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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, April 27, 2017.
I hereby appoint the Honorable PAUL MITCHELL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN.
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

REMEMBERING YