signed by the President, deem the rule to have not been in effect for the past 60 legislative days. The Constitutional provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of the bill, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the Whole for further consideration of the bill. The Speaker of the House and Senate and signed by the President.

The vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to the rule. The vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to the rule. The Speaker of the House and Senate and signed by the President.

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 minority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the Republican House is debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question as a rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House." To make a true choice we must 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 comply with rule XX. On March 15, 1969, 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 [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever."

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subsection 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 21.3, pages 1928 and 1929.) "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 on the question and who controls the time for debate thereon."

The vote on the previous question on the whole rules package under rule XXI. The Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it. The vote was by electronic submission, with aye votes 231, nay votes 10, as follows: [Roll No. 70]

YEAS—231

Abercrombie

Johnson (SD)

Abraham

Johnson (OH)

Aderholt

Jones

Allen

Jor-Allen

Amash

Joyce (OH)

Amodei

Kats

Arrington

Kelly (AZ)

Aston

Kelly (MS)

Babin

King (LA)

Bacon

King (NY)

Banks (IN)

Enmer

Barletta

Faso

Bart

Ferguson

Barton

Fitzpatrick

Berman

Fleischmann

Bilirakis

Flors

Bishop (MI)

Fonzi

Bishop (UT)

Fonzi (AZ)

Black

Feshure

Bluem

Gage

Brou

Galagher

Brady (TX)

Gayber

Brad

Gibbs

Brat

Gildartine

Bratton

Goldwater

Broun

Gohmert

Buck

Goodlatte

Buckman

Gosar

Buckwheat

Gowdy

Budd

Grady

Burgess

Graves (VA)

Byrne

Graves (GA)

Byler

Graves (MA)

Carter (GA)

Griffith

Carter (TX)

Groatson

Chaffetz

Guillory

Cheney

Hagerty

Chillad

Hamer

Chips

Hamer (CT)

Coffman

Hanna

Cole

Hanna (OH)

Coleman (GA)

Hansen

Collins (NY)

Hartzler

Comer

Hayworth

Combs

Haywood

Conaway

Hill

Cook

Holt

Cook (AR)

Hollingsworth

Costello (PA)

Horne

Crawford

Hufnagel

Curbelo (FL)

Hudson

Davidson

Johnson (TX)

Davidson (NY)

Johnson (TN)

Davis

Johnson (GA)

Dent

Johnson (OH)

Dent

Johnson (OH)
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CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE
Mr. BONAMICI and Mr. KENNEDY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BLUM changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”
DISAPPROVING A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 70, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 38) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reads the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

MR. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 38.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah? There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

We are starting an historic week in the House, something that was republished almost two decades ago, but we are doing it again and using the Congressional Review Act to look at actual rules and regulations. What we are doing is the right thing.

In 1996, when this act was first passed, President Clinton, after signing it, said that this act would give congressional accountability for regulations. Even Harry Reid said that this act would be reining Congress some of its policymaking authority, and Sander Levin of Michigan, at the time, also said that now we are in a position to do something ourselves. If a rule goes too far afield from the intent of Congress in its passing the statute in the first place, we can stop it. That is exactly what we are attempting to do, and this is one of the first of those activities we will be doing this week.

The Congressional Review Act actually has three purposes in mind. They said, if a rule has excessive costs, if a rule goes beyond the particular agency’s statutory authority, and if a rule is unnecessary, it should be reviewed by Congress and rescinded. That is exactly what we are going to do because this rule, commonly called the stream protection rule, does all three of those criteria.

What I want to do is talk about this rule that was passed at the last minute by the former administration—it actually went into effect on the very last day of the administration—and say that it violates all of those three elements. The act itself—the rule itself—was done in secret. They had their own opaque study that they did without letting anyone know what the data was. We asked for it repeatedly, but the department did not provide it. Even in 2015, Congress passed a law in the Appropriations Act that mandated they tell us the data, the information. They simply ignored that law. They have refused to work with Congress in any particular way.

□ 1400

Actually, it violates law. If this rule goes forward, it violates the NEPA law. If it goes into implementation, it would violate the Endangered Species Act. It violates a memo of understanding the Federal Government had with 10 States at the time. In fact, there are 14 States suing over this rule and regulation. We asked for support from 14 State attorneys general in support of what we are attempting to do here.

If put into effect, it clearly violates the Clean Water Act by its effort to redefine hydraulic balance, which means the memo of understanding with this agency does not have the authority to do. It is given to other elements. It also puts us at risk of litigation on a takings issue. There is precedent for that. It could happen again, all because of this ill-defined and unnecessary rule and regulation.

If we roll it back, there is still protection. There will always still be protection. In a Department of the Interior study, they clearly said that 93 percent of the impact has already been taken care of and does not actually exist. It would be easy for us to do and it would put us back to a rule established in 1983 that is effective in protecting these areas. Ninety three percent of all streams have no impact by this issue whatsoever.

It also clearly says, under the report when this rule was being done, that the States that are legally supposed to be coordinated and be a part of the process were shut out of the process. It is one of the reasons why they are still suing, which means the memo of understanding signed by those States was ignored by the agency in coming up with this rule. The States that regulate 97 percent of the Nation’s coal production and tribes that abate well over 90 percent of the abandoned mine problems—they have it in line, they have it ready, they are ready to move forward with it—they were simply shut out of the process. It is a poor process.

There were a former icon of this body, a great Midwest Democrat, who allegedly said: If I let you make the policy and you let me make the procedure, I will screw you over every time.

This is poor procedure that has produced a poor rule, which will result in poor policy. At best, this rule is redundant. It is clearly unnecessary, and it does have the potential of hurting people nefariously when it does not need to.

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

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

I rise in strong opposition to this resolution which would put coal company profits ahead of clean water and public health. The stream protection rule has been in development for 7 years and puts in place modest, commonsense protections for people who live near coal mines.

This isn’t just a rule to protect streams. This is a rule to protect people’s health, to protect people’s homes, and to protect the clean water that they rely on. These folks felt strongly enough about this rule to submit public comments.

The rule is designed to protect people like Donetta from West Virginia, who nearly lost her life when chemicals from coal fields found their way into her water supply and interacted with her medication in such a way that it nearly destroyed her liver.

The rule is designed to protect people like John from Alabama, who reports lakes that have turned gray and streams that have turned orange.

This rule is designed to protect people like David from Tennessee, who watched a creek near his grandmother’s home become lifeless due to strip mining nearby.

This rule is designed to protect people like Josh from North Carolina, who can no longer fish in the streams near a family home and wants coal companies to be held accountable for the damage that they did.

This rule is designed to protect people like Jonita from Kentucky, a coal miner’s daughter whose water supply is tainted with heavy metal and other toxins from coal sludge. She wrote: “Coal put the food on my table. It also put the poison in my water. Reasonable trade-offs.”

I don’t believe that Jonita or anyone else should have to make that trade-off. No one’s water supply should be sacrificed in the name of higher bonuses for coal company CEOs. Those coal companies have set their overriding goal to kill this regulation; and after spending nearly $50 million on political campaign contributions over the past 6 years, they now have a Congress and a President to do it.

So for the first time in 16 years and just the second time ever, Republicans are going back to Newt Gingrich’s playbook and trying to successfully use the Congressional Review Act simply because the coal industry feels like it shouldn’t be held accountable.

This is only the first of five regulations that we will be repealing just this week. Later today, they are going to get rid of the rule
that requires increased transparency on the part of oil, gas, and the mining industry. Later this week, we will be fighting for the right of oil and gas companies to pollute the air with methane.

This is the Republican agenda in the age of Trump; an attack on clean water, an attack on clean air, an attack on transparency, and an attack on human health. If you are a CEO or a wealthy Republican donor, this is great news for you. But if you are an ordinary American that depends on their government to hold companies accountable through tough but fair enforcement of regulations, you should be extremely worried.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) to explain this joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, the stream protection rule is not about protecting streams—it is about protecting one purpose—to regulate the coal mining industry out of business. It is the centerpiece of the Obama administration’s war on coal.

The simple truth is revealed when you begin to follow the Office of Surface Mining’s 7-year approach to writing this job-killing rule, a process which began only after the previous administration discarded the rule’s predecessor, a 2008 regulation that underwent 5 years of extensive environmental review and public comment.

That was just the beginning. Since then, millions of taxpayer dollars have been needlessly spent developing this rule. Contractors were hired to help rewrite the rule, but then subsequently fired when it was leaked that the initial revisions of the rule would cost thousands of jobs, and that was within the first few months of this attempted rewrite.

Unfortunately, estimated job losses have only skyrocketed since the final rule was released. What is troubling is that, throughout the rule’s rewrite, the administration refused to visit mines or to actually assess the impact of the rule on operating mines.

There were attempts to cover up data that concealed the rule’s true economic impact. The Office of Surface Mining also repeatedly refused to provide Congress with important documents it used to develop the rule, while keeping State regulating agencies charged with implementing this onerous rule in the dark and at arm’s length throughout the entire rewrite.

Now, after 7 years of this politically motivated rewrite, the previous administration issued the final rule as they were leaving town, well after the American people—particularly those men and women in coal country—had sent a message to Washington. Politically motivated attacks on the livelihoods of those who keep the lights on will not stand.

The issuance of this rule, after all these facts are considered, proves what I said earlier. This rule is about one thing: regulating the coal industry and putting thousands of hardworking Americans that depend on the coal industry for their livelihoods in the unemployment line.

No one cares more about our streams that run through coal country than those who live there, and no public officials know better how to create a balance between protecting both jobs and the environment than those in local and State governments that represent coal-producing communities. It is certainly not the beltway bureaucrats in Washington.

I look forward to what I hope to be and should be a bipartisan vote supporting today’s important resolution.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources’ Subcommittee on Energy and Minerals Resources.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.J. Res. 38.

The science is clear: mountaintop removal mining is harmful to the health of people who live near these mines. Anyone with a computer can go to Google Earth and see the tremendous scars on the landscape from mining companies that blast the tops off mountains and then dump the waste into the valleys below. But largely invisible to the naked eye is the suffering of people who live in the nearby communities because of these harmful practices.

The stream protection rule will protect hundreds of vulnerable families and children who live near these sites from lung cancer, heart disease, kidney disease, birth defects, hypertension, and other health problems.

If the majority has a problem with this fine rule, they say they do, they should hold a hearing in the Natural Resources Committee to discuss its merits. There we would have an opportunity to talk to the administration and hear from those who are most affected by mountaintop removal mining.

Instead, they have decided to bypass regular order, go straight to the Congressional Review Act, which will take a chainsaw to this commonsense pollution rule. That is unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to take time to listen to the voices of the American people. Please put the health and safety of American families first and vote “no” on this reckless resolution.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS), someone who has forgotten more about coal than I will ever know.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. Like so many folks, I have been fighting this misguided rule for years. Miners have been fighting this rule for years. And States—bipartisan, Democrat and Republican—have been fighting this rule for years.

Stopping this rule matters to West Virginians, to our miners, to our families, to our consumers. We produce 95 percent of our electricity from coal. It is clean and it is affordable. Coal employs 20,000 West Virginians, and tens of thousands more make their living related to coal.

The loss of a coal job and the closing of a coal mine affects us all. Its severance tax revenues help to fund our schools, pay for our police and fire departments, and put money in the coffers of our local governments.

This rule would cost cities and counties $8.4 billion in tax revenue over a decade, with the greatest hits for other coal States.

However, despite these facts and the objections of more than a dozen States, the Office of Surface Mining adopted a go-it-alone approach. They ignored input that contradicts their agenda. They withheld information on the rule and restricted States from reviewing it. Well, that ends today.

I thank Chairman BISHOP, I thank the House Natural Resources Committee, and I thank the leadership of the House for their support on this resolution. Thank you, Senator CAPITO and Leader McCONNELL, for your leadership in the Senate. We also have the support of the White House on this resolution.

With a simple majority vote in the House and the Senate, we will end this rule and stop this job-killing, anticoal agenda.

I urge support on this joint resolution.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, it should be noted for the record that the Republican majority conducted a 4-year investigation into the development of this rule, holding 12 hearings, issuing two subpoenas, collecting 25 hours of audio recordings and 13,500 pages of documents, but were unable to uncover any political interference or misconduct in the development of this rule.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 38. This rule is a much-needed update to existing mining regulations. It ensures that communities that reside by coal mines are treated fairly, and that mining regulations monitor water pollution levels.

I am standing here today to continue to speak up and fight for clean water in
America, I promised that I would stand up and make sure that never again in America another community would be poisoned by the water. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that miners deserve clean water as well.

That resolution monitors drinking water sources for pollution, such as lead and other toxic substances, and provides that information to the public. Have we learned something from Flint, Mr. Speaker? This rule will also help protect land and forests by ensuring that companies restore the land and water sources that were impacted by a precious occupation in our country, and that is mining operations.

Let's defeat this resolution that prohibits commonsense rulemaking, protects the environment, and protects the rights of Americans to have access to clean, safe drinking water, while also creating jobs.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I don’t want to quibble over details, but we actually held 13 hearings and passed four bills over the last three Congresses that would do it all right, while this particular rule and found countless problems with it. That is why we are here today. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. McKINLEY), who knows the real impact on his constituents that this rule will have.

Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Coal Caucus, I rise today in strong support for this action.

After 8 long, torturous years, our coal communities have endured a withering attack from Washington bureaucrats focused on this agenda of anticoal. What has been the result?

Across this country, in the coal fields of this country, 400 mines have closed down, 83,000 coal miners have lost their jobs, 246 power plants have closed down, and our electric utility bills have gone up 45 percent.

Then, right before President Obama left the administration, the administration punctuated its war on coal with this damaging further rule. This rule is nothing more than an organic manifestation of a Washington bureaucracy drunk with power. If it is left unaddressed, this rule would shut down an additional number of coal mines, and 78,000 men and women would lose their jobs because of this rule.

For the last 2 years, our Coal Caucus, bipartisan members, have made stopping this administration’s war on coal a top priority, because it has nothing to do with the health of America, the safety of America, and the life of Americans.

Simply put, it was President Obama’s attempt to drive a final nail into the coffin of an industry that made America great.

Look, enough is enough. This war on coal has to come to a stop, and I think this election set the tone for that.

Now that we finally have a President who understands the painful impact of excessive and unnecessary regulations, we should pass this CRA as quickly as possible so he can sign it.

It is time to give the families of the coal fields all across America a chance to get relief from the unelected bureaucrats in Washington. I thank the chairman for his work in getting this. I thank him for the co-sponsorship that he and my colleagues Jimmy JOHNSON and JENKINS to help us out on this, to get this before us. We have to do this for the people of West Virginia and around the country.

Mr. GRJALIVA. Mr. Speaker, if there is a war going on, it is being led by the natural gas industry which produces a cheaper product at a lower cost. And if there is any trouble that coal is in, it is directly attributed to the free market and that competition. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this attempt to politically override Interior Department’s stream protection rule.

Much like the destructive mountain-top removal practice that this rule is designed to prevent, this Republican assault on the environment and the health of coal mining communities is a crude and dirty process.

Using the Congressional Review Act, a single hour in Congress is going to be enough to remove a rule that reflects 7 years of national public debate, including testimony at more than 200 meetings, over 100,000 public comments. This blows up the regular legislative and regulatory process, ignores science, marginalizes public health, and puts communities at risk.

Let me be clear: when the coal dust settles on this devastating resolution, it certainly won’t be Members of Congress who are left drinking polluted drinking water or battling lung cancer, heart disease, and birth defects. Much like the executives who profit from exhausting and polluting the natural resources of these communities, the GOP will move on to the next target and look for the next way to let business off the hook, to let polluting industries dictate the regulations they would suddenly take precedence over the people they govern the industry under the Clean Water Act. The Fish and Wildlife Service would also gain the power to veto coal permits. The aim is to take permitting power from States and impose a one-size-fits-all standard. When this process started, 10 States signed on to Interior’s rulemaking process as State cooperating agencies. But 8 of the 10 later withdrew because Interior wasn’t interested in what they had to say.

The subcommittee I chaired held 13 hearings to expose the flaws behind this rule. The rule provides no discernable environmental benefits, while duplicating extensive existing environmental protections at both the Federal and State levels.

In fact, the rule’s only purpose appears to be to support the environmental lobby’s “keep it in the ground” platform, locking away up to 64 percent of our domestic coal reserves, putting tens of thousands of Americans out of work, and raising energy costs for millions of Americans. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act.

Mr. GRJALIVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 38. Today, I speak against eliminating the Department of the Interior’s stream protection rule. The proposed rule is...
about balancing the need to support our American coal industry with our responsibility to safeguard and protect our environment.

What is most concerning and simply outrageous is that this bill proposes to not only reverse the stream protection rule, but it would prohibit the Interior Department from ever issuing a similar rule in the future, even as technology advances and best practices to safeguard the environment improve.

The rule was drafted over 7 years, after 30 public meetings and over 100,000 public comments, is the first major update to surface mining regulations in more than 30 years, but is being rolled back without even a single hearing in this Congress, which doesn’t follow regular order.

Mr. Speaker, Maryland has a rich history of coal mining, a history that predates our Nation’s founding. Yet, for a decade, we have witnessed a slow decline in coal production and a shift toward cleaner, and cleaner sources of energy. Nevertheless, the industry in Maryland continues to employ hundreds of people, produce nearly 2 million tons annually, and coal is the leading export commodity leaving the port of Baltimore. I support the coal industry in Maryland.

But in Maryland, where the streams from our mountain panhandle, coal country, flow into the Potomac and eventually the Chesapeake Bay, we have taken proactive steps to mitigate the environmental impact associated with mining, requiring companies to develop and follow reclamation plans, divert streams, treat acidic drainage with chemicals, and control erosion and runoff.

However, our efforts and requirements haven’t kept up with modern technology and innovative best practices. And the proposed rule enables us to employ better technology to better achieve environmental goals.

The Department of the Interior estimates that compliance costs will amount to a de minimis percentage of coal industry revenues, there will be a minimal impact on mining jobs, and it will create good-paying, green jobs. We will protect 6,000 miles of streams, 52,000 acres of forest, and reduce 2.6 million more tons of carbon dioxide emissions.

Mr. Speaker, representing families in the Chesapeake watershed, I understand firsthand that once the ecological streams, rivers, and bays are degraded, they cannot be easily reclaimed.

Now is not the time to turn back or turn our back on technology that is available and that is offered up in this rule.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Gosar), part of our committee who has heard the 13 hearings, understands this issue, and was part of the House when we voted four different times to be opposed to this particular rule.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that President Obama put his own environmental legacy ahead of the well-being of the American people. The Obama administration squandered taxpayer money for 8 years attempting to force the stream protection rule down our throats.

The deception and lack of transparency utilized to implement this rule were unprecedented. Along with manipulating job loss numbers, the administration even changed the rule’s name, thinking the American people might forget about it. But the fact is, you can’t put lipstick on this pig. Whether you call it the stream buffer zone rule or the stream protection rule, the rule still stinks.

The American people who want good-paying careers have missed out on hundreds of thousands of jobs around the country as a result of President Obama’s ideologically-driven war on coal. But in Appalachia, birth defects, and serious health problems for residents living near these mining sites.

Just look at my Virginia map. The highest death rates in the State and the most chronic diseases are in the coal fields. Just 1430

I saw this firsthand while I was Lieutenant Governor of Virginia for 8 years, when mountaintop removal mining became the most prevalent coal mining technique in central Appalachia.

That is why this is so important. Communities near coal mining sites have a right to know what is in their water because it impacts their livelihood and their lifespan.

This rule includes commonsense monitoring of streams—many of which are important drinking water sources—for pollutants such as lead, selenium, and manganese. Basic monitoring for these toxins is essential, given their potential impacts on human health and the environment.

The rule also requires that streams and lands disturbed by surface coal mining be restored. This would result in the protection or restoration of approximately 6,000 miles of streams and 52,000 acres of forest over the next two decades.

This is really important because we know the contamination of streams by coal mining pollution threatens everything from fishing and outdoor recreation to small businesses like restaurants and farms that are relying on clean, safe water. This rule is an appropriate balancing act between our energy needs and our environmental protections, and it is also appropriately flexible to coal mining companies.

Most importantly, the Congressional Review Act doesn’t make sense here. If you want to trim a tree, you don’t chop it down and bury it under cement so it will never grow again. The Congressional Review Act is an extreme measure that would permanently damage our surface mining laws. We have heard that it was a product of more than 7 years of work and the chairman talks about the 13 hearings, but not one has been held in the 13 months since the rule was proclaimed.

The Congressional Review Act describes the vast amount of work that the Office of Surface Mining did in order to create this rule.

On behalf of all hardworking Americans, I urge my colleagues to vote to support this commonsense legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, with respect, I quote Mr. MCKINLEY: “We have to do this for the people of West Virginia and around the country.” And I agree, and this is why we need the stream protection rule.

It is a commonsense approach to minimizing the impacts to surface water and groundwater from coal mining.

In Appalachia alone, mountaintop removal has been responsible for the destruction of 2,000 miles of streams. Peer reviewed studies have linked mountaintop removal mining to cancer, birth defects, and serious health problems for residents living near these mining sites.

Just look at my Virginia map. The highest death rates in the State and the most chronic diseases are in the coal fields.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Bost).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration anticoal regulation was a war on small business. It wasn’t intended to protect the environment. It was intended to put coal miners out of work. And, sadly, it has been successful in achieving that goal.

A study of the rule estimates it would destroy more than one-third of our coal jobs, and that nearly half of all coal resources would effectively be off limits to mining. In addition, the OSM rule has ignored clear congressional directives to share information with the States.

If ever there has been a time for Congress to act, this is it. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.
Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. McEACHIN), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. McEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution to overrule the stream protection rule, just as I would oppose any measure that threatened the quality of our drinking water.

Clean drinking water is a fundamental health need, and meeting that need is one of our most basic responsibilities in this Congress. We must not put special interests ahead of the health of our constituents.

The stream protection rule is very simple:

- It strengthens and clarifies existing water quality protections with respect to mining.
- It requires that affected streams be restored when mining is finished.
- It gives communities accurate information about water quality so they can best protect themselves from pollution.

Mr. Speaker, these protections are not onerous, but their benefits are vast.

We have seen in Flint, Michigan, and elsewhere the painful consequences when people lack access to safe drinking water. We must do more to prevent that kind of suffering and damage. Nixing this rule would, instead, mean that we are doing less.

This stream protection rule is the product of a careful year’s-long process. Countless stakeholders participated at two dozen public meetings, and regulators received tens of thousands of public comments.

Mr. Speaker, if this body is seriously concerned about the health of our constituents, and passage of this bill will inflict another blow to their health and well-being. They deserve far better.

I will make a final offer to my colleagues on the other side. If anybody wants to come and take a drink out of this, I will withdraw the ACHE Act and vote for their legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI).

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, in the waning days of his Presidency, the Obama administration finalized the stream buffer rule, a final parting shot at the coal industry on his way out the door. Not once did the Office of Surface Mining visit and assess the economic impact of this rule on operating mines.

In fact, in their analysis, they relied on hypothetical mines.

These aren’t hypothetical mines and they aren’t hypothetical jobs that will be affected.

In the real world, this rule could mean the end of coal production in Ohio and the end of thousands of good-paying jobs in countless communities like the one I grew up in.

Ohio will be directly impacted by this rule. Fifty-nine percent of our electricity comes from coal-fired power plants, and Ohio’s coal industry employs thousands of hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker. I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Tipton), another State that was promised, in the Clean Water Act, to have authority which was taken away by this simple rule.

Mr. Tipton. Mr. Speaker. the United States is blessed with a wealth of domestic energy resources, allowing our Nation to responsibly develop safe, abundant, and affordable energy to meet our own needs.

The unique character of Colorado has blue skies, clean water, while maintaining a healthy amount of responsible development of oil, natural gas, and coal production in its many communities.

According to the Energy Information Agency, coal accounted for approximately 60 percent of the electricity generated in Colorado in 2015; yet this vitally important resource that provides affordable energy and jobs to many of our communities has been under attack. Backed by radical interests, the government has issued new rules and regulations under the guise of environmental protections, but whose true intent is to bankrupt the coal industry with regulatory compliance.

The stream protection rule is a solution in search of a problem. Modern mining operations are already adept at avoiding impacts to watersheds, as the Office of Surface Mining's own numbers show. The industry is also already subject to a wide array of environmental statutes and regulations enforced by various Federal and State cooperating agencies.

I urge the passage of this resolution and encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Grijalva. Mr. Speaker. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to read a few lines from letters our opposition to this resolution. The first comes from a coalition of 75 national and local environmental groups who are strongly opposed to this bill. They write: “This long awaited rule provides local communities with information they desperately need about water pollution caused by nearby coal mining operations, and includes several important protections for clean water and the health of communities surrounding coal operations.”

The flood protection rule is an attack on clean water and should be opposed.

Wildlife and sportsmen groups are also opposed.

The National Wildlife Federation writes: “The Stream Protection Rule is an important water quality rule for our nation. It seeks to empower State regulatory authorities to ensure coal mining and reclamation best practices, taking into account their unique region, functions and impacts to local communities and wildlife.

...any efforts to undermine the safeguards afforded by the finalized Stream Protection Rule, a rule with years of stakeholder outreach and engagement, would be an attack on clean water and should be opposed.”

Travel Unlimited says: “The rule is a worthwhile, sensible effort to reduce the impacts of mountaintop removal mining on Appalachian streams and rivers.

And it goes on and on. They all go on to point out the specific impact of mountaintop removal mining on fish, and wildlife and sportsmen.

“Mountaintop mining practices create a survival risk for brook trout and other wild trout populations, and impede efforts to restore brook trout in already degraded watersheds.”

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Comer), a new Member of Congress, who realizes that this rule is long on regulations and short on real new protections for people.

Mr. Comer. Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak in favor of repealing the stream protection rule.

I represent a coal-producing district whose economy has been devastated by the former President’s and his re-election of unelected bureaucrats’ war on coal.

Last year, a Presidential candidate boasted among a liberal political crowd that she would put a bunch of coal miners out of work. She went on to say that the government would then essentially come in and put those hardworking, out-of-work coal miners on welfare.

Well. Mr. Speaker, my coal miners don’t want to be on government welfare. They want the government to get out of their way and let them work.

Because of senseless, onerous regulations like the stream protection rule, the liberals in Washington have succeeded in putting most coal miners out of work. I believe that with the passage of H.J. Res. 38 and a sensible energy policy created and implemented by businesspeople instead of bureaucrats, we can begin to bring coal jobs back to Kentucky and help provide the struggling economies in Kentucky’s coal counties.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. Lamalfa), one of the other members of our committee who has served for a long time and has heard many of these arguments before.

Mr. Lamalfa. Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of the measure for congressional disapproval of the Department of the Interior’s stream protection rule, which was created under the guise of protecting the environment, but has been very harmful to American jobs.

They have attempted to cripple an industry—energy—that has provided vast amounts of energy to States across this country for decades. My home State of California has had a long history of mining that has led to incredible economic growth and job opportunities for many of my local communities.

This one-size-fits-all approach fails to provide any regulatory certainty to industry and denies important tax revenue from energy extraction to the American taxpayer.

I appreciate my colleagues bringing this to the floor, and I hope we can sort through the rhetoric on this against energy jobs of a very important segment across the country that supplies so much of our energy currently, and can do it with safety and a mind for redeveloping our economy.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker. the opposition to this particular bill goes from coast to coast. We just heard from California. Now we will go back to the East Coast.

Mr. Speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YoHo).

Mr. YoHo. Mr. Speaker. I stand here today in support of an entire region of our country and industry that was unfairly targeted by the Obama administration in pursuit of an ideological agenda to do away with our Nation’s abundant coal resources.

The previous administration targeted the coal industry and, by extension, the hardworking Americans employed by the industry under the guise of protecting the environment. We all want clean air and water for our Nation’s prosperity, but this rule is so strict, it makes it impossible for companies to continue to operate. It results in layoffs, closed businesses, and ultimately an entire region unemployed.

Our Nation is blessed with an abundance of natural resources and we should utilize them all: oil, hydro-power, wind, solar, and yes, clean coal, too. We must be prudent about how we regulate our energy industries because when one sector is pushed out, it is the moms and dads at the end of the month paying their electric bill that feel the impact the most. All Americans will be affected, but it will be felt more by the ones who can least afford it.

That is why I am opposed to the rule, and I urge my colleagues to support the CRA.

Mr. Grijalva. Mr. Speaker. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The use of the Congressional Review Act has been categorized as reckless and extreme. The CRA was going to cause significant and lasting harm. If successful, two things are going to happen: the regulation is void and the agency is prohibited from issuing another similar rule ever again.

I mention that because this is about health. It is about the health of the people living around those mining operations and it is about mountaintop removal and the documented analysis
that proves that it is a danger to health. It contaminates water and it is destructive to the environment.

It is curious that we had 13 hearings—I stand corrected—and an investigation that went on in perpetuity, it seems like. Yet, once the rule was finalized and published in 2015, we never had another hearing on the item again, which begs the question: If the whole point was to delay and prevent this rule from ever taking effect and, more importantly, make it susceptible to the Congressional Review Act,mission accomplished for the majority.

But the long-term consequences of using the CRA on a rule that is designed to protect people’s health, on a rule that is designed to make coal companies be transparent and disclose to the public, on a rule that every scientific analysis and the science is clear that this rule was indeed there to protect both people and communities, I think that is the permanent harm being inflicted today—deny the people in those communities to return to past practices that created the problem that we are dealing with and that this rule attempted to address that created that problem.

No one would argue those times where unregulated mountaintop removal causes the destruction to both human beings and the environment that we see as a legacy. I think it is not only disrespectful to the people of those regions, but it puts their health and the well-being of both the environment and humanity in that area at major risk. It is not only reckless and extreme to use the CRA, it is also dangerous.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who clearly understands the situation that this rule has put his people in.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in favor of this Congressional Review Act resolution on behalf of the thousands of fellow Kentuckians who have lost their jobs in the coal industry.

In eastern Kentucky, not far from where I live, it is not just a recession that they are experiencing. What is happening in eastern Kentucky is a little depression over the last several years at the cost of protection for a rule that would be the final death knell of a proud industry that has literally powered America for over a century.

When I talk to the men and women of eastern Kentucky about the prospects of losing even more jobs in an economically depressed place, it is just absolutely devastating. So I applaud the work of the committee and I applaud the work of this House to take this matter seriously to end this regulation that would put even more of my fellow Kentuckians in economic distress.

Instead of looking at environmental questions as a matter of the need to have more government central planning, let’s solve environmental problems in a different way, through innovation and technology.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROY DAVIS).

Mr. ROY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution providing for a congressional disapproval of the stream buffer rule.

In my home State of Illinois, coal production employs roughly 5,000 workers and the industry contributes $2 billion a year to our State’s economy. In southern Illinois, these are some of the region’s best-paying jobs.

Unfortunately, this rule was one of the final shots the Obama administration fired in their war on coal. Unless reversed, this rule is directly going to hurt our Illinois coal miners and those working at coal power plants and, in the end, the people who pay the utility bills in this country.

The last administration refused to work in good faith with the States when finalizing the rule, even after Congress told them to do so in the 2015 omnibus. I include in the record a letter from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources in opposition to the rule.

I_llinois Department of Natural Resources, Springfield, IL, January 30, 2017.

The Stream Protection Rule and The Congressional Review Act.

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

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL, Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As the regulatory authority for administering the federal Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act ("SMCRA") in the State of Illinois, the Department of Natural Resources ("Department") appeals Congress’s failure to properly consult with the State of Illinois and the other States, resulting in a burdensome and unlawful rule that usurps States’ authority as primary regulators of coal mining as intended by Congress and demands congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, rules like this are what the CRA is all about. I ask for your support.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The stream protection rule has got to be the poster child for the Congressional Review Act’s action. There are 400 changes to the bill. There are 400 changes in over 1,600 pages of regulations, and there is no new, real protection above and beyond what we were using since the Reagan administration.

But it does outline benefits and potential problems for 70,000 people directly with their jobs, for 300,000 people whose jobs are threatened in a ripple effect, and, unfortunately, for everyone else. Every time you turn a light on, your costs will be exacerbated because of this particular rule.

This rule affects the most vulnerable of our population and it hurts them. It is time for us to realize that it is time to stop making rules and regulations for an ideological approach, and, instead, new rules and regulations that help people, not hurt people, as this particular one does.

That is why this House, on four different occasions over the last three congresses, has voted against this particular proposal.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, our opposition to this action being proposed by the Republican majority to eliminate protection is, indeed, an action that goes against fundamental science goes against the public health of the American people in those communities, and, overall, takes the Congressional Review Act and uses it as a bludgeon to knock down regulations in those areas at risk in their health, their water, and the general environment in the area.
The issue of cost is an issue that comes up. The loss of jobs has been the creation of competition, not because of any proposed rule.

Second of all, when we were dealing with the horrors of black lung, we were dealing with issues of mine safety for coal miners. If you have a mine where the states have taken control, that their unions had to go through to get mine safety and healthcare protection for their workers.

At the time, I am sure, those were considered cost factors and why not do it. There is a lot here about human life and it is about protection of water. I would suggest that that should be the priority of this Congress and not emboldening or enriching the mine operators and their profit line.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO). My friend.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have been involved for 28 years on the Natural Resources Committee on these issues.

What we are talking about today is simple. It is cheaper to blow the top off a mountain and you dump it in the valley and you bury a stream. It is cheaper. Okay.

Is that what we all are about here? The most destructive, least environmentally responsible, but cheapest way of doing things?

If we are going to set the precedent here, I can think of a whole lot of other areas that relate to clean water, clean air, and things that are important to the American people and the sustainability of our environment that will go away because it would be cheaper. If we can just dump the waste out the back door of the factory, that is cheaper.

If we can just put whatever we want up the stack and people wear gas masks, that is cheaper. That is the major argument we are hearing today. This rule, a 100-foot buffer—a 100-foot buffer—for toxic materials around streams is too expensive. It is cheaper to blow the top off the mountain, get the coal out, and take all the overburden and other assorted stuff and dump it in the valley and bury the stream.

The only problem is then it rains. What happens when it rains? Well, you can either cap that whole thing and make it impermeable and then have big runoff downstream or, as it generally happens, the water percolates down the cost factor here is about human life and it is about protection of water. I would suggest that that should be the priority of this Congress and not emboldening or enriching the mine operators and their profit line.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote. I think the arguments have been made. The precedent being set tonight by this House is a dangerous and extreme precedent that we will all come to regret. I urge a "no" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama made it his mission to bankrupt the coal industry when he took office, and through a slew of job-killing regulations, he has nearly made good on that promise. His administration spent 7 years and over $10 million in taxpayer dollars writing the stream protection rule. Even though the bipartisan 2016 omnibus appropriations bill directed the Interior Department to engage with the States before finalizing the rule, the agency refused to comply, leaving crucial voices out of the rule-making process.

Under this midnight regulation, at least half of the Nation's coal reserves were shut out of the process, which is why they are suing over it. This rule is a direct assault on the rights of States tasked with regulating the coal industry in their borders, and it also actually helps people. People are going to be harmed if this act is not repealed and actually goes into effect, and the most vulnerable of our populations are the ones who will suffer the most because of it.

Because of that reason, it is right for Congress to do our responsibility here and now and repeal this bad act that was done in secret that was not allowed to have the openness that we have requested in the past and that is simply redundant at best, totally unnecessary, and does the harm that it does to real people: 70,000 direct jobs, over 300,000 indirect jobs, as well as a higher cost to everyone who uses energy in this Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution of disapproval and vote for its final passage.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 38, the resolution by saying we are responsible for the policy, not some agency of the executive branch.

Adopting this resolution protects the rights of States tasked with regulating the coal industry in their borders, and it also actually helps people. People are going to be harmed if this act is not repealed and actually goes into effect, and the most vulnerable of our populations are the ones who will suffer the most because of it.

Because of that reason, it is right for Congress to do our responsibility here and now and repeal this bad act that was done in secret that was not allowed to have the openness that we have requested in the past and that is simply redundant at best, totally unnecessary, and does the harm that it does to real people: 70,000 direct jobs, over 300,000 indirect jobs, as well as a higher cost to everyone who uses energy in this Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution of disapproval and vote for its final passage.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of false science today, which is appropriate since the agency that concocted this rule refused to allow any of the data they used to make the rule to be made public. We asked for it. We asked for it in legislation. They simply refused to comply. Ninety-three percent of the sites are not having any impact on the streams, and the other seven percent we already had rules that covered them that did this protection. There is no real new protection in this particular act.

The States, which regulate 97 percent of the coal mines in the United States, were shut out of the process, which is why they are suing over it. This rule is a direct assault on the rights of States tasked with regulating the coal industry in their borders, and it also actually helps people. People are going to be harmed if this act is not repealed and actually goes into effect, and the most vulnerable of our populations are the ones who will suffer the most because of it.

Because of that reason, it is right for Congress to do our responsibility here and now and repeal this bad act that was done in secret that was not allowed to have the openness that we have requested in the past and that is simply redundant at best, totally unnecessary, and does the harm that it does to real people: 70,000 direct jobs, over 300,000 indirect jobs, as well as a higher cost to everyone who uses energy in this Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution of disapproval and vote for its final passage.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 38, the resolution by saying we are responsible for the policy, not some agency of the executive branch.

Adopting this resolution protects the rights of States tasked with regulating the coal industry in their borders, and it also actually helps people. People are going to be harmed if this act is not repealed and actually goes into effect, and the most vulnerable of our populations are the ones who will suffer the most because of it.

Because of that reason, it is right for Congress to do our responsibility here and now and repeal this bad act that was done in secret that was not allowed to have the openness that we have requested in the past and that is simply redundant at best, totally unnecessary, and does the harm that it does to real people: 70,000 direct jobs, over 300,000 indirect jobs, as well as a higher cost to everyone who uses energy in this Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution of disapproval and vote for its final passage.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 38, the resolution by saying we are responsible for the policy, not some agency of the executive branch.
The Stream Protection Rule is an effective and sensible regulation that has undergone years of development in order to compel big polluters and industry actors to responsibly dispose of dangerous waste so that our water supply and ecosystems remain free of toxic pollutants. The attempt to dismantle this rule will cause irreparable harm to clean drinking water sources for millions of Americans. The Stream Protection Rule provides Americans with an environmental monitoring system that assures the cleanliness of the water.

The residents of the 4th District of Georgia, like many of the constituents of my colleagues, live alongside and depend upon rivers to be protected from harmful pollutants and toxic chemicals that are the product of mining and industrial run-off. Run-off from mining and industry sources contaminate stream water with various lethal toxins, including lead and arsenic. These pollutants not only impact the lives of people living in close proximity to the run-off sources of heavy pollutants, but all people, who drink the water.

The water protected by this rule is the same water consumed by our families, including children and the elderly. Those exposed to carcinogens in their water can suffer from birth defects, cancer, and even death.

Clean water is a human right and this rule ensures our country can provide clean drinking water to its citizens.

I ask my colleagues this question: if the Stream Protection Rule is overturned are you prepared to tell your constituents and their families that their water will be less safe to drink or use?

I am not alone in my stance. More than 70 groups representing the interests of a wide swath of American citizens have expressed their strong disapproval with this resolution. Two of these groups, the Savannah Riverkeeper and Altamaha Riverkeeper organizations, represent the environmental concerns of my home, the great state of Georgia. These groups along with dozens of others have expressed to our country’s elected officials their opposition of disapproval for the Stream Protection Rule would significantly jeopardize the well-being of millions of Americans.

By subjecting the Stream Protection Rule to the Congressional Review Act, we set a dangerous precedent in delegitimizing federal rulemaking procedure, while we elevate the interests of corporations over the health and safety of our citizens. The health of our nation’s children must supersede the maximization of profits.

For the sake of the millions of Americans who rely on the safety regulations established by this rule, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote NO on the resolution. The citizens of our nation will thank you for putting their health first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the ayes appeared to have it.

The joint resolution was ordered to the House of Representatives, and the order to engross the resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. Res. 41
Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers," and asks for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRJALVA. Mr. Speaker, on that question is ordered on the joint resolution under consideration.

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

Providing for Congressional Disapproval of a Rule Submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XX, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 41) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 71, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. Res. 41
Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers" (published at 81 Fed. Reg. 49359 (July 27, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentleman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials on the joint resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 41, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, (Mr. HUZENGA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises of the Committee on Financial Services.

This resolution disapproves a burdensome and controversial Securities and Exchange Commission rule that places an unfair burden on American public companies that is not applied to many of their foreign competitors.

Virtually every week we hear from many Americans about how this economy is just not working for them. It is just not working for working Americans like Keith from Dallas in my district who wrote me: "I am 53. I have a grown son who lives with me. It seems like the cost of everything keeps going up, yet wages do not keep pace."

The economic opportunities of Keith and millions of Americans like him are not helped by top-down, politically driven regulations that give many foreign companies an advantage over American public companies.

That is exactly what this Securities and Exchange Commission regulation that we are talking about does. It forces American public companies to disclose inexpensive proprietary information that can actually be obtained by their foreign competitors, including state-owned companies in China and Russia. This is just one regulation out of thousands and thousands that are burdening our companies, our job creators, and are costing our households, by one estimate, over $14,000 a year, Mr. Speaker.

Even though this is a Securities and Exchange rule, section 1504 of Dodd-Frank has nothing to do with investor protection nor anything else we were told the Dodd-Frank Act was supposed to do. As the acting chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission has said, this rule "neither reforms Wall Street nor provides consumer protection and it is wholly unrelated, and largely contrary, to the Commission's core mission."

For example, Mr. Speaker, the SEC estimates that ongoing compliance costs for this rule could reach as high as $591 million per year. It is just an outrage, Mr. Speaker. That is $591 million every year that could better be used to hire thousands more Americans in an industry where the average pay is 50 percent higher than the U.S. average. Literally we could be talking about 10,000 jobs on the line for this ill-advised rule. This is significant, given millions of Americans, like Keith from my district, have not seen their wages increase while our economy has been stymied under the Obama administration.

Now, for those who claim that somehow rolling back this rule undermines anticoercion efforts, let me remind everyone that Mr. HUZENGA’s resolution, that the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, which the SEC and the Department of Justice administer, already makes it illegal to pay former government officials when it comes to winning or maintaining business opportunities.
To further prove the point, Mr. Speaker, just this year the SEC has brought enforcement actions or settled four separate cases for violations of this anticorruption law. So even without this SEC rule, fraud will still be fraud, corruption will still be corruption, and both will still be illegal. The SEC and the Department of Justice will still have the authority to vigorously pursue those who break the law and hold them accountable, as they well should. So no one, Mr. Speaker, should fall for this false argument of our opponents.

Let’s also remember that this joint resolution does not repeal section 1504 of Dodd-Frank. I wish it did, but it doesn’t. Rather, it vacates a flawed SEC rule that mimics a previous rule that was already struck down by a U.S. District Court. It is a rule that by the SEC’s own estimates has taken 51 employees over 20,000 hours to promulgate, defend, and repromulgate. Fifty-one employees, 20,000 hours—the rule could have been directed at rooting out Ponzi schemes, that could have been used to promote capital formation or make our capital markets more efficient.

Furthermore, this rule still goes far beyond the statute passed by Congress and mandates public specialized disclosures that cost more and more, and is more burdensome than the law requires.

So, Mr. Speaker, for those who religiously defend the Dodd-Frank law, they should be in vigorous support of what Mr. HUIZENGA brings to the floor today because the rule flies in the face of the Dodd-Frank Act. So when an agency exceeds its statutory authority, it is no longer regulating, Mr. Speaker, it is legislating. And all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, should be able to agree that when the executive branch acts in such a manner, Congress has a duty, a duty under article I of the Constitution, to check this executive overreach.

As such, this House should wholeheartedly support Mr. HUIZENGA’s resolution. It simply tells the SEC to go back to the drawing board, comply with the Dodd-Frank Act, and come up with a better rule that will not put American public companies at an unfair disadvantage and cost us jobs. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.J. Res. 41 would roll back the SEC’s rule that implemented an important congressional mandate in Dodd-Frank requiring oil, gas, and mining companies to publicly disclose payments made to foreign governments for access to their natural resources.

That rule helps fight corruption in the extractive industries sector, provides investors with crucial information on their investments, and enables citizens to demand greater accountability from their governments for spending that serves the public interest. It also helps to diminish the political instability in resource-rich countries, which is not only a threat to investment but also to our own national security.

Specifically, the disclosure rule enables shareholders to make better informed assessments of opportunity costs, threats to corporate reputation, and the long-term prospects of the companies in which they invest.

In addition, opening the extractive industries to greater public scrutiny is key to increasing civil society participation in resource-rich countries, which are often underdeveloped countries that are politically unstable, rife with corruption, with a history of civil conflict fueled, in part, by natural resources.

Moreover, the SEC’s rule is a reasonable disclosure and places no limits or restrictions on who companies can pay money to, how much, or what for. After 5 years of robust debate and input, the final rule accommodated a number of industry concerns, providing companies with a generous 4-year phase-in period and a case-by-case exemption process for companies that face implementation challenges.

The SEC also allowed companies to comply with the disclosure by using a report prepared for other substantially similar disclosure regimes, which include regimes in the European Union and Canada.

Nevertheless, Republicans continue to claim that the SEC’s rule is harmful and puts American companies at a competitive disadvantage to their foreign competitors.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they are entitled to their own set of opinions, but they are not entitled to their own set of facts. I suppose these are alternative facts.

The truth is that U.S. companies are not the only ones required to make these disclosures. Many foreign companies must report under the U.S. rules, including a number of state-owned oil companies, such as China’s PetroChina and Sinopec, and Brazil’s Petrobras.

Also, after the SEC issued its initial rule in 2012, the rest of the world followed our lead, establishing a global standard for the public disclosure of extractive payments companies make to governments.

A wave of transparency laws have been proposed in markets that mirror the U.S. law. This includes legislation in the European Union, Norway, and Canada, which are all now in force. These laws cover the vast majority of oil, gas, and mining companies that compete with U.S. firms.

Now, leading global oil companies like BP, Shell, and Total, as well as Russia’s state-owned companies—Gazprom, Rosneft, and Lukol—are entering their second year of reporting under EU rules without any negative impact.

So contrary to Republican claims, U.S. and foreign companies already compete on a more level playing field here and abroad. Therefore, rolling back the SEC’s disclosure rule would directly undermine the interests of extractive companies in having a level playing field.

Worse, once the rule is nullified by this resolution, the SEC would not be able to put another rule in place that is substantially similar. This would create different reporting regimes directly contravening what companies have requested from the SEC. And, the SEC filed a complaint against industry concerns by including a generous phase-in period. U.S.-listed companies are not required to report until 2019. The rule also provides for case-by-case exemptions if covered companies face any implementation issues.

Therefore, the rule does not put U.S. companies at a competitive disadvantage, nor does it impose an unreasonable compliance burden.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, would also perversely to my Republican colleagues the importance of the SEC’s disclosure rule in protecting U.S. national security and energy security interests.

Specifically, it helps protect U.S. national security interests by helping prevent the corruption, secrecy, and government abuse that has catalyzed conflict, instability, and violent extremist movements in Africa, the Middle East, and beyond.

As ISIS demonstrated, nonstate actors can benefit from trading natural resources in order to finance their operations. Project-level disclosures in the rule will make hiding imports from nonstate actors more difficult, thereby limiting their ability to finance themselves with natural resource revenues.

Corruption and mismanagement of oil revenues destabilizes regions and leads to conflict. And, resource-rich countries like Venezuela, Iraq, and Angola are considered to be among the top ten countries perceived to be the most corrupt according to Transparency International.

In addition, transparency of Russian companies and its extractive industry is critical. The SEC’s rule would create transparency of Exxon and other company payments to the Russian Government. Gazprom, Rosneft, and Lukol are already disclosing under the U.K. rules, and BP has already reported payments to the Russian Government. The SEC’s disclosure rule will make a crucial contribution as Russian citizens seek to follow the money received by their government.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 41. I reserve the balance of my time.
many other provisions that were ultimately included in the sprawling law. They had absolutely no relationship to the underlying cause of the financial and housing crisis.

However, some have used the financial crisis as a cover to rewrite the federal securities law in order to push a socially motivated agenda. Specifically, section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires companies registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission to annually report payments made to each government, including the amounts paid, who in the government got the money that should be going to the people, and where this natural resources money is spent. This could not have been further from the truth.

The SEC recognized this fact and stated that section 1504 “appears designed primarily to advance U.S. foreign policy objectives,” not investor protection or capital formation. Notwithstanding the merits of the underlying policy goals, conducting American foreign policy is not what Congress invited the SEC to do. In fact, just moments ago, the U.S. Senate confirmed Rex Tillerson as the Secretary of State, and I would suggest that we let him direct our foreign policy. With his lead, establishing as a global norm the necessary basis to swiftly schedule a new rulemaking and to reissue a rule mandating public disclosure by company and by project for the next ten-month period, and that the agenda includes a proposal to initiate rulemaking for the next ten-month period, and that the agenda includes a proposal to initiate rulemaking for Section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act by March 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter, on which I was joined by roughly 58 of my colleagues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California, Mr. MAXINE WATERS.

Mr. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets on the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and for her leadership in so many areas, including her leadership on this joint resolution.

I rise today in strong opposition to the resolution, which would repeal an SEC anticorruption rule. I fail to understand why anyone in this body would want to repeal something that helps us fight corruption.

The SEC rule would require companies registered in the United States to disclose the payments that they make to foreign governments for the development of oil, natural gas, or other minerals. Unfortunately, there is a long and very sad history of corruption where Big Oil or mining companies strike deals with foreign governments to extract their natural resources. Too often, the money from the oil or mining company ended up going to pay bribes to corrupt politicians and not to benefit the ordinary citizens of the country.

The SEC rule is intended to bring some basic transparency to these deals—that is all we are talking about, transparency—by requiring U.S. companies to disclose the payments they make to foreign governments—who the payments went to, how much they paid, who in the government got the money that should be going to the people.

It tells the people and the country where this natural resources money is going. This is just common sense, and it is outrageous and unbelievable to me that anyone would oppose simple transparency rules that combat corruption.

I have been a long-time supporter of this rule. I spoke in favor of it during the Dodd-Frank debate, and I sent a letter to the SEC urging them to finalize this rule as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter, on which I was joined by roughly 58 of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter, on which I was joined by roughly 58 of my colleagues.
Public reporting of extractive payments is also fundamentally to improving governance, curbing corruption, improving revenue management, and allowing citizens to demand greater transparency from their governments for spending that serves the public interest. This, in turn, can help create more stable and predictable government environments as more stable business environments, which contribute to the advancement of U.S. national security interests.

Since 2010, Congress has continued to support the strong implementation of Section 1504 rules. Last year, legislation to implement the Section 1504 for the Gulf of Mexico to develop oil and gas reserves in the Gulf of Mexico (HR 1613) was significantly delayed when the House version of the bill included a waiver from Section 1504 requirements.

The White House strongly objected to the House bill precisely because of the waiver, and issued a Statement of Administration Policy calling the exemption unnecessary and contrary to U.S. national security interests.

The court decision, along with data and analysis from the previous rulemaking process, has provided the Commission with a timeline for the implementation of Section 1504 rules. Last year, legislation to implement the Section 1504 from ever fulfilling its statutory mandate.

The White House strongly objected to the rule, not because it was cosponsored by Republican Senator Dick Lugar. Senator Lugar was a long-time chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and he understood the negative impact that these corrupt deals could have on developing countries.

The only reason—and I repeat, the only reason—to vote for this resolution is to help corrupt governments steal money from their people. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. Speaker, let's also be clear that the foreign and corrupt rule will not cover governments stealing money from their people; so I strongly urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Mr. HENSARLING for the time. The SEC disclosure rule for resource extraction issuers to disclose the types and amounts of payments to each government annually. The previous administration placed crushing regulatory burdens on the American people. In 2015 alone, Federal regulations cost almost $1.9 trillion—nearly $15,000 per American family. This particular SEC regulation, which was issued by the Obama administration, regarding resource extraction disclosures.
Private and public institutional investors—representing trillions of dollars invested on behalf of American families—voiced support to the SEC in favor of the rule. There are two main reasons for this support from institutional investors: first, all investors want to be able to review payments to all governments, to assess the exposure the issuer may have to corruption risk. The SEC has jurisdiction over compliance with the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, and investors need to know whether fines for potentially corrupt payments could be levied against firms in which they are considering investing.

Investors should always have the right to know material information about the firms, and systemic non-compliance with the law is always material. It should not take an event of noncompliance that has been uncovered by the regulators to inform investors of the simplest transparency requirements, like the annual reporting of payments, can alert them to the risk.

Secondly, some investors may simply want to stay away from investments in firms that make payments to foreign governments. Many resource-rich nations in the developing world lack a democratic rule of law and are often governed by oppressive regimes that exploit their land and environment, extracting resources for their rulers' financial gain at the expense of their citizens. Investors have the right to know this information because they own the company and may feel a moral responsibility for its action.

For these two reasons, extractive payments are information crucial to an investor's analysis of an issuer's securities.

The United States equity markets are the most efficient in the world because we have strong disclosure laws and strong enforcement at the SEC. The disclosure of payments made to foreign governments is a relevant factor in valuing securities and is crucial to valuations in determining the financial gain at the expense of their citizens. Investors have the right to know this information because they own the company and may feel a moral responsibility for its action.

In short, there are three market-based reasons to disclose payments to foreign governments:

First, these disclosures promote market-based decisions on where they allocate their resources—a right that we should be enhancing rather than eroding. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 41.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the chairman of our Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires the Securities and Exchange Commission—an agency not charged with the responsibility of carrying out American foreign policy—to promulgate a resource extraction issuer disclosure rule. That regulation, which is the subject of today's resolution, requires publicly traded issuers to disclose payments that they make to governments for the commercial development of oil, natural gas, or mineral resources.

The intent of the rule, as my colleagues have pointed out, is to allow local populations to see how much revenue is generated by their natural resources; but, in practice, if fully implemented, this rule will have a very negative impact on Americans and on the people it is purported to help.

First, the rule puts American firms at a competitive disadvantage, and we have talked about this before. Because section 1504 applies only to companies that are listed on U.S. exchanges, it forces them to disclose payments in detail in a way that would put them at a competitive disadvantage to non-U.S. companies, like those located in China. The SEC estimates that the initial cost of compliance for U.S. firms could be as high as $700 million and that the ongoing costs could be as large as $591 million annually. That is $591 million that American businesses could be putting to better and more productive use, like in creating jobs for their workers. The SEC, itself, admitted that compliance costs would result in diverting capital away from other productive opportunities.

In addition, these disclosures will include sensitive commercial proprietary information and trade secrets that foreign state-owned competitors can use against American firms, and 50 percent of the firms that are likely to be obliged to comply with this rule are small and thinly held.

Secondly, these rules in Dodd-Frank, and it was a bicameral decision. It was thoughtful and bipartisan. There were multiple hearings in both Chambers and a conference report.

These Dodd-Frank rules were the first of their kind, and they have become the model for 30 other industrialized countries' own rules. These rules have been so necessary because of the so-called resource curse, in which we have seen countries—particularly Afrika— that have lots of resources, but there is widespread poverty because of the corruption of these extractive industries. Surprisingly, these companies have implemented them, and they are currently complying with them globally.

Now, we have heard a whole lot of whining and, quite frankly, lying about how these regulations have cost us jobs; but, certainly, the Obama economy has created a lot of prosperity. In fact, Mr. Speaker, investor advocates are litigation management companies and civil society groups that are fighting corruption and instability support these rules. We should be supporting them. In fact, companies that have $10 trillion under management say that these disclosures help them manage risk.

Now, I am not going to go into a long-winded explanation of the ills and issues related to illicit payments related to extractive industries to foreign governments. We know about them. I guess that we are appalled by this vote, but I guess it's the beginning that we are going to be appalled for the next 1,500 days.

It shouldn't be surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the friend and ally of Russian leader Vladimir Putin—and now President Trump's nominee for Secretary of State—Rex Tillerson lobbied against that very rule when he was at Exxon. Specifically, he said it would hurt their Russian operations. Transparency will hurt ExxonMobil's Russian operations.
So the question has just got to be asked, Mr. Speaker: What does that mean?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired. Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, just the implication that transparency is going to hurt Putin’s Russia is prima facie proof that we need these rules.

What payments to Putin does Rex Tillerson not want shareholders and the American people to see?

Today, we should be demanding more transparency and not less from the most conflicted President and administration in history. We are now trying to make transactions less apparent.

All my colleagues should reject this joint resolution, not only on substance, but it is an abuse of the Congressional Review Act.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, we are all painfully aware that Washington’s financial control law, Dodd-Frank, is full of provisions that have nothing to do with protecting consumers or preventing another financial crisis.

The SEC rule in question today is an exception. This politically motivated rule, tucked into a provision under the mislabelled provisions of Dodd-Frank, fails to advance the core mission of the SEC, which is to protect investors, maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation.

Ensuring that payments by oil, gas, and other mineral companies are transparent and accountable is a worthwhile public policy goal, but it is outside the securities laws’ core mission of investor protection.

Not only would this rule and its enforcement fall outside the purview of the SEC, but the rule itself is fundamentally flawed.

Like so many rules and regulations emanating from Dodd-Frank that harm our economy, it is more complex and costly than is required by statute, which calls into question the extent to which it meets the SEC’s economic analysis requirement.

The SEC itself estimates the cost for compliance at between $239 million to $700 million initially and from $96 million to $591 million annually after that.

I am also concerned that this rule could force companies to withdraw from certain countries. Among other things, some foreign countries have laws to prevent the sort of disclosures called for in this rule.

Since the rule provides no exemptions, American firms may be forced to abandon business ventures that provide jobs and opportunities for Americans.

I understand that some opponents of our effort have tried to label the SEC’s policy as an anticorruption rule. It is important to keep in mind that nothing in today’s resolution to repeal the rule undermines the ability of the SEC or the Department of Justice to fight corruption. Even without this rule, the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act remains in force and any corrupt activities by Americans will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

The rule under consideration today, however, is unnecessary, poorly written, outside the core responsibilities of the agency, and it would impose significant costs on publicly listed companies with no discernible benefit.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, let’s be honest, guys: leveling the playing field, capital formation. Come on.

All this rule was written for is to expose bribery. There is no line in any corporate report that says: paid for bribery. It comes up as royalty fees. It comes up as gifts. It is bribery, pure and simple.

Every company in a foreign country is subject to it, especially a Third World country, especially when it comes to natural resources, and we all know it.

If you think this rule is overbroad, yet you are still truly appalled by bribery and the results of it, submit some other option for us to do it. That is all this rule was ever meant to do.

Give us an alternative, as opposed to simply repeal this. It is just like health care: you complain, complain, complain, but no alternative.

Honestly, if you put forth a proposal that says the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act is now legal, it is okay to have bribery to support it. People like me might be open to it. I understand.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAPUANO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I will point out, though, what my resolution does, is it directs the SEC to go back to the drawing board. It is not our job to write the rule. You are asking for that proposal. The SEC wrote a rule, it got struck down by the courts. They got sued again.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I respectfully disagree. This, for all intents and purposes, prohibits them from doing it, number one.

Number two, you have an obligation. You have an obligation, if you don’t like what exists, to propose an alternative. That is the way the world should work.

Every time we don’t like something, we offer an alternative. You don’t have to like the alternative, but there is an alternative offered.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAPUANO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to write a rule. I am not sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts would be happy with it. I am not sure that the SEC would be happy with it.

Again, having the debate here in the well of the House, I was not here for the writing of Dodd-Frank. I am dealing with the echo effects of it, and that is what we are trying to do right now. So rather than us having that, I put it back to the SEC.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, re-claiming my time, I respect the gentleman’s intentions on this. I understand the concept of a level playing field. If the Chinese are bribing a Third World country, we should be able to compete. If they make our companies allowed to bribe them, as long as we know what is going on. Now, I don’t know how you are going to write that law, but I am happy to work with you any time you want.

There is the problem: bribery is insidious. It is secretive. It can’t be found.

Now, I am a Catholic. I probably am not the best Catholic in the country. I think we could probably all agree to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, the basic tenets are pretty clear. Here is what they write, one line from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops: "...where governance is weak and corruption is rampant, extractive, transfer revenue that is not transparent becomes a curse that deepens poverty, destroys democratic institutions, deprives elections and allows autocratic leaders to remain in power against the will of the people.”

If you really believe that people around this world should benefit by true and open democracy, you have to provide them the opportunities to do that. I happen to agree with the bishops.

If you want to allow our companies to bribe foreign governments, say it. I don’t like it, but it is a reality of the world. They have been doing it for generations.

That is all this attempt was. And to simply repeal it says: It is open business day, guys. Go in, pass the cash around, stick it to the regular people, and don’t tell them about it.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Tipton).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) for offering the resolution under consideration today.
This resolution of disapproval will repeal the SEC’s resource extraction rule, which imposes burdensome disclosure requirements on public companies engaged in the commercial development of natural gas, minerals, and oil.

The SEC’s mission is to promote equity, efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation. Unfortunately, the resource extraction rule is well outside the bounds of these mandates, which acting SEC Chair Michael Piwowar noted in his dissent of the SEC’s decision that it is either reforms Wall Street or provides consumer protection and it is wholly unrelated, and largely contrary, to the Commission’s core mission.

When our businesses are being overwhelmed by compliance obligations, it is crucial that our regulators do everything in their power to ensure regulations do not actively disrupt growth by enforcing nonmaterial, socially motivated disclosures like those included in the Dodd-Frank rule.

The SEC itself has admitted that this rule will be costly. The SEC estimates that the ongoing compliance costs for the resource extraction rule could reach as high as $592 million annually and that the disclosure requirements could result in capital being diverted away from productive opportunities. An agency tasked with maintaining efficient markets and facilitating capital formation should not be promulgating unnecessary and burdensome rules like this.

Dodd-Frank is full of examples like the resource extraction rule that require Federal agencies to engage in rulemaking on topics outside of their substantive experience and jurisdiction. In the future, I urge my colleagues to craft legislation in a bipartisan manner that only requires actions consistent with the mission of the applicable agency. Until then, however, it is necessary for Congress to exercise its oversight power to unwind these misguided regulations that have hampered economic growth.

I am happy to lend my support to this resolution and encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense measure.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

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

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution, providing congressional disapproval of a rule submitted by the SEC relating to disclosure of payment by resource extraction issuers.

Section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires a public company engaged in the commercial development of natural gas, minerals, or oil to report payments made to foreign governments for these natural resources.

At a time when our President and my Republican colleagues are looking to cut regulations on businesses, the SEC estimates that ongoing compliance costs for this rule to be as high as $591 billion. Let me say that again: one agency, one rule, $591 billion.

Let me go back to something many of my colleagues have already mentioned today, the SEC mission. I will quote from their own website. The mission of the SEC is to “protect investors, maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation.”

If investor protection is truly the mission of the SEC, then why was this provision of the Dodd-Frank listed in the section titled “miscellaneous provisions”?

Mr. Speaker, American companies should be protected, and no one denies that. But to put them at a competitive disadvantage against their foreign counterparts by implementing this rule is just plain wrong.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle will argue that Republicans are gutting an important transparency policy meant to combat corruption. Well, Mr. Speaker, my response to those claims are this: Republicans are the party of transparency. We value accountability. But in this instance, the Dodd-Frank Act instructed a Federal agency with 60 years of experience in resource extraction or foreign policy, to craft this mandatory disclosure for certain public companies. As many of my colleagues have said today, industry is already publicly disclosing the work they do in foreign countries and will continue to do so. The difference is simple; they do it at a level that does not cause competitive harms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support passage of this resolution and erase a top-down, Washington-knows-best provision that is harmful to American companies and American investors. We should all want to do it better.

In God We Trust.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 41, offered by my good friend, Mr. Huizenga. This resolution is simple. It repeals an onerous rule that puts American manufacturing and energy companies at a global disadvantage.

Both foreign and American companies sell products and energy in our economy, but only American companies are required to jump through additional hoops, regulations that cost billions of dollars and pass on hundreds of millions of dollars to consumers. Michiganders know all too well what happens when government tips the scale in favor of foreign companies: jobs are lost overseas, and the investment necessary to create jobs is delayed or canceled.

My friends across the aisle have suggested that this resolution is about bribery. It is not. This resolution and, in fact, the election on November 8 is about jobs, the loss of American jobs.

Manufacturers in Michigan don’t need special treatment. The unparalleled product of hardworking men and women of this great state deserves a level playing field on which to compete.

In the past two decades, the United States has lost more than 50 percent, Mr. Speaker, of its public companies, in large part due to the costs and regulatory burdens of being associated with being a public company. Dodd-Frank’s resource extraction rule piles on even more harmful red tape for those publicly traded companies in the United States that are global energy providers.

As this rule only applies to publicly traded companies, this increased burden puts U.S. companies at a disadvantage. Over 75 percent of the extracted minerals are owned by state-owned enterprises, Mr. Speaker, that are not covered by this rule. That puts our companies at a competitive disadvantage. It requires our companies to reveal confidential information, putting our companies at a competitive disadvantage.

And if, Mr. Speaker, the people want transparency, the best way to handle that is through self-disclosure through global transparency and accountabilities. There are important policy goals, and 51 countries have entered into the Extractive Industry Transparency Institute, which is self-reporting and publishing, by country, by company, both public and private, some important issues about mineral extraction.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if it is about corruption, our friend, Senator Proxmire from Wisconsin, long ago, in the 1970s, passed the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. There is no more fear of American companies selling products and energy in our market than American companies selling products and energy in our market.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today is the 100th day since President Trump took office.

Mr. Speaker, in the 100 days since the inauguration, this Administration has pursued a strong, pro-jobs agenda.

Yesterday, the President welcomed 220 CEOs to the White House, nearly all of whom promised to expand their American workforce.

The American people are back in business, and so is America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 41, offered by my good friend, Mr. Huizenga. This resolution is simple. It repeals an onerous rule that puts American manufacturing and energy companies at a global disadvantage.

Both foreign and American companies sell products and energy in our economy, but only American companies are required to jump through additional hoops, regulations that cost billions of dollars and pass on hundreds of millions of dollars to consumers. Michiganders know all too well what happens when government tips the scale in favor of foreign companies: jobs are lost overseas, and the investment necessary to create jobs is delayed or canceled.

My friends across the aisle have suggested that this resolution is about bribery. It is not. This resolution and, in fact, the election on November 8 is about jobs, the loss of American jobs.

Manufacturers in Michigan don’t need special treatment. The unparalleled product of hardworking men and women of this great state deserves a level playing field on which to compete.

In the past two decades, the United States has lost more than 50 percent, Mr. Speaker, of its public companies, in large part due to the costs and regulatory burdens of being associated with being a public company. Dodd-Frank’s resource extraction rule piles on even more harmful red tape for those publicly traded companies in the United States that are global energy providers.

As this rule only applies to publicly traded companies, this increased burden puts U.S. companies at a disadvantage. Over 75 percent of the extracted minerals are owned by state-owned enterprises, Mr. Speaker, that are not covered by this rule. That puts our companies at a competitive disadvantage. It requires our companies to reveal confidential information, putting our companies at a competitive disadvantage.

And if, Mr. Speaker, the people want transparency, the best way to handle that is through self-disclosure through global transparency and accountabilities. There are important policy goals, and 51 countries have entered into the Extractive Industry Transparency Institute, which is self-reporting and publishing, by country, by company, both public and private, some important issues about mineral extraction.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if it is about corruption, our friend, Senator Proxmire from Wisconsin, long ago, in the 1970s, passed the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. There is no more fear of American companies selling products and energy in our market than American companies selling products and energy in our market.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today is the 100th day since President Trump took office.

Yesterday, the President welcomed 220 CEOs to the White House, nearly all of whom promised to expand their American workforce.

The American people are back in business, and so is America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 41, offered by my good friend, Mr. Huizenga. This resolution is simple. It repeals an onerous rule that puts American manufacturing and energy companies at a global disadvantage.

Both foreign and American companies sell products and energy in our economy, but only American companies are required to jump through additional hoops, regulations that cost billions of dollars and pass on hundreds of millions of dollars to consumers. Michiganders know all too well what happens when government tips the scale in favor of foreign companies: jobs are lost overseas, and the investment necessary to create jobs is delayed or canceled.

My friends across the aisle have suggested that this resolution is about bribery. It is not. This resolution and, in fact, the election on November 8 is about jobs, the loss of American jobs.

Manufacturers in Michigan don’t need special treatment. The unparalleled product of hardworking men and women of this great state deserves a level playing field on which to compete.
women in Michigan speaks for itself. But I think we can all agree that the American Government should be their ally, not their opponent. Repealing this rule does just that.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution would overturn a Securities and Exchange Commission rule that, according to the agency, is supposed to "help combat global corruption and empower citizens of resource-rich countries to hold their governments accountable."

Well, that is a grand idea, but we have a financial regulator to protect the American investor, not to combat global corruption or empower citizens for over-regulation. And sure, we could have sent the SEC off to fight any number of other international problems—religious oppression, authoritarian regimes, malaria, maybe even leprosy.

The question is if a financial regulator is the ax to this battle and all these things can fulfill its core mission to provide financial transparency and prevent fraud. Given that we had a financial crisis that the SEC didn't foresee and did nothing to prevent, that would suggest that it needs even less on its plate, not more. What this joint resolution does is put the American investor first and help us to stop sending the SEC off on global rabbit trails.

I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, if you opened up your copy of Dodd-Frank, this big thick book with 2,300 pages of microscopic print, and went all the way back to title XV, way back in the back, under "Miscellaneous Provisions," you would find excessive complexity and a regulation that only breeds corruption, not the other way around.

In these provisions lies section 1504, which directs the SEC, the Securities and Exchange Commission, to adopt a rule requiring resource extraction issuers to report payments to the U.S. and foreign governments for the commercial development of certain natural resources and make them available to the public.

Though we all fully support transparency and accountability, I believe that section 1504 fails to protect investors while simultaneously decreasing the productivity of capital markets and competition in the marketplace. This has stifled job growth and expansion.

The SEC estimated that the cost of the new rule would be somewhere between $229 million and $700 million in initial startup compliance costs alone. After the first year, the SEC projects it would be an annual ongoing cost of compliance ranging from $100 million to $591 million. Rather than this rule, companies could reinvest these dollars into new opportunities for the communities, which will result in the creation of more good-paying jobs for Americans.

My district in central New York and the Southern Tier has the highest or one of the highest unemployment rates in the Nation and a lower median household income than the national average. Section 1504 is merely another example of how bureaucratic government overreach can result in lost opportunities for the people in the 22nd District of New York and all hard-working American workers. However, instead of taking this opportunity to empower our citizens who are eager to get back to work, we are fueling additional costs and regulations.

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

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution gives global rivals a competitive edge. The other article that says: "Tillerson tried to get this rule killed. Now Congress is about to do it for him." The other article entitled: "Exxon Set for Early Victory in Rescinding Payments Rule." The other one is a Bloomberg article, entitled: "SEC Comments From Early Victory As Congress to Rescind Payments Rule." The other one is a Politico Magazine article that says: "Tillerson tried to get this rule killed. Now Congress is about to do it for him.

The other article is a Washington Post article: "One of House GOP's first targets for regulatory rollback is tops on the oil industry's wish list." (From Bloomberg Government, Jan. 30, 2017)

EXXON SET FOR EARLY VICTORY AS CONGRESS TO RESCIND PAYMENTS RULE

(By Catherine Truwayck)

For years the oil industry has appealed to the executive branch and courts to de-fang a U.S. rule forcing Exxon Mobil Corp., Chevron Corp. and other producers to disclose their payments to foreign governments. Now, the Republican takeover in Washington is handling it for them.

The House of Representatives is set to vote this week on a bill, the Securities and Exchange Commission Edict that requires publication of overseas payments by oil, natural gas and mining companies. The industry has lobbied hard against the Dodd-Frank act, gives global rivals a competitive edge. Backers say it will help keep payments to foreign nations in government coffers, not private pockets.

"To roll it back would be a complete abdication of U.S. initiative and leadership on issues of corruption," said Daniel Kaufmann, president of the Natural Resource Governance Institute, an International Transparency Watchdog.

The SEC rule, set to take effect next year, is one of a series of Obama administration regulations Republican lawmakers are trying to reverse using the Congressional Review Act, a law that allows Congress to undo regulations with a simple majority vote.

Congress also plans to vote this week to kill another curbing has potential of mountain-top mining. To do so, both chambers must pass a resolution disapproving the rules, which the president would then have to sign. While President Barack Obama would have reliably vetoed such resolutions, President Donald Trump is likely to sign it.

Trump argues that curbing regulations is key to unlocking investment by U.S. companies. He pledged to rescind two existing regulations for each new one that's issued.

"The SEC's rule forces U.S. companies to disclose proprietary information, allowing competitors while foreign entities do not. This can give some large industry players an advantage on future business projects," the American Petroleum Institute, an industry group, said in a statement.

House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy pledged in a Wall Street Journal op-ed, to spend the first 100 days of the administration "on creating opportunities for the people in the 22nd District of New York and all hard-working American workers. However, instead of taking this opportunity to empower our citizens who are eager to get back to work, we are fueling additional costs and regulations."

U.S. ADVANTAGE

Because Exxon and Chevron aren't listed on the European exchanges, they don't have to comply with the EU disclosure rules. That may give them an edge over other oil majors who must report project-level payments, critics say.

In its 2015 disclosure to the UK, Rosneft reported £29.8 million in payments to the Russian government, Vietnam, Norway. In the same year, BP reported £15.2 billion in payments to 23 countries, Total disclosed £16.7 billion to 44 countries, and Shell reported £21.3 billion to 29 countries.

The idea behind the measure is simple: If foreign oil companies disclose payments of $1 million to the government of Country X, then the lawmakers and citizens of Country X will know that $1 million should show up on the country's budget. If less shows up, that means it has been diverted for private use.

ExxonMobil and Chevron say they support financial transparency in the oil sector. Both are members of an advisory committee under the Interior Department that oversees a voluntary corporate financial disclosure program.
API asked the agency to consider a reporting model that detailed payments by resource type and production method—omitting company-specific data. But, the SEC didn’t adopt that approach.

“The SEC largely ignored industry’s comments,” said Exxon spokesman Bill Holbrook. While the final rule included exemptions for voluntary reported payments made to the activities, it “remains based on the EU’s model and likely will adversely affect the ability of publicly-traded companies to compete globally,” he said.

A Chevron spokesperson did not respond to a request for comment.

PATTERN OF BEHAVIOR

Transparency advocates say they’re concerned that the repeal effort is part of a pattern of behavior among Republican lawmakers.

“The GOP that tried to gut the ethics committee is trying to gut a critical anti-corruption law,” said Jana Morgan, director of the advocacy group Publish What You Pay. “It sends a really disturbing message.”

The threatened vote is generating tension among members of the anti-corruption advisory committee on which Exxon, Chevron and API sit. The panel, made up of representatives from industry, civil society, publishes an annual report detailing U.S. government revenues from the oil, natural gas and mining industries, as well as voluntary payments made by companies.

Civil society members of the committee say Exxon’s opposition to the SEC rule jeopardizes its standing on the panel. At a meeting on Wednesday, members will discuss whether Exxon, Chevron and API should keep their seats at all.

“I really have to question whether it’s appropriate for companies like Exxon and Chevron and API to continue to sit around the table with the anti-corruption group Global Witness, and a member of the advisory committee,” said Amanda Polk, a co-author, then-Sen. Richard Lugar, to try to stop.’’

The scaled-back resource extraction rule is not one of President Barack Obama’s most prominent legacies, but one reason getting rid of it is such a high Republican priority is that it’s considered a corruption giveaway. That’s because it was only finalized last June; two weeks too late to avoid scrutiny under the Congressional Review Act, a law allowing Congress to strike down end-of-term regulations with simple majorities. The CRA has only been used once before, when Congress erased a Clinton-era workplace law. But now the Republicans have control of both houses of Congress and the White House, they hope to use the CRA to wipe out a variety of Obama rules, starting Wednesday with this and another measure opposed by extractive industries, a “stream protection” rule restricting discharges from mining operations.

Aside from anti-Obama politics, the other reason gutting the Section 1504 rule is a high priority for Republicans is that their supporters in the oil industry really hate it. In fact, oil interests sued to block an earlier version of the rule, contributing to the delays that pushed the final rule past the Congressional Review Act deadline.

Tillerson alluded to those competitiveness concerns in letters to Washington environment.

“Why would anyone want to help the oil industry hide payments to kleptocracies?” Lugar pointed out that in 2010, his amendment introducing Section 1504 with Democratic Sen. Ben Cardin had a fair amount of bipartisan support. But so far, no Republicans have come out against the resolutions to strike it down, filed by Bill Huizenga of Michigan in the House and Jim Inhofe of Oklahoma in the Senate. If the GOP can cobble together a majority for the resolution in the Senate, Democrats can get it five more votes of floor time delaying it, but they can’t stop it.

And nobody seems to think that Trump, who had lunch with Tillerson Monday, would veto it, regardless of his fiery rhetoric about taking on special interests. The White House did not respond to a request for comment.

Most of Obama’s most important regulations, like his Clean Power Plan to rein in greenhouse-gas emissions or other Dodd-Frank financial rules designed to rein in Wall Street, were completed early enough to avoid Congressional Review Act challenges. Trump and the Republicans will have to take on more extended legal fights to kill those rules. But there are plenty of less prominent late-term rules that Republicans can take on if they’re willing to devote the floor time, on issues ranging from paid sick days for federal contract workers to energy efficiency for ceiling fans to carcinogenic byproduct in the workplace.

In general, the rules that are most likely to face challenges are the rules that could cause problems for the best-connected Republicans. And the kind of rules that inspire inspired lobbyists in Washington, the CEOs of mega-corporations like Exxon Mobil seem unlikely to survive in the current Washington environment.

“Tillerson argued that forcing U.S. oil firms to report payments abroad would provide a wink-and-nod blessing to international aid groups that the move would provide a wink-and-nod blessing to hidden corporate payments to petro-thugs. So he called out on Wednesay afternoon, and since the move relies on a special mechanism for reversing rules enacted late in a term, Senate Republicans will need a mere majority rather than a filibuster-proof 60 votes to follow suit.

“So after all of Trump’s promises to drain the swamp, the corruption giveaway bill, pushed by Big Oil and his own top diplomat might be the first policy legislation to reach his desk.”
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The House resolution was introduced by Rep. Kendra Horn (D-Colo.). The House might take it up as early as Wednesday or later in the week.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely surprised at how many of us are on the opposite side of the aisle are. They come here on this floor today with this rule that they would like to overturn. They have not been in committee. We have not had any hearings. They have moved very, very quickly to do exactly what all of these articles are discussing. They are concentrating on how to roll back disclosure that the SEC had developed a rule for for the oil industry.

And why are they trying to do this? It is so interesting that this is happening on the same day that Mr. Tillerson has just been voted on to be the Secretary of State for the United States Government, the former CEO of Exxon; and I am going to talk about that connection, which should cause a lot of people to be concerned.

This government is not about disclosure. First of all, the President of the United States refuses to disclose his income tax returns. I didn’t expect them to support openness of the oil industry to avoid corruption.

As a matter of fact, they have the audacity to come here today and say that it is too expensive to be honest. It costs too much money to these huge billionnaire oil companies to disclose, and somehow that is going to prevent them from creating jobs. That is nonsens.

I would like to just show some connection.

Both during his campaign and since his election, Donald Trump has surrounded himself with people who have extensive ties to Vladimir Putin and the Russian Government, and then we are going to see the connection between Tillerson and the Russian Government. First of all, let’s look at this circle of people around him and their connection to Russia.

Paul Manafort, Trump’s former campaign manager, was a paid lobbyist for Viktor Yanukovych, the pro-Russian politician in Ukraine who fled to Russia in 2014 and was subjected to U.S. sanctions related to Russian aggression in Ukraine. Manafort has also been involved in multimillion-dollar business deals with Russian and Ukrainian oligarchs, which were reportedly the subject of an FBI inquiry.

The other person, Roger Stone, Trump’s longtime friend, is reportedly under investigation for possible links with Russia. He had dealings ever since he was admitted to have worked in Ukraine. Stone announced in a speech last summer that he had spoken to WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange, and Stone predicted that there would be additional leaked documents, a prediction that came true within weeks.

Let’s go to another person. Michael Flynn, Trump’s National Security Advisor, did a paid series of events in Moscow including a paid appearance at a party for RT, a Kremlin-funded TV station, where he was photographed sitting next to Vladimir Putin.

Trump’s nominee for Secretary of Commerce, Wilbur Ross, was a business partner of Viktor Vekselberg, a Russian oligarch and Putin ally, in a major financial project involving the Bank of Cyprus.

Finally, former ExxonMobil CEO Rex Tillerson, Trump’s nominee and now the person who has been voted by the Senate for Secretary of State, signed a multibillion-dollar agreement with Russia in 2011 on behalf of ExxonMobil for an oil drilling project in the Arctic. The project was brought to a halt in 2012 but resulted in sanctions that were imposed on Russia in response to Russia’s aggression in Ukraine.

Putin personally awarded Tillerson the Order of Friendship in 2013. Don’t forget, this President talked about lifting sanctions. Oh, you can see the connection here.

In addition to that, I just want to point out that it comes as little surprise that ExxonMobil is one of the leading companies in the fight against the global initiative to enhance transparency of extractive industry payments made to foreign governments, given its long history of engaging in questionable transactions with governments of oil-rich countries such as Nigeria, Pakistan, Equatorial Guinea, Angola, and Chad.

The move to eviscerate the rule issued under section 1504 that we are talking about here today makes clear that Republicans in Congress and the Trump administration believe that transparency is more important than people and that fighting corruption is less important than enriching oil, gas, and mining companies.

Without the SEC’s extractive industry transparency rule, citizens around the world will lose a critical tool for holding their governments and corporations accountable for how natural resource proceeds are used.

Let’s talk about Nigeria. Just days before the Securities and Exchange Commission issued its final rule pursuant to section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act, Global Witness, a highly respected and good governance NGO, issued a report detailing how a major oil deal, as I referred to earlier, struck by ExxonMobil with the Nigerian Government, was being investigated by Nigeria’s Economic and Financial Crimes Commission, an agency charged with uncovering high-level corruption.
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The investigation relates to a widely reported deal in which the Nigerian Government in 2009 agreed to renew a
do next, deliver the mail? Will they be-
come our air traffic controllers?

Meanwhile, there are Ponzi schemes
taking place in America. Meanwhile,
we have markets that are not efficient
creating the jobs that the American
people demand.

Let’s vote for jobs. Let’s vote to get
America back to work. Let’s vote down
this leftist, elitist agenda declaring
war on carbon-based jobs. Let’s vote
for H.J. Res. 41.

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

Mr. HENSAWLING. Mr. Speaker, may
I inquire how much time I have remain-
ing?
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWARD). The gentleman from Texas has
3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that
the American people are watching this
debate because it will certainly con-
firm their decision to deny Democrats
control of the House, to deny them
control of the Senate, and to deny
them control of the White House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, their words may
claim they care about jobs, but their
policies is what we need to talk about.
Mr. Speaker, is jobs, and we are talking
about a rule promul-
gated by the Securities and Exchange
Commission that can cost $591 million
a year and can cost us 10,000 jobs.

My friends on the other side of the
aisle have been clearly tone deaf to the
pleas of the American people. They
tired of part-time jobs. They are tired
to go back to work. They are
clearly听ed to the
American people.
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Mr. GALLEG0 and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay." Messrs. GONZALEZ of Texas, VELA, JOYCE of Ohio, and SANFORD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The joint resolution was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### DISAPPROVING A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 38) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule, on which the yea and nay votes were ordered. The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 194, not voting 10, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROLL NO. 73**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherheat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirakis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (GA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (MI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (UT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady (TX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridenstine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (AL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (IN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buescu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (GA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (TX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsongas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takehi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson (CA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson (MI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velasquez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE**

**H859**

**THE JOURNAL**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal. Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING VICTIMS OF QUEBEC TERRORIST ATTACK**

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I now ask my colleagues to bow their heads and join us for a moment of silence.

Let our presence here serve as a reminder that we will stand up against bigotry and hatred wherever it takes place.

I now ask my colleagues to bow their heads and join us for a moment of silence.

---

**REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 611**

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representative HIMES be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 611.

There was no objection.

---

**TITLES**

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representative HIMES be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 611.

There was no objection.

---

**WAITS**

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representative HIMES be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 611.

There was no objection.
Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, as the United States is gearing up for the Super Bowl in Houston, unfortunately, so are many human sex traffickers.

Just a few days ago, a 21-year-old trafficking victim who had special needs was rescued in Houston. The young girl was kidnapped off the streets of Ohio by a dastardly trafficker. He put her in his car and told her: Now you work for me. She was brought to Houston specifically to be prostituted at the Houston Super Bowl. However, the woman’s mental disabilities and seizures became too much for the moral-less trafficker, so he dropped the victim off downtown Houston where she later was sexually assaulted by a local criminal.

A Good Samaritan rescued the girl and brought her to the hospital. As exploiters and buyers roam the streets looking to prey in Houston, they should know that Mayor Turner, the Department of Homeland Security, and local law enforcement are prepared to jail traffickers and rescue victims.

No trafficking. Not in our town. We will protect victims and prosecute the slave trafficking deviants and buyers.

And that is just the way it is.

GET AMERICA MOVING BY INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

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

Mr. DeFAZIO. Madam Speaker, the clock is ticking. That not clock, but the new clock that I put up on the Democratic side of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, which is the cost of congestion clock.

The President has proposed $1 trillion investment in infrastructure. He went to the Republican Conference last week and said: Fix it first, and we want it in the first 100 days. I am with him on that, we should do that, and I have proposals to actually fund a way to get there. Not to $1 trillion, but a good part of the way.

So this clock indicates, from the day he was sworn in, noon a week ago Friday to today, the cost of congestion for American commerce, the movement of goods, and the American people. It is $438 million per day.

So the clock is ticking. Let’s get America moving again, and let’s invest in our infrastructure.

UNITED IN REINING IN REGULATIONS

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, for the last 8 years, Americans have felt the burden of excessive and intense regulatory overreach having to comply with time-consuming rules and regulations. But that ends now. For the first time in 8 years, the legislative branch and the executive branch are on the same page. We must get the government out of the way.

Last week, I joined my colleagues on the One In, One Out Act, which requires Federal agencies to repeal or re- vise one rule before they can issue a new one, and any new rule must be of equal or lesser cost to Americans.

And in true Trump fashion this week, the President announced his own version, the one in, two out executive order.

These measures are commonsense at their core. To begin growing our economy and creating jobs, we have got to reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government and tackle the mountain of red tape surrounding our Nation’s job creators. Americans are ready for growth and innovation, and, for the first time in a long time, the President is on our side.

SCALING BACK BURDENSOME REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTED BY THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. LaMALFA. Madam Speaker, this week, House Republicans have undertaken the effort to scale back some of the burdensome regulations implemented by the previous administration.

The use of so-called midnight rules to slim regulations at the last minute and without congressional approval was a favorite tool of the last President. Many of these regulations would negatively impact, and have, American people by destroying their jobs, hamstringing our economy, often for no good reason.

That is why, at the very start of the 115th Congress, we passed the Midnight Rules Relief Act, which utilizes the Congressional Review Act, to allow Congress to review multiple midnight rules en bloc.

Additionally, we now have the unique opportunity to utilize the CRA, Congressional Review Act, and express our disapproval for some of these harmful, burdensome regulations that hurt jobs and stunt the economy, in order to protect the American people from these harmful effects.

The regulatory state has been rapidly expanding in recent years for too long, and I am happy to see that Congress is taking action to reverse this destructive behavior.

U.S.-MEXICO RELATIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TENNEY). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O’ROURKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. O’ROURKE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise
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Mr. ESPAILLAT. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Madam Speaker, back in 1987, then-President Ronald Reagan issued one of his most famous speeches—"a great wall''—as he addressed then-Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to insist that he open the barrier dividing East and West Berlin. It was, perhaps, one of the most exciting times as we watched that transition of power, that we would have a different world, certainly the largest on the U.S.-Mexico border, is not just the safest city in the State of Texas, it is the safest city in the United States. And it is not an outlier. If you look at other U.S. border cities, like San Diego, California, you will find that they are among the safest in the United States. In fact, there is a positive correlation with the number of migrants and immigration enforcement efforts, in a community and that community's relative safety. The U.S. side of the U.S.-Mexico border is far safer than the average American city deeper into the interior. These are some of the facts that we need to have at our command as we are developing policy, as we are judging the President's recent executive actions, and as we are thinking about how best to secure this country. Here is another fact that we need to keep in mind. If we are committing resources where they are not needed, where, for example, we don't have terrorism, where we don't have a problem with immigration, where we don't have an issue with security, then by definition we are taking those resources from where they could be best used, where we have known risks and threats, where we have real problems against which we must contend, where we are not keeping Americans as safe as they could be because we are directing resources at something that need not be, this is something that we need to know. I think, as we make policy for this country, as we fulfill our most important solemn obligation, which is the safety and security of this country and every American within it.

Madam Speaker, I am very fortunate today to be joined by some outstanding colleagues. One whom I would like to welcome to the floor is the great city of New York, that New York is a new citizen, he himself an immigrant to this country. He represents tens of thousands of immigrants in his Congressional District, has already, from day one, become a leader on this issue, introducing legislation that provides a rational, humane, smarter approach to some of these issues that have been blown out of proportion, politicized, mythologized, and from that steering the country in the wrong direction. Here is somebody who wants to get us back on track.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).
irrational and hateful rhetoric we have witnessed from him before, and it stands contrary to who we are as Americans and to what we believe as a nation.

I am proud to introduce one of my first bills, a Congressional Act called This Is Our Land, which is legislation that will prohibit this divisive wall from being erected on public lands. This is a time when we should be investing in our infrastructure—in roads, bridges, tunnels, airports, schools, housing—also respecting our public lands. Building President Trump's wall would trample on our public lands and potentially put precious endangered species at risk and likely disrupt or destroy environmentally important ecosystems and habitats. It would also deplete precious resources from our cities. We should be building a wall around Trump to stop these irrational executive orders—instead of this ludicrous $25 billion wall between our closest ally.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments—again, bringing his experience to bear and, right from the beginning, introducing legislation, not just criticizing, but offering an alternative. It reminds us that, if we are to spend $20 billion on building something in this country—which is the upward cost of what President Trump's proposal would take from the American taxpayer—there are roads; there are bridges; there are tunnels. There are legitimate infrastructure needs on which we could spend that money that would put people to work, and it would be money much better spent.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Peters), someone who represents a part of the border that really demonstrates what is beautiful about the United States-Mexico border. He is a fierce advocate for our shared economic development and growth, for the jobs that are connected to that, and for everything that is beautiful about the United States-Mexico border. Mr. Peters, I thank Mr. O'ROURKE for putting together this Special Order to talk about what is really an important issue and, with all of the things going on, something that has even got a little bit lost.

Madam Speaker, for the region that I represent in San Diego, the border is an economic engine—it is a job creator. Home to the Otay Mesa, San Ysidro, and Tecate ports of entry, San Diego-Baja is the busiest border crossing in the world. From life sciences to electronics, San Diego is an attractive place to start a business and to manufacture goods, in part, because of our proximity to border crossings and international trade.

Last month, Mr. O'ROURKE and other members of the Congressional Border Caucus and I held a hearing with local leaders from chambers of commerce from around our districts to discuss real pragmatic solutions and issues around the border. I was joined by Jerry Sanders, who San Diegans well know as the former mayor. He is also the former police chief of San Diego and is now the current president of the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce. Mayor Sanders said that an efficient border is a safe border, and he knows something about safety from his time as a police chief. We also know that 99 percent of what gets screened at border crossings is safe and we do not need to worry about its coming into the country. What we need is to get more efficient at approving the 99 percent of safe cargo and travelers and better at stopping the 1 percent that we don't want to come in.

One of the big challenges that we faced when I first came to Congress was in border delays. We saw that delays at the border crossing were costing us, at that point, $7.2 billion of economic activity and 35,000 jobs annually—numbers so big that they are almost unbelievable, but those numbers came from independent assessments.

One of the great successes I have had in Congress is working with my colleagues within our congressional delegation, is to have worked together to secure more than $500 million to finish the expansion and the improvements at the San Ysidro border crossing. We did this work in recognition of the fact that JUAN VARGAS and SUSAN DAVIS and with Republicans DUNCAN HUNTER and DARRELL ISSA because we all understood how important the United States-Mexico border is to our regional economy. By investing in infrastructure and innovation in San Diego, Tijuana, and across the border, we are keeping Americans safe and supporting the export of goods made in America by American workers. In San Diego and in other communities, we are embracing this forward-looking approach of opportunity and job creation.

Now President Trump wants to put us in reverse by building a wall, which we have assessed at $15 billion. I mean, I have heard estimates of its being from $18 billion to $20 billion. By any count, it is a waste of money. Let's say, for purposes of argument, it is $15 billion. It took Congress more than a year to approve $170 million to help Flint, Michigan, recover from a crisis that has poisoned children and left an entire city without clean water—$170 million compared to $15 billion for a wall that nobody needs. We are talking about spending 100 times the money for Flint to build a wall that will do nothing to make us more secure, to make our children safer, or to make us more prosperous.

$15 billion is exactly how much the American Society of Civil Engineers says we will need to fill the funding gap for infrastructure needs at all of our Nation's ports for the next decade. So, if you took the money you were going to spend on this wall, you could cover all of the investment we would need at our ports around the country for the next decade. We are going to spend it on a wall.

$15 billion is also three times as much money as the Federal Government needs to spend every year. For the cost of this wall, we could build the Navy the 11th aircraft carrier that it needs. For 60 times less—or 1-60th—we could finish the modernization of the Otay Mesa border crossing, which is the busiest commercial port of entry along our southern border and which facilitates $35 billion in trade every year.

What are we doing here? Unlike President Trump's wall, this investment will support long-term job creation and increase revenues and is a much more responsible way to spend American taxpayer dollars. Let's be clear. American taxpayers are going to foot the bill for this wall, not Mexico. It is the leader of the Senate and Speaker RYAN who have committed they are going to spend $15 billion on this wall. That is American taxpayers. That is not Mexico.

Instead of trying to turn his campaign rhetoric into policy, we would prefer that President Trump listen to those who understand what business is like at the border, to those who understand that border cities are safe, like El Paso, like San Diego, and that the border is an opportunity for America, not a threat. We don't need a wall. We need to hire more Customs officers. We need newer screening technologies. We need to modernize and expand our infrastructure at other border crossings like we are already doing at San Ysidro. That is how you would create jobs in America. That is how you would keep us safe.

I thank my friend BETO O'ROURKE for his leadership and for his hosting this conversation today. I look forward to working with the gentleman in diverti-...
our separation, in sealing Mexico off from the United States literally physically, we deprioritize those connections that make us stronger, that grow our economy, and that create more jobs in the United States.

One thing you should know, as long as we are talking about sharing facts and confronting some of these unfortunate, untrue myths about the border, is that, when we export to Mexico, of course, we win—we are building things together; we are sending them to Mexico; the Mexican consumer buys them; those dollars are flowing back to the U.S. worker. It also happens that, when we import from Mexico, we win as 40 cents of every dollar of value that we import from Mexico originates in the United States. Literally, factory floor jobs in Ohio, in Iowa, in Michigan are producing things that go to Mexico and that are part of the final assembly that is reimported to the United States.

We could probably list things in America today, but we make a lot of things in the United States and in Mexico concurrently. Our economies, our production platform—our future—is inextricably connected, and to try to break that certainly makes no sense. In addition, the American and Mexican economies are connected, whether it is the $90 billion in U.S.-Mexico trade that passed through just the points of entry in El Paso, the city I have the honor of serving in Congress, and Ciudad Juarez, the city with which it is connected, whether it is the kind of immigration, when you have this kind of vilification of an entire people and their connection to us at the U.S.-Mexico border, then you be the judge of where these priorities are coming from and what they are and why they in no way reflect the real concerns, threats, and issues that we have in this country today.

My colleagues, the fact of the matter is Mexico presents opportunity to the United States; it always has. Whether it is the $90 billion in U.S.-Mexico trade that passed through just the points of entry in El Paso, the city that, with Ciudad Juarez, the city that, with which it is connected, whether it is the kind of immigration, when you have this kind of vilification of an entire people and their connection to us at the U.S.-Mexico border, you lose the benefit of that, whether it is the 6 million jobs that we already have in the United States economy, whether it is our security cooperation to ensure that we are disrupting transnational criminal organizations that are trying to move into this country, whether it is our work to address the real security issues in the northern triangle countries of Central America that border Mexico, we will lose a very valuable partner. We will lose those things that we want most: job growth, economic development, security for the people that we represent.

When we begin to humiliate that country and its leadership—and President Pena Nieto has canceled a trip to visit the United States in just 2 week of this administration—nothing good will follow that.

We cannot wall Mexico off from the United States. We cannot wish them to disappear. They will always be there, and they should always be there. And we should be grateful that they will always be there because they have always been a part of our history, our success, those things that are best about the United States; and, God willing, they will always be part of our future.

I think it is going to take each and every one of us—every Republican, every Democrat, every person who doesn’t feel affiliation to a party—to stand together behind and with the facts, with the truth, with this country’s best interests in mind. I am confident that if we do that, if we will simply look at what is happening today, what is happening with the relationship with that country, where our interests lie, we will make better policy. We will not be constructing walls between the two countries.

We will, at some point—hopefully, sooner rather than later—try to stand together behind and with the facts, with the truth, with this country’s best interests in mind. I am confident that if we do that, if we will simply look at what is happening today, what is happening with the relationship with that country, where our interests lie, we will make better policy. We will not be constructing walls between the two countries.

We can, at some point—hopefully, sooner rather than later—try to stand together behind and with the facts, with the truth, with this country’s best interests in mind. I am confident that if we do that, if we will simply look at what is happening today, what is happening with the relationship with that country, where our interests lie, we will make better policy. We will not be constructing walls between the two countries.

We can, at some point—hopefully, sooner rather than later—try to stand together behind and with the facts, with the truth, with this country’s best interests in mind. I am confident that if we do that, if we will simply look at what is happening today, what is happening with the relationship with that country, where our interests lie, we will make better policy. We will not be constructing walls between the two countries.

We can, at some point—hopefully, sooner rather than later—try to stand together behind and with the facts, with the truth, with this country’s best interests in mind. I am confident that if we do that, if we will simply look at what is happening today, what is happening with the relationship with that country, where our interests lie, we will make better policy. We will not be constructing walls between the two countries.

We can, at some point—hopefully, sooner rather than later—try to stand together behind and with the facts, with the truth, with this country’s best interests in mind. I am confident that if we do that, if we will simply look at what is happening today, what is happening with the relationship with that country, where our interests lie, we will make better policy. We will not be constructing walls between the two countries.

We can, at some point—hopefully, sooner rather than later—try to stand together behind and with the facts, with the truth, with this country’s best interests in mind. I am confident that if we do that, if we will simply look at what is happening today, what is happening with the relationship with that country, where our interests lie, we will make better policy. We will not be constructing walls between the two countries.

We can, at some point—hopefully, sooner rather than later—try to stand together behind and with the facts, with the truth, with this country’s best interests in mind. I am confident that if we do that, if we will simply look at what is happening today, what is happening with the relationship with that country, where our interests lie, we will make better policy. We will not be constructing walls between the two countries.

We can, at some point—hopefully, sooner rather than later—try to stand together behind and with the facts, with the truth, with this country’s best interests in mind. I am confident that if we do that, if we will simply look at what is happening today, what is happening with the relationship with that country, where our interests lie, we will make better policy. We will not be constructing walls between the two countries.
Texas, is the safest city in the United States.

It is the safest city not in spite of the large number of immigrants who live in my community—and, by official counts, 24 percent of the people that I represent in another community. It is not in spite of those people who were born in another country that El Paso is so safe. It is, in large part, because of their presence.

Families made extraordinarily difficult decisions to leave their home country—their home city, their families, the language they knew, the customs that they loved—to come to a new country. They make sure that they follow our laws. They make sure that their kids follow our laws. They make sure that the right thing by this country so that they can get ahead, have an opportunity and a crack at the American Dream. Not only is there nothing wrong with that, there is something profound about that. It is what has helped make El Paso the safest city, a wonderful city in America, a great country.

I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUIJAN GRISHAM) who understands the value of our relationship with Mexico, the special character of border people, and the value of immigration and immigrants.

Ms. MICHELLE LUIJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Madam Speaker, the people who, in fact, know the border issues the best—whether it is companies or lawmakers, both Republicans and Democrats, border communities, trade groups, economists, and law enforcement officials—all agree that building a wall is unnecessary, impractical, ineffective, and it is a complete waste of time and taxpayer money.

This wall, in fact, damages New Mexico’s economy, and that is without talking about President Trump’s idea to now impose a 20 percent tax on Mexican imports to pay for it. In the end, we know that it is American jobs, American consumers, and American companies that will be hurt.

Given that the United States already maintains approximately 650 miles of border fence, drones, cameras, motion detectors, thermal imaging sensors, ground sensors, and 21,370 Border Patrol agents, the wall is completely unnecessary for the stakeholders who are, in fact, most impacted. The only person it truly benefits is President Trump by furthering his isolationist, divisive, and anti-immigrant agenda.

I agree that this country should be building, and I agree with my colleague from El Paso, Mr. O’ROURKE, that there is a wonderful thing, an incredible thing about building bridges, building highways, building buildings, and focusing our energy on making sure that everyone has a fair shot and that we are living up to those economic values and those economic indicators. That is not what we are doing here. We are diverting our attention for an unnecessary, huge, colossal mistake that hurts the progress that border communities and border States have made.

Mr. O’ROURKE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUIJAN GRISHAM) for bringing her state’s experience and perspective to bear on this issue and for being a champion for the best in our traditions and our values.

I would like to build on the gentlewoman’s remarks and talk about one of the consequences of building walls. I have already made the point that the border is as secure as it has ever been. Those who study and understand security issues have come to the conclusion that extra miles of wall don’t deter migrants.

The lower levels of migration that we have seen to this country have a lot more to do with the U.S. economy and its struggling performance in the immediate aftermath of the Great Recession and throughout that road to recovery. The performance in other countries, including Mexico, that has afforded Mexican nationals more opportunity to stay there.

The border is as secure as it has ever been. We have recently doubled the size of the Border Patrol. We are using the latest and greatest technology to remain as vigilant as possible, which we should.

It is also important to know the character and quality of the Border Patrol agents and Customs and Border Protection officers who man the line, who are at our ports, and who have one of the most difficult, dangerous jobs that anyone has in the Federal Government. The conditions in which they work, the situations which they must anticipate, the constant vigilance that they must maintain, and the kind of threats that they have to be aware of—which include drug smuggling, which is critically important to stop—and human smuggling, which we must deter and stop; and which includes, even though there has never been a terrorist or terrorist act connected to the U.S.-Mexican border, incompleteness on our southern border—to last year, when there were just a little over 400,000, so a quarter of the level that we had 15, 16 years ago, in that same time that we have low levels of migration, we have maintained record high levels of migrant deaths. So those few migrants who do try to cross in between our ports of entry and do encounter physical barriers are going to more remote sections of the border. They are dying of thirst. They are dying of exposure. Those are otherwise preventable deaths.

So I ask you to think about it this way. Whether you are looking at the moral dimension of this, the otherwise preventable deaths, the effort to humiliate our closest partner in the country, of Mexico—whether you look at the economic dimension of this, if you want to protect those 6 million jobs that depend on a strong U.S.-Mexico connection, whether you look at the security dimension and taking our eye off the ball when it comes to real threats, proven threats that we have in this country at our international airports, at our northern border with Canada, at the increasing radicals in the United States radicalized over the internet, if you want to remove resources from those real threats, then go ahead and build a wall if it makes you feel good. But it is going to make us less safe, it is going to make us less economically secure, and it is going to be to our lasting shame. It will haunt us, and it will haunt us for generations for anyone who supports this or does not stand up and speak against it.

I would like to leave you with two anecdotes that I think exemplify the beauty, the strength, and the safety of the border. The first is a story of an event that took place this weekend in El Paso and Ciudad Juarez, where we are joined by the Rio Grande River channel. Right now, all that water is stored up at the Elephant Butte Reservoir in New Mexico. Really, there is just a little trickle in the river channel not more than a couple of inches deep. Thanks to the Border Network for Human Rights and thanks to the Border Patrol who allowed this, they were able to organize 300 families from Mexico and El Paso who were allowed to meet—one family at a time—in the channel that runs home and both sides clearly identified so there would not be any security or immigration issues.

And those families got to spend a total of 3 minutes together, families who, in some cases, had not seen each other for decades. A young woman
posted on Facebook that she drove down from Oklahoma City to see her
dad who she had not seen in 10 years.

You had folks meeting grandchildren
they had never seen before, sons or
daugughters-in-law that they had never
seen, having fun, crying, laughing,
hugging, holding, kissing for 3 minutes.

That, to me, is absolutely beautiful.

That, to me, is family values. That, to
me, shows you the extent to which people
will try to be together, to be with each
other, to do the things that perhaps
you and I, as U.S. citizens, take
for granted. And that happened in El
Paso, Texas, thanks to the Border Net-
work for Human Rights, thanks also to
the men and women in the Border Pa-
trol.

It didn't compromise our security. It
didn't add any new immigrants to this
country. It was just doing our best
under the current conditions.

The other anecdote that I would like
to share with all of you, and with whom
I will close on, involves another outstanding
organization in the community that I
have the honor to serve, Annunciation
House, led by Ruben Garcia, who—
—when we faced unprecedented numbers
of young children and young families, young
people in their teens and twenties, coming up from Honduras
and Guatemala and El Salvador, which
have become the deadliest countries,
not just in Central America, not just in
the western Hemisphere, but in the
world, the top five most violent countries in the world; kids being murdered and raped
and sold into slavery.

Those kids fleeing that horrific bru-
tality and violence, coming up the
length of Mexico, sometimes riding on
top of a train known as la bestia, or
the beast, to come and present them-
se in our border, not evade detect-
ion, not try and escape, not try to do
anything against the law; literally, as
the law prescribes, presenting them-
selves at our points of entry to a Bor-
der Patrol agent, or a Customs and
Border Protection officer, and asking
for help and for shelter, depending on
the best traditions inscribed on the
Statue of Liberty, counting on the
United States in their moment of need.
Well, the Border Patrol were out-
standing. The agents themselves, out
of their own pockets often, were buying
toys and gifts for these young children,
taking care of them, having their
hearts with you, and their best to serve
them. Agents who work for ICE and
immigration were doing their best as
well.

As that flow of people, the number of
people became too many temporarily
for us to hold and to process, they got
in touch with Ruben Garcia at Annun-
ciation House, which is a charity oper-
ated in El Paso, Texas. And Ruben
took those asylum seekers, those refu-
gees, and housed them, clothed them,
fed them, insured they had showers and
medications, visited with them, and
the ability to talk to their families
deepner in the interior of the United
States and, most importantly, espe-
cially for my colleagues on the other
side of the aisle, had a full and com-
plete understanding of their legal obli-
gations under U.S. law, what they were
allowed and not allowed to do, what
their court expectations were, and that
they must appear in court, and that
their case must be adjudicated, and
that they may or may not be able to
stay in this country.

Annunciation House, Ruben Garcia,
the volunteers who work for him, and
hundreds of thousands of people who
contributed this at not a penny's cost
to the Federal taxpayer or to our gov-
ernment.

So $20 billion to build a wall or An-
nunciation House taking care of refu-
gees, asylum seekers, little kids who
need our help for free?

That is the border. That is the best of
us. That is the best of this country.

That is what we need to think about.
Those are the facts we need to listen
to. Those are the facts we need to un-
derstand before we even contemplate
building a wall, separating ourselves
from Mexico, giving in to the nativist
sentiment and instinct that was so
powerfully played during this Presi-
dential election.

I think if we look at the facts, if we
take the best from the border, we are
going to get the best policy and the
best outcome from the United States.

And after all, isn't that why we were
all sent here? Isn't that what we are
going to get the best policy and the
best outcome from the United States?

And I think that's why we were
sent here. Isn't that what we are
supposed to do when our voters sent
us here to do the work of the American
people?

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

CONDITIONS AT THE SOUTHERN
BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-
uary 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa
(Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes
as the chairman of the majority leader.

Mr. KING. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to address you here on
the floor of the United States House of Represen-
tatives. And I came here to the floor with a bit different topic in
mind, but as I listened to the gen-
tleman from Texas, I thought it would
be a good idea, while there still was a
captive audience on the topic, to re-
fresh some things with perhaps a bit
different perspective.

And that is that, from my
time and experience, I have traveled
most every mile of the southern bor-
der, that would be 2,000, all together.
I think it would be true that I have trav-
eled every mile of California and Ariz-
a and New Mexico, and most all the
miles in Texas. I have flown a lot of it.
I have driven a lot of it. I have been
out on the water on some of it. And I
have spent some nights down on the
border, a number of them in some of
the dangerous crossings, in San
Tiquila crossing on the Tohono
O'odham Reservation. It is one of those
without any night vision and without
what we would call official security.

So when I hear that the border is as
secure as it has ever been and that
there is no security threat to the U.S.,
which is what we have just heard here
in this previous hour, Madam Speaker,
I absolutely don't agree with that.

There is no terrorism that is any
factor at all, that there has never
been a terrorist attack on the southern
border, I would point the gentleman to
the five heads that were lined up on the
Mexican side of the fence across from
the people that were driving to church
in New Mexico a few years ago. I think
those children that looked out the win-
dows of their cars as they were getting
a ride to church were victims of the
terror that was created by heads
shot along the side of the highway
within feet of our U.S. border.

As I spend time with the Border Pa-
trol agents that have made a career
out of protecting our border down
there, they tell me that they are mur-
dering their families over the border,
where they just throw the body over
the fence on to the U.S. side; and other
cases where they identify bodies on the
Mexican side of the border, and they
call the Mexican security people
who they have good relations with,
as a rule, and they will see the equiva-
 lent of an S-10 pickup pull up and just
throw the body in the back of the pick-
up and drive away, with zero forensics
and very little attempt to identify who
the perpetrators might be that have
committed these murders there close
to the border.

I have made surprise visits down to
the border on a number of occasions,
and I make it a point to stop in and see
what is going on and talk to the people
that are there protecting and guarding
our border.

I recall one of those visits down to
Tasabe, Arizona, at a relatively rural
crossing there. I pulled into that port
of entry and port of exit for us, and I
got out and I decided on the spot that,
well, I should let them know who I am
for reasons of courtesy, and so I intro-
duced myself.

Madam Speaker, I said: I'm Congress-
man STEVE KING from Iowa.

That agent immediately said: I can't
talk to you. And he turned and walked
away.

And so I went to the next agent and
I introduced myself: I'm STEVE KING
from Iowa.

And he said: I can't talk to you, but
talk to Mike. Mike is the supervisor
here tonight, and he's ready to retire,
and he has terminal cancer. He will
talk to you,

And I went and spoke to Mike. The
gentleman's name is Mike Crane. It
was Mike Crane. He did have terminal
cancer. That is verified. And he has
died away.

But as we were speaking about the
difficulties in securing the border and
the illegal crossings, both one east and
one west of the crossing at Sasabe, he
got a phone call, and he said, Excuse
me, and stepped away, and he was gone
for a couple of minutes outside the cir-
CLE.
He came back in and he said: There’s been a knife in the Mexican side of the border, and so there will be an ambulance coming through this border and this crossing in a few minutes. And I’ve called in U.S. ambulances with oxygen on them, and I’ve called in a helicopter by the victim out to the Tucson University Hospital.

So we waited there for a few minutes. The Mexican ambulance came across the crossing. I did have an EMT with me and I asked him to do what he could to lend a hand to help save the victim’s life, so he was in the middle of that process.

In the Mexican ambulance there was only one glove—just one glove—and a roll of gauze and nothing else, no oxygen, no medical equipment. It was an ambulance as far as the shell of it was concerned, and the painting on the outside said “ambulance,” but inside, it was just the same thing as an old home bread truck.

So they took him out of that Mexican ambulance. The U.S. ambulances had arrived fairly close to that period of time and they put him on oxygen and stabilized him, and then we loaded him off on to a helicopter and flew him up to Tucson University Hospital.

I went to Tucson that night, and the next morning I went to Tucson University Hospital and, essentially, talked my way in to visit this victim that had been stabbed in the liver with a knife. He just recalled it was 3% inches wide at the hilt. That was the width of the wound in him.

I went to the room that he was in and they said: Okay, here he is behind this curtain.

It was a two-patient room. When I walked behind the curtain, the individual there who had been knifed the night before was not the one that I had seen and been part of taking care of at Sasabe. It was a different victim that had been stabbed in the liver with a knife or a shaft that just recalled it was 3" inches wide at the hilt. That was the width of the wound in him.

I went to the room that he was in and they said: Okay, here he is behind this curtain.

As I was, I will say, looking at the situation, the patient whom I knew had been wounded the night before was rolled down the hallway in a wheelchair. He had been stabilized. He looked a lot better. We didn’t know if he was going to live.

So I spoke to the situation and, Madam Speaker, I then met with the chief financial officer of the Tucson University Hospital and other leaders there in the hospital and collected a whole series of narratives about the cost of the medical care that has been assumed by the United States, even from people who have injuries in a foreign country.

This cost on this particular incident was $30,000 to bring the wounded Mexican into the United States—parole him into the United States—is the legal term that we use—and then to send him back to Mexico once he was stabilized. And they had to post an agent with him to guard him during that period of time.

Now, I am not here on the floor tonight taking a position on whether that is right or wrong. From a moral standpoint, it is right. But we should be aware of what is going on. This is not a stable border. It is not a safe border.

I have sat on the border at the other crossing in Tohono O’odham Reservation, San Miguel crossing, and there, throughout the night, I heard vehicles coming through the brush, and you can listen and hear the doors open. You hear the individuals get out and drop their packs on the ground. They will close the door and you can hear them talking and whispering to each other; pick their packs up and walk off through the brush.

I sat there and tried to count the shadows, and I won’t give you those numbers because none of us are sure what we see when it is pitch black out, but I told [the chief financial officer of the Tucson University Hospital] that I counted a good number of people that were delivered down there to that crossing who came through the fence, which it would be rare for that to hold an old cow as they walk a four-barred wire fence, with the barbs pushed down where they have been continually crossing in the path through there, you can easily see.

When the gentleman from El Paso tells us that we are down to the low crossing level in a kind of modern history lowest crossing level of roughly 400,000 people last year, compared to not quite 1.6 million in the year 2000, I would point out that we count those who we can count, those who we see and those who we willingly see.

If we are not looking for them, if we are not guarding the portion of the border that they are pouring through, and we say we have counted 400,000 attempts coming into the United States, that doesn’t mean that there are only 400,000 attempts; that only means we counted 400,000.

The same goes with the interdiction of roughly 1.6 million. They were more aggressive then. And I will say that Bill Clinton was successful in interdicting more border crossing attempts than any other President. I don’t know that that was his goal or his objective, but I believe that was the statistical results.

To that extent, Madam Speaker, I don’t disagree with the gentleman from Texas. And I agree that the border crossings have slowed down. Ten years ago they were greater than they are today, but it is not logical, in fact, it is not rational to assert that because the border is as secure as it has ever been. Neither is it logical or rational to say that it is no security threat.

In the times that I have been on the border, I have encountered the incidents of seven different persons of interest from nations of interest, and I am only going to learn about that in that window between the time they are interdicted and the time that they are taken into the custody of the FBI.

So how many hundreds are there and perhaps more that are terrorists that are crossing into the United States? We know the easiest way to get into the United States illegally is to cross our southern border. So these assertions that we don’t have a border security problem and that it is not a security threat are false. That is why we should just simply leave the border open.

I heard hire more agents not to secure the border, but to facilitate crossing through legal crossings. I think there are some some false myths there. And if there have been seven incidents of persons of interest from nations of interest, and I am only going to learn about that it in that window between the time they are interdicted and the time that they are taken into the custody of the FBI.

I don’t disagree with the full breadth of that statement. Mr. Speaker, but the facts are 80 to 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico—80 to 90 percent. It is more than a $60 billion annual business pouring into the United States. Out of that $60 billion worth of drugs, a lot of that is laundered in the United States and brought back into Mexico and points south down toward for cocaine, for example, from Colombia. We saw a big bust of Colombian cocaine that was smuggled into the nose of an airplane that was found by the maintenance crew when they diverted the plane for maintenance. But 80 to 90 percent of the illegal drugs come from or through Mexico.

It is an American problem. It is a demand we have on the streets of America, it is a demand that we make as we abuse the drugs that kill thousands of our citizens. We have seen the addiction. We have seen the heroin addictions that have emerged in the United States and become part of the news in the last few years, but the people who die from overdoses of drugs has accelerated to more than die because of car accidents in the United States.

Now, that is alarming when you consider most all of us travel in cars in this country. Not a very big percentage but it is alarming. It is a very high percentage of those who are drug addicted that are dying because of the drugs they are getting and the
overdoses and the bad drugs that they are getting, and we need to shut that down and shut that off.

It isn’t a final solution, I would agree, because, Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to this equation. One of them is that we need to break the chain of illegal drugs, the transport of illegal drugs into the United States and the delivery of them in the United States to their retail destination. But the other side is that if we need to shut down the demand on those illegal drugs, that is in the south of the border in America. This Congress has not taken up in the time that I have been here. I have stood here on this floor a number of times and discussed the need for us to shut down the demand for illegal drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I will set that component aside for a moment and acknowledge that part of this problem is the United States’ demand for illegal drugs. The deaths in the United States aren’t solely the responsibility of the drug dealers. It also is the responsibility to reconstitute illegal drug use and abuse and to clean up our society using a number of tools that we haven’t yet developed; the will in our society to address the drug consumption problem in America.

Now, I have developed the will, I believe, especially with the election of Donald Trump, to address the illegal drug supply coming into America and to shut off the smuggling of drugs into the United States. So when I hear from the gentleman from El Paso that he wants open borders and he thinks walls and fences insult people and they damage the relationships between us and Mexico, what about 100,000 dead Mexicans that die in the drug wars? Doesn’t that damage our relationship between the United States and Mexico far more than the size of a wall that would probably save tens of thousands of Mexican lives by drawing a line, creating a barrier, and keeping the illegal drugs on the south side of that border away from the $60 billion-plus demand in the United States? I think that damages our relationship a lot more if we continue to allow that to happen.

The flow of illegal drugs flows this way into the United States. This is from the Drug Enforcement Agency. I said to them that I want to know about the drug distribution in America, who controls it. I know the answer, but I asked that question so I have got their response.

It is the Mexican drug cartels that control almost all of the illegal drug distribution in the United States of America. They are the cartels that operate in every major city, that control the illegal drug supply in nearly every major city; and if there is a significant exception, it is the southern tip of Florida—Miami—where more of those drugs come out of South America, across, through Haiti, and are smuggled into the United States. A lot by boat come through the Caribbean and into Miami and points along Key West. That is more a Haitian connection, South American connection, and to some degree a Cuban connection. But the balance of illegal drugs distributed in America are done so by the Mexican drug cartels.

I asked the Drug Enforcement Agency, if there is going to be the result of the illegal drug distribution chains in America if, magically, every one is illegally in America woke up in their home country tomorrow morning, what would that do to the illegal drug distribution in the United States or in the country? Their answer is: It would sever at least one link in every distribution chain of illegal drugs in America, at least one, and in many cases every link of that chain of distribution of illegal drugs. In other words, for a brief time, if that magical miracle thing happened that everybody woke up in their home country, say, tomorrow morning, there would be an instantaneous suspension of the transfer of illegal drugs through that chain in the hands of the users, where tens of thousands are dying because of the drug abuse that they are committing. That is how bad this drug stream is in America.

I cannot be convinced that it is not a national security problem. I can’t be convinced that it is not a social problem, a law enforcement problem, a criminal problem, and an economic problem. We are allowing these crimes against the humanity of the United States and turning a deaf ear—a deaf ear—because we don’t want to speak about how bad this is because somebody over on that side will start calling names again. Well, I don’t think I ever got up in the morning without a bunch of them calling me names before I ever got up—no matter how early—and I am immune to that, but I think we need to speak the truth.

With regard to the offensiveness of fences and walls, and having traveled the almost all of this border and examined it for the prospects of the need to build a fence, a wall, and a fence on our southern border, I would recount, Mr. Speaker, to you what I saw from the helicopter over El Paso.

The gentleman spoke and said that El Paso is the safest city in America. I have to check the data on that, but I do recall that El Paso is unusually safe in comparison to the other border cities between New Mexico, Texas, and the border between New Mexico, Arizona, California and Mexico. Why would El Paso be an unusually safe city if it sits on the border in the fashion that it does? And it does.

The gentleman from El Paso recounted that it is because they get along with each other and because they have 25 percent immigrants in his constituency, and somehow they have reached this balance of comity that they get along and so they don’t conflict with each other. I didn’t hear him address the drug problem at all. He may have and I missed it.

But I will submit that is not the reason why the crime rate is low in El Paso. Anybody who would like to fly over the border and take a look at that in El Paso can see why the crime rate is low. I recall President Obama going down there and standing about a mile of the border a few years ago and making remarks. He said that some people want to build a wall on the border, some want to build a moat, and some want to put a helicopter over on that side will start calling names again. Well, I don’t think I ever got up in the morning without a bunch of them calling me names before I ever got up—no matter how early—and I am immune to that, but I think we need to speak the truth.

So if we want to really do this from an analytical perspective, perhaps we would extrapolate some of those numbers and project that kind of security to, oh, Laredo, for example, McAllen, Brownsville, and maybe San Diego, which already has better crime rates now after they built their barriers across Smuggler’s Gulch. Everybody who has a fence admits they are safer than before they had one.

There is another tragedy, Mr. Speaker, that I recall the gentleman speaking about. He said that you would tear down the 600 miles of barrier that we have. Well, it is the opposite. We need to build them up. But, in any case, he said that those who study walls say they don’t deter illegal traffic coming across the border.

I wonder if the gentleman studied what was going on in Israel, the fencing that they built in Israel, and if he
happened to even notice the tweet that came out from Prime Minister Netanyahu just a couple days ago. He said that they built a barrier to protect them in Israel, and it is nearly 100 percent effective. Their lives depend upon it. So I don't disagree with that. It is just that we don't have a barrier between the North and South. Victor Davis Hanson, one of my top two favorite authors in the country and one of the deepest, most thoughtful, well-read, and prolific writers of history that goes far back to the Greek Peloponnesian era and beyond. He has a terrific understanding of the history of the world from the ancient world up. He's especially to Western civilization and came to us. I said: Mr. Hanson, I would like to know. I can think of the Berlin Wall as a wall that was built to keep people in. It was built by Communists to keep people in. Can you think of another wall in history that was built to keep people in?

I look across the history that I know, the rest of the walls were built to keep people out. Victor Davis Hanson thought for a little while. He said: Well, one could note the wall, the fence, the barrier between North and South Korea is at least in part built to keep people in North Korea. I don't disagree with that. It is just another case where Communists had to lock their people up to keep them from freedom.

So I would challenge anyone who is listening. Mr. Speaker, dig through your history books. Google this—to the end of the Earth if you like. I would like to know if there is another example of a fence or a wall that has been built by a nation-state on its borders that is built for the purpose of keeping people in—other than Berlin and the barrier between North and South Korea.

In both cases, it was keeping Communists locked in a Communist nation and keeping them from accessing the God-given liberty and freedom that we enjoy here in this country. The rest of the walls throughout history, including the Great Wall of China, were built to keep people out.

The example of that, in the Great Wall of China, would be that the segments of the Great Wall of China were built by different emperors. In fact, they were not a unified China during those years. I am going back several hundred years before Christ. Different emperors built different segments of the wall. They built them because they concluded the Mongols were coming down from the north and were raiding the Chinese. The Chinese decided they didn't want to be the subject of those raids any longer.

When you are not defended like that, you have a couple of choices. One, of course, is to submit and be killed, and that is not an option for the survivors at least. Another is you can run raids up into the Mongolian area and provide them a punishing deterrent to ever coming back into China again. A third alternative was to build the Great Wall of China.

They built it in segments. It had gaps in between. By about 245 B.C., the first emperor of China, the unifier of China, Qin Shi Huang, decided to connect all of these segments of the Great Wall of China to make the continuous wall. You could pull a chariot on top of it, it was so big and so well built. That wall—we believed up until the last few years—was 5,500 miles long, at least 2½ times as long as we need to build on the Mexican border.

He connected that together. I am sure he had cheap labor. I don't have any doubt about that. They may have worked for free and board and room, but they connected the great walls of China. Theirs, Qin Shi Huang, established the continuity of that wall that now, by satellite, Chinese scientists have identified it as it really was—13,000 miles long.

That is 13,000 miles. We need to build a dinky, little 2,000-mile wall here—a fence, a wall, and a fence—and people say it is too expensive. It doesn't cash flow. We can't think that. It is too hard. There are mountains on the border. There are complications. There are little toads that need to jump across the border. There are long-nosed bats that get confused if they have to fly over the top of it. There are these little species out here that we should worry about. And we have got an Indian reservation that spans both sides of that border. That is Tohono O'Odham.

All of these complications right away would be too expensive. The woe-is-me people come out. They have been manufacturing all these reasons why it doesn't make sense to build a fence, a wall, and a fence on the southern border, creating every kind of difficulty that you can imagine.

I will just tell you, Mr. Speaker, in my lifetime, I started a construction company in 1975. We are in the business of earthmoving and structural concrete work. We do underground utilities of all kinds. We know pretty well what it takes to do a job.

We bid jobs nearly every week, and we are out there with, let's say, two underground utility crews, a farm drainage crew, and an earthmoving crew. We can't possibly do that for the needs of the job we are doing.

Throughout the last more than 10 years, I have drawn up a design that I think is the most effective way to build a wall on the southern border, one that is cheap and effective and that will stand for a long time with very low and very little maintenance. I will just briefly describe that for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

We have an ability to slip formed concrete. A lot of the curbs and gutters that you see around on our streets aren't forms that are set up and poured any longer with a concrete worker with a board pulling that up on the edge of that 2-by-12 on the back. Instead, it is form, where you simply drive the machine along, it scrapes the concrete off, and you pour it with a low enough slump that it will stand in the mold that you leave it in.

I propose that we go in and trench the fence, the fence is about 18 inches that has a 6- or 7-inch gap between the concrete panels.

The precast concrete panels are poured pretty much on site, where they don't have to be moved very much. As you do that, you move along and pour the concrete panels. When they are cured, you just take a crane or an excavator and pick them up one at a time to drop them into the slot. Drop the next one into a slot.

They are tangible and groove. You lay that all out along the border. And yes, you have to tie it in so that it doesn't tip on you vertically. You have to engineer it. The strongest force on that wall isn't going to be people trying to get through or over it, it is the wind force on the full face of the wall that you have to design for.

We can do all of that, and it is simple. Then, with that kind of a pace, even the crews that we have today in our little, old construction company—and I will say for the record, Mr. Speaker, I am not proposing that King Construction build this, but I am asserting that it is not expensive, it is uncomplicated, and as companies in America have the full capability of building a good wall on the border that will stand for a long time. But, in any case, we slip form that footing foundation with the open slot in it, and then we drop the precast panels in. They can be whatever height the President of the United States would like. If he wants a 12-foot wall, we can build that, and I can price that out and put an estimate in place.

As I mentioned to the Secretary the other day, we are not proposing that we build it for the price I put into his hands, but if you call my bluff, we will. His answer was: Well, will you build 10 miles? I said: No, we want a thousand miles.

That is how good I think my estimate is. Our word would be good. But we will find cheaper bids out there if we put this together right. So we can put this together for substantially less
than I am hearing from this gentleman. I don’t know where he is getting his numbers. Mine are real. We cranked them out in the sophisticated software bidding package that King Construction uses for multiple jobs that are going on. Every week, we are bidding on new jobs.

When I stood on the floor here 10 years ago and said that we will build a wall with a 5-foot foundation in it, a slot in it, and precast panels, a functional 12-foot height, 6-inch wide concrete with wire on top, and we can say that for $1.3 million a mile. That is for the foundation, the wall only. That is not for right-of-way acquisition, that is not for maintenance roads, that is not for all the bells and whistles that we need, or for the fence on either side that I believe we need, but that is what the wall would cost—roughly in the area of $1.3 million a mile.

If that doesn’t sound plausible, Mr. Speaker, I will put this in a perspective for you. When I was listening to Mr. Cuellar, he is just finishing up, and will here, I guess, a year from this fall, almost 300 miles of highway across the middle of Iowa through expensive cornfields. It is interstate-equivalent. It is four lanes. It is all built with the medians and the ditches.

When you look at an interstate highway, first, you have to by the right-of-way. Then you have to do the environmental and archeological tests. Then you do the engineering. Then you have to do the contracts. Then you have to do the clearing and grubbing. You strip the topsoil, stockpile it, move the Earth, and then when that is done, you go in and put in any subgrade that you have got.

Then you pave, then you shoulder it. Then you seed it. While all this is going on, then you paint the stripes on it, put the signs up, and you put a fence on either side of that. Then you cut the ribbons and then to travel miles, we are hearing people talk about a $30 or $30 billion project to build a 2,000-mile wall on the southern border.

I will submit, Mr. Speaker, this: we built that highway through the center of Iowa for roughly 300 miles for an average cost of something slightly less than $4 million a mile. That is buying the right-of-way going through Iowa cornfields, not the desert, and that is all of the engineering, the earthmoving, the paving for our highway strongly there.

Can anybody think that, at $4 million a mile to build an interstate, you can’t build a fence for about $1.3? I will tell you that, in the $2 million a mile category, we will have a fence, a wall, and a much lower percent of that southern border.

And there will be maybe 20 percent of that, and probably not more than 20 percent of that, that is tougher than that, and that is rock and it is mountain. Some of it is semivertical. What I have long said is: Let’s build that fence, the wall, and the fence until they stop going around the end.

You don’t have to commit to a thousand-mile barrier right away and build it out into the Gulf at the Rio Grande and the Gulf of Mexico where the Rio Grande dumps in or run it into the Pacific Ocean in San Diego, although those are probably good places to have it. You build it until they stop going around the end.

If you build it into the mountain and the stone and they decide it is too hard to travel all that way and climb those mountains, you don’t need to build it at any function going around the end, then you build it.

We can build right over the top of the mountains, if we need to. We can put that foundation in there and drop the panels in right up nearly vertical face, if we need to. It is a lot more design and is expensive. Or, we can build the wall around the base of the mountain, where it makes more sense to do that.

In some places, we probably won’t need to build one for a long time, if ever. We can build it very cheap and fast and where there is a lot of traffic. Let’s shut it all off, Mr. Speaker, and let’s do so for a cheap and economic price of a good concrete wall that will last for a century or more standing there with very little maintenance.

And yes, I think we should have vibration sensors, and I think we ought to have infrared where we need it. I think we ought to have cameras where it makes sense. We need people to patrol that. That all goes with the package.

I will say, as I said to President Trump more than a month ago, we build the wall until they stop going around the end. This is the centerpiece of our border security. And then all of the other things we do with sensors and lights and sensing wire on top of the wall, all of that are accessories to the centerpiece, which is the concrete wall.

Donald Trump, as President of the United States of America, to accept that kind of transfer of massive transfer of wealth and that destruction of our own people.

As bad as it is, that is 100,000 Mexicans killed in the wars over the last decade or perhaps a little less than that, many more Americans have died because of drug overdoses in that period of time. And do we shed a tear for them? We should. And there are others we should shed a tear for, Mr. Speaker. There are others we should shed a tear for. Mr. Lopez-Sanchez’s wife, a beautiful brown-haired, blue-eyed, 32-year-old lady out with her father along the wharf in San Francisco. If I can remember his name—Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez is his name—was deported at least five times from the United States for committing felonies.

And what did he do? He came back into the United States, and he went to a sanctuary city, San Francisco, that had put out the beacon in the advise and consent. We did not do that. We created those cities. We will protect you. We will not let Federal immigration officials disturb your life here. We have hearts for people who are criminals, who are felons violating American laws with impunity being deported and coming back into the United States.

So he is living in a sanctuary city in San Francisco. He shot Kate Steinle in the back, and she fell and died in her father’s arms, this beautiful young lady. When I saw that story, when it came up on my Twitter account that day, I looked at that and re-tweeted the story with a quote that said: This will make you cry, too.
Just sitting alone, reading my email, when I saw that story, it made me cry. Mr. Speaker, because I know that Kate Steinle is not 1 of the 124 who her father, Jim Steinle, spoke of when he so courageously testified before the House Judiciary Committee. I give him great credit as he承受ed the courage to do so, and to commemorate his daughter’s life. She is not 1 of 124, which were essentially undocumented who were documented to be released who committed homicide after they had been released by our criminal justice system. The number is in the thousands. It is in the thousands—the Americans who died at the hands of criminal aliens who are in the United States illegally committing crimes against. And I call them Americans. Sometimes they are green card holders, lawful permanent residents.

That number is not 124. Mr. Speaker, that number is in the thousands. It is in the thousands—the Americas who has been sacrificed, that has been taken at the hand of someone who is unlawfully present in the United States of America, every life could have been saved. Every crime is a preventable crime. I have lived and believed that for a long time, Mr. Speaker.

As I came to this Congress some 14 years ago, I listened to the witnesses before the Immigration Subcommittee, and the witnesses would continually testify as to why do aliens were lost in the Arizona desert as people were trying to sneak into America. Having snuck across the border and they are trying to creep through the desert, often the heat will affect them, and they will run out of water and they will die of exposure or exhaustion. The numbers went from roughly 200 a year in the Arizona desert, I recall them going up to as high as 450. That testimony would come almost every hearing, someone would come in and testify to the number of lives lost on an annual basis in the Arizona desert.

I began to wonder, as I would hear the news stories in the United States of the Kate Steinles and the Jamiel Shaw’s—Jamiel Shaw’s son, Jas Shaw, the son had just spoken to his father on the cell phone and said: I will be home in just a few minutes, Dad.

But he never came home because he was shot in the head and killed up the street a block or two from his home because he refused to go to his murderer was to go kill a Black person. Jamiel Shaw will never, never forget those days. Neither will Jas’s mother, who was serving in the military and, I believe, deployed at the time. Both of them have testified here in the United States Congress.

There are others. Sarah Root from Modale, Iowa, a perfect 4.0 grade point average who was the victim of a random investigation at Bellevue University in Omaha. I believe the date that she graduated would have been January 30, 2016. The next day she was run over and brutally killed by a drag racing, illegal alien, Mejia—Eswin, I believe his first name is Mejia. He was driving under the legal blood alcohol content. He was drag racing, and he ran Sarah Root, this perfect young woman with the beginning of her adult life set up perfectly in front of her, the only daughter of her father, Scott, and her mother, Michelle. She had a brother, Scotty. Sarah’s parents have both testified also before the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This is personal, Mr. Speaker. It is personal to these families that have lost a loved one that they know would still be alive today if the administrations had enforced existing immigration laws.

When I read the very, very sad story in Cottonwood, Minnesota, southwest Minnesota, not very far from my district, several years ago where a schoolbus full of kids was taking kids home from school, from after school, and an illegal alien who had twice encountered local enforcement and twice been released on the streets because the local law enforcement decided “it is not my job,” ran the schoolbus off the road and into the ditch, and the bus rolled over. Four grade-school children were killed by Cottonwood, Minnesota: a brother and a sister, and then separate children from two other families. Three families grieving at the tragic, horrible death of their grade-school children.

If we had enforced our immigration laws, those children would be alive today. They would be living, laughing, loving, studying, maybe teaching. They would be falling in love and doing all of the things that we want them to do as Americans, but their lives were snuffed out because we had an administration that refuses to enforce the law.

Others would say: Well, Congressman King, you cannot assert that it is because of illegal activity or illegal aliens in America that brought about the death of those four children in Cottonwood, Minnesota, or the death of Sarah Root from Modale, Iowa, or the death of Kate Steinle in San Francisco, or Jas Shaw, or Brandon Mendoza, or Dominic Durden.

All of their lives and thousands more have been lost because we refused to enforce immigration law.

They tell me: No, crimes will be committed, bad things will happen; it has nothing to do with not enforcing immigration law.

My answer to them is, Mr. Speaker: Then you go tell those parents in Cottonwood, Minnesota, that their children would still be dead if we had deported the perpetrator who killed them. You go tell the parents of Kate Steinle that she would still be dead if Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez had been effectively deported or locked up for a mandatory 5-year sentence as we have written into Kate’s law, that Kate would still be dead if we had enforced such a law on Sanchez. Or go tell the mother of Brandon Mendoza that her fine and proud law enforcement son would still be dead if we had deported the illegal who ran him down that day. Or tell Jamiel Shaw that his son, Jas, would still be dead if we had deported the illegal alien who murdered his son on the street in his neighborhood.

We know better, Mr. Speaker. This is personal. It is personal in the lives of thousands of families in America who are suffering thousands of incidents of their grief that will be part of their lives. For generations, that will look back, and they will grieve for those lost family members who will not be there on Easter or on Christmas or on Thanksgiving, and they will grieve for the grandchildren, who were never born, and they will call upon their surviving brothers and sisters. Now you are responsible to be the parents of the grandchildren for the parents who lost their daughter or lost their son.

That is what is at stake here, Mr. Speaker.

We are a nation of laws, but we are, today, a nation of not yet fully enforced laws, and we have had a President in the past who seemed bent on to bring the maximum number of illegal aliens and leave them here and keep them here. He never demonstrated a desire to enforce the law as he opened up the borders of America to people who are coming from terrorist-sponsoring countries. Now, thankfully, we have Donald Trump, who has stepped up to close those borders back down again and get a handle on this migration so that the American people can be safer. But we will be a lot safer with a fence, a wall, and a fence on our southern border.

By the way, at this point now, the United States is spending, annually, $13.4 billion a year—that is billion with a B—to secure our southern border, and we are getting perhaps 25 percent enforcement efficiency in that southern border—25 percent. That, by the way, is the testimony of the Border Patrol before the Committee on the Judiciary. It is not a number that is brought up from someone who wants to be critical of them.

I salute the Border Patrol. They have got a tough job. But their operation has not been managed for the purpose of achieving border security. They have tried to redefine it as to something else.

Oh, $13.4 billion a year spent on our 2,000-mile southern border. Now, somebody out there, Mr. Speaker, has done this math on that 2,000 miles into $13.4 billion. That comes to $6.7 million a mile to secure our southern border, $6.7 million a mile for every
mile every year, day and night—$6.7 million.

I would just ask people, contemplate that cost, that heavy cost, $6.7 million a mile. What can you buy for that?

Well, you can buy an interstate highway. You can buy 2.7 million a mile, the $14 billion, and we can build an interstate highway the full length of that and have $2.7 million a mile left over. That is how much money is being spent on the southern border to get 25 percent efficiency.

You cannot convince me that if we spend $1.3 million a mile for the wall—if we dial that up to 2 or a little more than $2 million a mile so we can cover a fence on either side of that wall and access roads that would be built out of necessity and to maintain and to patrol it—a couple million dollars a mile on that, wouldn’t give us something pretty close to Israeli-level border security. That is nearly 100 percent. That is up into the 99 percentile and beyond. That is the efficiency of the security of our border. Of course we could get that kind of security on our border.

It doesn’t mean we just build it and walk away. People on that side would know that we would just build a wall and walk away and we leave the ladders put up on the south side of the border. No, we would maintain that. We would patrol it. We would fly it. We would patrol it. We would have wire sensors. We would put wire on top, and that wire on top would signal to us if anybody grounded that wire, tried to breach that, touch that wire, brought it to the ground. It would tell us in milliseconds exactly where that breach was attempted to take place. We would zero our enforcement in on them and we would enforce it, and we would maintain it so that it functions 100 percent all the time.

I see the fence we have got on the border now, and sometimes they will come on the other side, take a set of wire cutters, cut themselves a gate through a chain-link fence. I believe I saw this in Lakeville, Arizona. There they take a chain and thread it through the chain-link fence, put a padlock on it, and it is their personal gate to come and go into America whenever they see fit, with a great, big, huge brown mastiff on a bigger chain just laying there by that gate with a growl under his throat waiting for anybody who might decide they want to walk through that gate in the fence.

We can do a lot better. We will do a lot better, $6.7 million a mile. Let me pose this another way for people who have a different way of putting images in their head.

For me, I live out in the country in Iowa. We have gravel roads every mile, in the flat country at least. From where I live, my west road runs a mile out there to the intersection where it goes on in four directions, gravel road. So let’s just say that General Kelly, Secretary Kelly, came to me and he said: ‘‘Mr. Speaker, I want you to guard your west mile, and I want you to secure that border so that 25 percent of the people that are trying to get across there will be interdicted and won’t be able to get across that border. So what would you take to give me that level of security for a mile? Make it a mile, the west gravel road from my house?’’

He said: ‘‘I have got a bid. I will give you $6.7 million—that is the average going rate for a mile—and you will get that every year. By the way, we do our budgets on a 10-year contract, so I will give you $67 million to secure 1 mile of Iowa gravel road.’’

Do you think I could secure that border for $67 million for 10 years? And do you think I would do that? I am going to do that if it is a very big chain and to patrol it—a couple million dollars a mile, and it is a very big chain and to patrol it—a couple million dollars a mile, and I want you to secure that border so that 25 percent of the people that are trying to get across there will be interdicted and won’t be able to get across that border. So what would you take to give me that level of security for a mile? Make it a mile, the west gravel road from my house?’’

He said: I have got a bid. I will give you $6.7 million—that is the average going rate for a mile—and you will get that every year. By the way, we do our budgets on a 10-year contract, so I will give you $67 million to secure 1 mile of Iowa gravel road.

Yes, I would hire a border patrol, and I would put the bells and whistles, the accessories on that wall so that we had the security of our border. Of course we could get that kind of security on our border.

What can you buy for that? You cannot convince me that if we spend $1.3 million a mile for the wall—if we dial that up to 2 or a little more than $2 million a mile so we can cover a fence on either side of that wall and access roads that would be built out of necessity and to maintain and to patrol it—a couple million dollars a mile on that, wouldn’t give us something pretty close to Israeli-level border security. That is nearly 100 percent. That is up into the 99 percentile and beyond. That is the efficiency of the security of our border. Of course we could get that kind of security on our border.

It doesn’t mean we just build it and walk away. People on that side would know that we would just build a wall and walk away and we leave the ladders put up on the south side of the border. No, we would maintain that. We would patrol it. We would fly it. We would patrol it. We would have vibration sensors. We would put wire on top, and that wire on top would signal to us if anybody grounded that wire, tried to breach that, touch that wire, brought it to the ground. It would tell us in milliseconds exactly where that breach was attempted to take place. We would zero our enforcement in on them and we would enforce it, and we would maintain it so that it functions 100 percent all the time.

I see the fence we have got on the border now, and sometimes they will come on the other side, take a set of wire cutters, cut themselves a gate through a chain-link fence. I believe I saw this in Lakeville, Arizona. There they take a chain and thread it through the chain-link fence, put a padlock on it, and it is their personal gate to come and go into America whenever they see fit, with a great, big, huge brown mastiff on a bigger chain just laying there by that gate with a growl under his throat waiting for anybody who might decide they want to walk through that gate in the fence.

We can do a lot better. We will do a lot better, $6.7 million a mile. Let me pose this another way for people who have a different way of putting images in their head.

For me, I live out in the country in Iowa. We have gravel roads every mile,
into the United States, shut off the illegal traffic into America, shut off the terrorists who are sneaking into America because the easiest and most reliable way for them to get here is across our southern border. If we do all of that, then we will respect for both countries that will be established.

And I would say this to President Trump. And that is, he is a builder. I am a builder. I don’t have any doubt about how to build that wall or to build the fences on the south and north side so that we have no nation’s lands to patrol. I don’t know that he has any doubt about it either. He has said that he will build a big, beautiful wall.

Well, I am looking for the architect’s ideas on beauty. That is not my forte. But the structural functionality and the efficiency of its construction is my forte. And I encourage that we draw up the plans and designs for this and let contracts to those contractors who can effectively and efficiently do this in a competitive lowly fashion with a proper inspection, and we will build that barrier that can stand for a long time, designed to keep people and contraband out, as every other wall in the history of the world, including the Great Wall of China and the walls that were built in northern England and those across northern Germany. The Romans built walls there to protect themselves as well.

Each wall, with the exception of those designed by communists to keep their subjects in, has been designed to keep people out. There is a huge moral difference between a wall to keep people in and a wall to keep criminals, terrorists, and also decent people, and contraband out. It is a simple equation.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention here this evening on this topic. I look forward to the construction of the fence, the wall, and the fence on our southern border, and the restoration of the respect for the rule of law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of family emergency.
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RULE I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(A) Applicability of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.—The Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives (the “House”) are the rules of the Committee on Homeland Security (the “Committee”) and its subcommittees insofar as applicable.

(B) Applicability to Subcommittees.—Except where the terms “full Committee” and “subcommittee” are specifically mentioned, the following rules shall apply to the Committee’s subcommittees and their respective Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members to the same extent as they apply to theFull Committee and its Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

(C) Appointments by the Chairman.—Clause 2(d) of Rule XI of the House shall govern the designation of a Vice Chairman of the Full Committee.

(D) Conferences.—The Chairman is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

(E) Committee Website.—The Chairman shall maintain a website for the purposes of furthering the Committee’s legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee’s activities to Committee Members, other Members, and the public at large. The Ranking Minority Member may maintain a similar website for the same purposes. The Committee shall display a link on its home page to the web site maintained by the Ranking Minority Member.

(F) Activity Report.—The Committee shall submit a report to the House on the activities of the Committee in accordance with House rule XI 1(d).

RULE II.—SUBCOMMITTEES.

(A) Generally.—The Full Committee shall be organized into the following six standing subcommittees and each shall have specific responsibility for such measures or matters as the Chairman refers to:

(1) Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence;

(2) Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security;

(3) Subcommittee on Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection;

(4) Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency;

(5) Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security; and

(6) Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Resiliency, and Technology.

(B) Selection and Ratio of Subcommittee Members.—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall select their respective Members of each subcommittee. The ratio of Majority to Minority Members shall be comparable to the Full Committee. The ratio of Majority to Minority Members shall be as follows: the Chairman of the Full Committee and each subcommittee shall have at least two more Majority Members than Minority Members.

(C) Ex Officio Members.—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall be ex officio members of each subcommittee but are not authorized to vote in the absence of the majority or minority of such subcommittee. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall only be counted to satisfy the quorum requirement for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(D) Posers and Dates of Subcommittees.—Except as otherwise provided, the Chairman of the Full Committee, each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the Full Committee on the matters within its purview. Subcommittees of the Full Committee shall meet and hear testimony only with the approval of the Chairman of the Full Committee. The extent practicable, no more than one meeting and hearing should be scheduled for a given time.

RULE III.—SPECIAL COMMITTEE PANELS.

(A) Designation.—The Chairman of the Full Committee may designate a special panel of the Committee consisting of Members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that warrant enhanced consideration, and to report to the Committee.

(B) Party Ratios and Appointment.—The applicable subcommittee or committees may appoint additional minority members, consistent with the ratio of the full committee. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member may serve as ex officio members.

(C) Duration.—No special panel shall continue in existence for more than six months.

(D) Jurisdiction.—No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

RULE IV.—REGULAR MEETINGS.

(A) Regular Meeting Date.—The regular meeting date and time for the transaction of business of the Full Committee shall be at the discretion of the Chairman, and may be scheduled for the consideration of any legislation or other matters pending before the Committee, or to conduct other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(C) Consideration.—Except in the case of a special meeting held under clause 2(c)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the determination of the business to be considered at each meeting of the Committee shall be made by the Chairman.

RULE V.—NOTICE AND PUBLICATION.

(A) Notice.—

(1) Hearings.—(a) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing before the Full Committee or subcommittee, which announcement shall be made not less than one week after such notice.

(b) However, a hearing may begin sooner than specified in (a) if the Chairman of the Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present, for the transaction of business. If such a determination is made, the Chairman shall make the announcement required under (a) at the earliest possible date, and the names of all witnesses scheduled to appear at such hearing shall be provided to Members no later than 48 hours prior to the commencement of the hearing.

(2) Meetings.—The Chairman shall announce the date, time, place and subject matter of
any meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which Members have notice thereof except in the case of a special meeting called under clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI. Notice will be provided to the public, made publicly available in electronic form, and posted on the official Committee web site.

(b) No later than 24 hours after concluding a meeting to consider legislation, the text of such legislation as ordered forwarded or reported, including any amendments adopted or deemed struck or stricken, shall be made publicly available in electronic form.

(3) Briefings.—The Chairman shall provide notice of the date, time, place, and subject matter of each briefing. To the extent practicable, a Member briefing shall not commence earlier than the third day on which Members have notice thereof.

(4) Publication.—House Rule XI 2(g)(3)(C) is hereby incorporated by reference.

RULE VI.—OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS; BROADCASTING.

(A) Open Meetings. The Chairman shall be open to the public including radio, television, and still photography coverage, except as provided by law, pursuant to Committee Rule XI and unless the Committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines that disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, compromise sensitive law enforcement information, tend to defame, degrade or incriminate a witness, or violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives.

(B) Broadcasting. — Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, the Committee shall permit that part of the meeting to be covered by television broadcast, internet broadcast, print media, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. Operation and use of any Committee broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with House Rule XI and applicable rules of the Committee and the House. Priority shall be given by the Committee to members of the Press Galleries. Pursuant to clause 2(e) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings and shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that allows the public to easily access the recordings.

(C) Transcripts.—A transcript shall be made of the testimony of each witness appearing before the Committee during a Committee hearing. An audio recording of meetings or hearings that are open to the public shall be made available.

RULE VII.—PROCEDURES FOR MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.

(A) Opening Statements.—At any meeting of the Committee, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall be entitled to present oral opening statements of five minutes each. Other Members may submit written opening statements for the record. The Chairman presiding over the meeting may permit Members, including the Majority and Minority, to submit opening statements to other Members of the Full Committee or of that subcommittee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

(B) The Five-Minute Rule.—The time any one Member may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes, and then only when the Member has been recognized by the Chairman, except that this time limit may be extended when permitted by unanimous consent.

(C) Postponement of Vote.—The Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a majority of the Members, by motion, ordered to report a bill or other legislation to the full Committee to a Committee by motion, may permit Committee proceedings to resume on a postponed question, an underlying proposition, a pending question for the hearing record to be directed towards a witness at the hearing.

RULE VIII.—WITNESSES.

(A) Questioning of Witnesses.—(1) Questioning of witnesses by Members will be conducted under the five- minute rule unless the Committee adopts a motion permitted by clause 2(h)(2) of House Rule XI.

(2) In questioning witnesses under the five- minute rule, the Committee shall question witnesses in the order of seniority with the Majority party and the Minority and Ranking Minority Members. Committee Members arriving after the commencement of the hearing shall be recognized in the order of arrival, alternating between Majority and Minority Members, after Members present at the beginning of the hearing have been recognized. To the extent practicable, each Member shall be recognized at least once before any Member is given a second opportunity to question a witness.

(B) Minority Witnesses.—(1) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by motion, may permit a specified number of Members to question witnesses for a period longer than five minutes, but the time allotted must be equally apportioned to the Majority party and the Minority and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(2) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by motion, may permit Committee staff of the Majority and Minority to question witnesses for a period longer than five minutes, but the time allotted must be equally apportioned to the Majority and Minority staff and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(C) Oath or Affirmation.—The Chairman of the Committee or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer an oath to any witness.

(D) Questioning by Witnesses.—(1) Witnesses may question any witness in accordance with clause 4(b) of Rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House of Representatives.

(2) Witnesses who testify before any hearing shall submit a prepared or written statement to the Chairman of the Committee or any other Member designated by the Chairman. Pursuant to clause 2(e) of rule XI of the Rules of the House, the text of such legislation to be marked up shall be provided to the Members, made publicly available in electronic form, and posted on the official Committee web site.

(3) Members of the Committee shall be entitled to submit questions for the hearing record to be directed towards a witness at the hearing.

(4) Questions for the hearing record to be directed towards a witness at the hearing. Pursuant to clause 2(e) of rule XI of the Rules of the House, except as otherwise provided, any questions for the hearing record to be directed towards a witness at the hearing are subject to the discretionary authority of the Chairman. The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may determine whether questions for the hearing record may be permitted to be directed towards a witness at the hearing.

RULE IX.—QUORUM.

Quorum Requirements.—Two Members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence. One-third of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for conducting business, except for (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings to the public, pursuant to Committee Rule IV; (3) any other action for which an actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law. The Chairman's staff shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member's staff when scheduling meetings and hearings, to ensure that a quorum for any purpose will include at least one Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE X.—DECORUM.

(A) Breaches of Decorum.—The Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, by, during, and after a hearing or Committee meeting; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

Access to Dais.—To prevent the dais before, during, and after a hearing, markup, or other meeting of the Committee shall be limited to Members and staff of the Committee. Subject to availability of space on the dais, Committee Members' personal staff may be present on the dais during a hearing if their employing Member is seated on the dais during a hearing if their employing Member is seated on the dais. Member's personal staff shall be under the control of and subject to the discretion of their employing Member. In addition to the Committee Members' personal staff, the Committee may permit staff of the Majority party and the Minority party to be present on the dais.

(B) Minority Witnesses.—(1) Witnesses shall include the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing, and the amount and source of any other support originating from a foreign government. Such statements, with the appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witnesses, shall be recorded and may be made publicly available in electronic form no later than one day after the witness appears.

(C) Oath or Affirmation.—The Chairman of the Committee or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer an oath to any witness.

(D) Questioning by Witnesses.—(1) Witnesses may question any witness in accordance with clause 4(b) of Rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House of Representatives.
remuneration of and may remove shared staff that is assigned to service of the Committee. The Chairman shall certify Committee staff appointments, including appointments of the Ranking Minority Member, as required.

(C) Divulgence of Information.—Prior to the public announcement by the Chairman or the Committee of a decision to initiate an investigation of a particular person, entity, or subject, no member of the Committee staff shall knowingly divulge to any person any information, including non-classified information, which comes into his or her possession by virtue of his or her status as a member of the Committee, if the member of the Committee staff has a reasonable expectation that such information may alert the subject of a Committee investigation to the existence, nature, or substance of such investigation, unless authorized to do so by the Chairman or the Committee.

RULEx. XI.—SUBPOENAS; COUNSEL.

(A) Authorization.—The power to authorize and issue the subpoenas is delegated to the Chairman of the Full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman, with consultation with the Ranking Minority Member prior to issuing any subpoena under such authority, may issue any subpoena under such authority.

(B) Disclosure.—Provisions may be included in a subpoena in the form of a countermand or a demand that counsel is bound by and agrees to furnish or organization, and contact information and controlled unclassified information may be destroyed, disclosed, discussed, examined, handled, reviewed, stored, transported, transmitted, or otherwise disposed of in an appropriate manner in accordance with all applicable laws, executive orders, and other governing authorities. Such documents may be removed from the Committee's offices only in furtherance of official Committee business. Appropriate security procedures, as determined by the Chairman in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall govern the handling of such documents removed from the Committee's offices.

(C) Subpoena duces tecum.—A subpoena duces tecum may be issued whose return to the Committee shall occur at a time and place other than that of a regularly scheduled meeting.

(D) Counsel.—When representing a witness or entity before the Committee in response to a document request, request for transcribed interview, or subpoena from the Committee, or in connection with testimony before a hearing, counsel for the witness or entity must promptly submit to the Committee a notice of appearance specifying the following: (a) counsel's name, firm name, and address; (b) contact information; and (c) each client represented by the counsel in connection with the proceeding. Submission of a notice of appearance constitutes representation that counsel is authorized to accept service of process by the Committee on behalf of such client(s), and that counsel is bound by and agrees to comply with all applicable House and Committee rules and regulations.

RULEx. XIII.—COMMITTEE STAFF.

(A) Generally.—Committee staff members are presumptions of officers of the House of the Committee and must be eligible to be considered for routine access to classified information.

(B) Staff Assignments.—For purposes of these rules, Committee staff means the employees of the Committee, details, fellows, or any other person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for, or at the request of, the Committee. All such persons shall be either Majority, Minority, or shared staff. The Chairman shall appoint, supervise, where applicable determine remuneration of, and may remove Majority staff. The Ranking Minority Member shall appoint, supervise, where applicable determine remuneration of, and may remove Minority staff. In consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman may appoint, supervise, determine

Access to classified information, the following oath (or affirmation) shall be executed:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose any classified information retained by the Committee on Homeland Security, except as authorized by the Committee or the House of Representatives or in accordance with the provisions of these rules governing the disclosure of classified or unclassified information. Copies of the executed oath (or affirmation) shall be retained by the Clerk of the Committee as part of the records of the Committee.

(F) Disciplinary Action.—The Chairman shall immediately consider disciplinary action at any event where either a Majority or Minority staff member fails to conform to the provisions of these rules governing the disclosure of classified or unclassified information. Such actions may include, but shall not be limited to, immediate dismissal from the Committee staff, criminal referral to the Justice Department, and notification of the House of Representatives. With respect to Minority staff, the Chairman shall consider such disciplinary action in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.
electronic form and posted on the official Committee web site within 48 hours of such record vote.

(G) Separate and Distinct.—All Committee records and files must be kept separate and distinct from the office records of the Members serving as Chairman and Ranking Minority Member. Records and files of Members' personal offices shall not be considered records or files of the Committee.

(H) Disposition of Committee Records.—At the conclusion of each Congress, non-current records and files of the Committee shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee. The Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member on any communication from the Archivist of the United States or the Clerk of the House concerning the disposition of noncurrent records pursuant to clause 4(b) of the Rule.

RULE XVI.—COMMITTEE RULES.

(A) Availability of Committee Rules in Electronic Form.—House Rule XI 2(a) is hereby incorporated by reference.

(B) Changes to Committee Rules.—These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by the Full Committee provided that a notice in writing of the proposed change has been posted on the Committee’s web site at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at which action thereon is to be taken and such changes are not inconsistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, the House adjourned at 6 p.m., under its previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, February 2, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

446. A letter from the Acting Commissioner of Social Security Administration, transmitting notification that the Administration has made a determination to contract with Equifax and ADP to obtain wage information from payroll data providers for the Supplemental Security Income and Social Security Disability Insurance programs, pursuant to Sec. 6.302-7(c)(2) of the Federal Acquisition Regulations; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

447. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule the Adjustments to Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts [Release Nos.: 33-10276; 34-79749; IA-4599; IC-32414] received January 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

448. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Section 5006A Hardship Exemption for HCTC-eligible Individuals [Notice 2017-14] received January 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred for consideration:

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself and Mr. JODY B. HICK of Georgia):

H.R. 781. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow charitable organizations to make statements relating to political campaigns if such statements are made in the ordinary course of carrying out its tax exempt purpose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McHENRY (for himself and Ms. MENEN):

H.R. 782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount excluded from gross income for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LoBIONDO (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 783. A bill to amend chapter 178 of title 5 of the United States Code to permit, during a 4-year period States to enact statutes that exempt from the operation of such chapter, lotteries, sweepstakes, and other betting, gambling, or wagering schemes involving professional and amateur sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. LoBIONDO):

H.R. 784. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to exclude the State of New Jersey from the prohibition on professional and amateur sports gambling to the extent approved by the legislature of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. W.C. FENDLEY of Virginia):

H.R. 785. A bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CHAKOSWRY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRYER, Mr. GJALVA, Mr. DeFAZIO, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BLUMENBAUER, and Mr. MCMORENY):

H.R. 786. A bill to place a moratorium on permitting for mountaintop removal coal mining activities conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIHALL, Mr. GUMM, Mr. HILFORD, Mr. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. EDIENBERNH JONSON of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. AYOTTE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Ryan of Ohio):

H.R. 787. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to promote early voting in elections for Federal office and to prevent unreasonable waiting times for voters at polling places used in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Ms. CHRISSY, Mr. WYNG of Alaska, Mr. WALZ, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. PALLAZZO, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. COMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MAST, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LA MALFA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. PEACE, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 788. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUDGE (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. GOMERT):

H.R. 789. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit assistance to the Palestinian Authority to amounts required to maintain a Liberlization Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KAP'TUR (for herself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FOCAN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHA KOWSKY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONTERS, Mr. GABARD, Mr. GURLEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DeFAZIO, Ms. LEE, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 790. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act and revive the separation between commercial banking and the securities business, in the manner intended by the Bank Reorganization Act, and the so-called “Glass-Steagall Act”, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 791. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Muhammad Ali, in recognition of his contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 792. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the section 45 credit for refined coal from steel industry fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CARHAJAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HECK, Mr. KILMER, Mr. O’HALLERAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 793. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for additional requirements relating to the regular attendees of meetings of the National Security Council and bodies thereof; to the Committee on Armed Services; and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period
to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAHONTAS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LONG, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HERNANDEZ of California, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WEAVER of Texas, and Mr. BARNES):

H.R. 785. A bill to facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. MATSU, Mr. MEHAN, Mr. DELBENE, Mrs. RAEMENGER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. CICILLINE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. POCAHONTS, Ms. WAGNER, Mr. HECK, Ms. JUDY Chu of California, Mr. MARINO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LANGHVIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 807. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy cap, 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 Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. LAMM):

H.R. 808. A bill to impose nonnuclear sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 809. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions of service-connection relating to the exposure to herbicides of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam Era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUSDELL:

H.R. 810. A bill to increase public safety by punishing and deterring firearms trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 811. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat obligations financing professional sports stadiums as private activity bonds if such obligations meet the private activity bond test; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KAPITZ, Mr. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SINEMA, Ms. JUDY Chu of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HECK, Mr. JUDY Chu of California, Mr. MARINO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LANGHVIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 812. A bill to prohibit Senegal from receiving certain assistance and training for a two-year period and make available such assistance to Rwanda and Uganda, and for other purposes; to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

By Mr. MENG:

H.R. 833. A bill to direct the United States Post Office to create a single, unique ZIP Code for Glendale, New York; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. Murphy of Florida (for herself, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Breyer, Mr. Higgins of New York, Ms. Clarke of New York, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Blumenauer, Ms. Meng, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Moulton, Mr. McCollum, Mr. Vargas, Ms. Moore, Mr. Schrader, Ms. Rosen, Ms. Lee, Mr. Foster, Mr. Garamendi, Ms. Cardenas, Ms. Shea-Porter, Mr. Kind, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Napolitano, Mr. Delgado, Mr. Hidalgo, Mr. Young of Iowa, Ms. Lowey, Mr. Perlmutter, Ms. Kelly of California, Mrs. Clarke of New York, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Engel, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Lipinski, Mr. Visclosky, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Blum, Mr. Young of Iowa, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Bucshon, Ms. Lawrence, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. Himes, Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania, and Ms. Brownley of California):

H.R. 786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employment-related assistance to employer payments of qualified education loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAUNT:

H.R. 796. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a uniform 5-year post-employment ban on the lobbying of any officer or employee of the executive branch, or any Member, or employee of Congress by former executive branch officials and former Members, officers, and employees of Congress, to establish a lifetime post-employment ban on lobbying on behalf of foreign governments by former senior executive branch officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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 Miss GONZALEZ-COLON OF Puerto Rico:

H.R. 795. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove the matching requirement for a territory to use specially allocated Federal funds for Medicare covered Part D drugs for low-income individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Miss GONZALEZ-COLON OF Puerto Rico:

H.R. 796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equitable treatment for residents of Puerto Rico with respect to a portion of the child tax credit and to provide the same treatment to families in Puerto Rico with one child or two children that is currently provided to island families with three or more children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. LOYD):

H.R. 795. A bill to authorize the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, to establish a pilot program to make college credits obtained at historically Black colleges and universities and provide educational programs to offenders who have recently been, or will soon be, released from incarceration, and to require the Department of Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. VALADAJO):

H.R. 887. A bill to authorize the conveyance of and remove the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands in the City of Tulare, California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. Flores, Mr. Latta, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LONG, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HERNANDEZ of California, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WEAVER of Texas, and Mr. BARNES):

H.R. 800. A bill to establish the Office of Rural Broadband within the Department of Agriculture, to preserve open internet requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ROODY DAVIES of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHRIFT, Ms. Judy CHU of California, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 832. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to pass on a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Route 66 National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 832. A bill to prohibit Federal assistance to offenders who have recently been, or will soon be, released from incarceration, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MENG:

H.R. 833. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to maintain a single, unique ZIP Code for Glendale, New York; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. Murphy of Florida (for herself, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Breyer, Mr. Higgins of New York, Ms. Clarke of New York, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Blumenauer, Ms. Meng, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Moulton, Mr. McCollum, Mr. Vargas, Ms. Moore, Mr. Schrader, Ms. Rosen, Ms. Lee, Mr. Foster, Mr. Garamendi, Ms. Cardenas, Ms. Shea-Porter, Mr. Kind, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Napolitano, Mr. Delgado, Mr. Hidalgo, Mr. Young of Iowa, Ms. Lowey, Mr. Perlmutter, Ms. Kelly of California, Mrs. Clarke of New York, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Engel, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Lipinski, Mr. Visclosky, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Blum, Mr. Young of Iowa, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Bucshon, Ms. Lawrence, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. Himes, Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania, and Ms. Brownley of California):

H.R. 785. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employment-related assistance to employer payments of qualified education loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
of Washington, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. SOTO;

H. Res. 512. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Simpson Booker in recognition of his achievements in the field of journalism, including reporting during the Civil Rights movement, as well as social and political commentary; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself, Ms. ROYAL-ELIZALDE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. PERRY, Mr. VELA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. JUDY Chu of California, Mr. GARAMendi, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. Himes, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DEENY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COURTNEYG, Ms. LEZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SOTO of Texas, Ms. KILDEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MEERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARDEÑAS, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DEFIANCE, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PELLMUTTER, Mr. BEN RAY LUCIAN of New Mexico, Mr. FOCAN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. PEDERSON of Texas, Mr. BREA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TREDIE MALONE OF California, Mr. LINCH;

H. R. 813. A bill to restore to access to year-round Federal Pell Grants; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ZELDIN;

H. R. 814. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify that the estate of a deceased veteran may receive certain accrued benefits upon the death of the veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELDIN;

H. R. 815. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to adjust certain limits on the guaranteed amount of a home loan under the Home Loan Guaranty Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. GORAR, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. RADERWAGEN, Mr. CRAMMER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. LAMBISON);

H. J. Res. 56. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROKITA;

H. J. Res. 57. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. GORAR, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CRAMMER, Mrs. BLACKWURN, Mrs. RADERWAGEN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. Tipton, and Mr. ABEDINHOLI);


By Ms. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NOTORO, Mr. GRAYLOGY OF Georgia, Mr. MOORE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio);

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the Buffalo Soldiers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN OF Texas (for himself, Mr. BLACKWURN, Ms. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Arizona, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLEAVEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DIMINOS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MACHIN, Mr. MEERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT OF Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON OF MISSISSIPPI, Mr. VIASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida);

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 108th anniversary; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH);

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BONAMIC, Mr. BROWN OF Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARDEÑAS, Mr. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO OF Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK OF Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE OF New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS OF Illinois, Mr. DE LAURA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKE OF Florida, Mr. GOTTMIRE, Mr. GENE GREEN OF Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ OF HIXSHAM OF New Mexico, Mr. HICK, Mr. HIGGINS OF New York, Mr. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEWIS OF Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KELLY OF Colorado, Mr. KILDREE, Mr. MARSH OF Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TREDIE MALLONE OF California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF New York, Ms. MATSU, MS. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MINGO, Ms. MURPHY OF Florida, Ms. NASPET, Mr. PASCHEL, Ms. PINKREE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RYAN OF Ohio, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SERANO, Ms. SHERE, Mr. SUGOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL OF California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VALD  QUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BOSWORTH, Mr. BUDTICH, Mr. VELA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SMITH OF Washington, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BRADY OF Pennsylvania, Ms. DINSELL, Mr. TITUS, Ms. KELLY OF Illinois, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DE SAULNIER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PETTITA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE OF Pennsylvania, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. BISHOP OF Georgia, Mr. BEN RAY LUCIAN OF New Mexico, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KREATING, Miss RICE OF New York, Mr. DELBENK, and Mr. GRIJALVA);

H. Res. 78. A resolution reiterating the indisputable fact that the Nazi regime targeted the Jewish people in its perpetration of the Holocaust and calling on every entity in the executive branch to affirm that fact; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AL GREEN OF Texas (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mr. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP OF Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN OF Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON OF Indiana, Ms. CLARKE OF New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS OF Illinois, Mrs. DIMINOS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF Texas, Mr. JOHNSON OF Texas, Mr. KELLY OF Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON OF Florida, Mr. LEWIS OF Georgia, Mr. MACHIN, Mr. MEERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT OF Georgia, Mr. SCOTT OF Virginia, Ms. SEWELL OF Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON OF MISSISSIPPI, Mr. VIASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS OF California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON OF Florida);

H. Res. 78. A resolution recognizing the significance of Black History Month; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALDEN;

H. Res. 81. A resolution providing for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services in the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THORNBERY (for himself and Mr. SMITH OF Washington);

H. Res. 80. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services in the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the laws and powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.
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By Mr. SCALISE:
H.R. 781.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
The First Amendment guarantees both free
speech and the free exercise of religion.
The Free Speech Fairness Act restores these
fundamental liberties to churches and nonpros.

By Mr. MCHENRY:
H.R. 782.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 or Article 1 of the United States
Constitution.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:
H.R. 783.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
The Constitution in the Government of
the United States, or in any Department or
Office thereof.

By Mr. McHENRY:
H.R. 784.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:
H.R. 785.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
This act erases the forced-dues clauses in
the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA)
and Railway Labor Act (RLA). As such, this
bill makes specific changes to existing law in
a manner that returns power to the States
and to the People, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitu-
tion.

By Mr. YARMUTH:
H.R. 786.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 787.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 4.

By Mr. HUNTER:
H.R. 788.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation 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 fore-
going Powers, and all other Powers vested
by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Offi-
cer thereof.

By Mr. BUDD:
H.R. 789.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the United States
Constitution.

By Ms. KAPTUR:
H.R. 790.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation 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 Office
thereof.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:
H.R. 791.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the
Constitution.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 792.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
The Congress has the power to enact this
bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Con-
stitution.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 793.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
As described in Article 1, Section 1, "all legislatures powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 794.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
This proposal is introduced pursuant to Ar-
ticle I.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 795.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of, and the
sixteenth Amendment to, the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DeSANTIS:
H.R. 796.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitu-
tion.

"All legislative powers herein granted
shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON of Puerto
Rico:
H.R. 797.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitu-
tion.

"All legislative powers herein granted
shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. HILL:
H.R. 799.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States
Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 800.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation 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 Pow-
ers, and all other Powers vested by this Con-
stitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office there-
of.

By Mr. LAHOOD:
H.R. 801.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2—"The Con-
gress shall have Power to dispose of and
make all needful Rules and Regulations re-
specting the Territory or other Property be-
longing to the United States. . .".

By Mr. MEADOWS:
H.R. 802.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States
Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:
H.R. 803.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States
Constitution.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:
H.R. 804.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact the Pro-
tection of the National Security Act of 2017 pursuant to
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. The Necessary and Proper
Clause supports the expansion of congress-
sional authority beyond the explicit authori-
ties that are directly discernible from the

By Mr. NUNES:
H.R. 805.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. OLSON:
H.R. 806.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Con-
stitution of the United States.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 807.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—To provide
for the general welfare.

By Mr. ROSKAM:
H.R. 808.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8—necessary and proper
clause.

By Mr. ROSSL:
H.R. 809.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 810.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
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 Constitu-
tion in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. SANCHEZ:
H.R. 811.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:
H.R. 812.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws
which shall be necessary and proper for
carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers,
and all other Powers vested by this Constitu-
tion in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SANCHEZ:
H.R. 813.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article One, section 8, clause 18:
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 Constitu-
tion in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. ZELDIN:
H.R. 814.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States
Constitution.
H. R. 149: Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Ellison, Ms. Norton, Ms. Judy Chu of California, and Mr. Richmond.

H. R. 151: Mr. Cohen.
H. R. 159: Mr. Serrano.
H. R. 160: Mr. Smith of Washington.
H. R. 174: Mr. Smith of Nebraska.
H. R. 223: Mr. Cook.
H. R. 241: Mr. Byrne and Mr. Smith of Texas.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H. R. 244: Mr. Carter of Georgia and Mr. Gibbs.
H. R. 245: Mr. Gabbard and Mr. Carter of Texas.
H. R. 246: Mrs. Brooks of Indiana, Mr. Thomas J. Rooney of Florida, Mr. Budd, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Trottt, Mr. Hunter, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. Thune, Mr. Pennsylvania, Mr. Shimkus, and Mr. Goodlatte.
H. R. 257: Mr. Vargas.
H. R. 300: Mr. Smith of Nebraska.
H. R. 354: Mr. Rice of South Carolina.
H. R. 361: Ms. Gohmert.
H. R. 365: Mr. Tipton and Mr. Fortenberry.
H. R. 371: Ms. Eshoo, Mrs. Demings, Mr. Price of North Carolina, and Mr. Jeffries.
H. R. 391: Mr. Francis Rooney of Florida.
H. R. 392: Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania, Mr. Perrey, Mr. Ted Lieu of California; Mr. Cramer, Mr. Yoder, Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Costa, Mr. Pallone, Ms. Moore, Mrs. Brooks of Indiana, Mrs. McMorris Rodgers, and Mr. Cartwright.
H. R. 394: Mr. Huizenga, Ms. Sinema, Mr. Long, and Mr. DeFazio.
H. R. 422: Mr. Walker.
H. R. 488: Mrs. Torres.
H. R. 490: Mr. Babin.
H. R. 504: Miss Rice of New York and Mr. Jones.
H. R. 512: Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.
H. R. 520: Mr. georgia.
H. R. 523: Mr. Holding.
H. R. 532: Mr. Blumenauer, Ms. DeGette, Ms. DeLauro, Ms. DelBene, Mr. Galllego, Mr. Raskin, and Mr. Veasey.
H. R. 559: Mr. Kelly of Mississippi.
H. R. 604: Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mrs. Black, Mr. Barton, Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas, and Mr. King of Iowa.
H. R. 625: Mr. Veila.
H. R. 628: Mr. Hultgren.
H. R. 632: Ms. Hanabusa, Mr. Massie, and Mr. Valladao.
H. R. 637: Mr. Budd, Mrs. Love, Mr. Cawley, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Renacci, and Mr. Ross.
H. R. 643: Mr. King of Iowa.
H. R. 644: Mr. Collins of New York.
H. R. 669: Mr. McClintock.
H. R. 673: Mr. Gomez, Mr. Jones, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Abraham, and Mr. Latta.
H. R. 681: Mr. Smith of Missouri and Mr. Banks of Indiana.

H. R. 683: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. Evans.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H. J. Res. 61: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. Mang.

H. J. Res. 17: Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania, Mr. Smith of Nebraska.

H. J. Res. 19: Mr. Polis and Ms. Brownley of California.

H. J. Res. 27: Mr. Luetkemeyer and Mr. Allen.

H. J. Res. 36: Mr. Williams, Mr. Newhouse, Mr. Biggs, Mr. Bridentine, Mr. Brat, Mr. Rothfus, and Mr. Arrington.

H. J. Res. 38: Mr. Newhouse, Mr. Yoho, Mr. Woodall, and Mr. Abraham.

H. J. Res. 44: Mr. Young of Alaska, Mrs. Love, Mr. Newhouse, Mr. Biggs, and Mr. Chaffetz.

H. J. Res. 46: Mr. Cramer.

H. J. Res. 48: Mr. Breyer and Mr. Serrano.

H. Res. 5: Mr. Lee.

H. Res. 23: Mr. Pocan and Mr. Grijalva.

H. Res. 28: Mr. Reed, Mr. Pascrell, Mrs. Bratton, Mr. Denham, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Meek, and Mr. Thompson of California.

H. Res. 31: Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. Bilirakis, Ms. Norton, Mr. Richmond, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Ms. Lofgren, and Ms. McCollum.

H. Res. 35: Mr. DesJarlais.

H. Res. 38: Mr. Smith of Texas, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Desantis, Mr. Sanford, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Yoho, Mr. Barton, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Davidson, and Mr. King of Iowa.

H. Res. 61: Mr. Ellison.

H. Res. 72: Mr. King of New York.

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. R. 611: Mr. Himes.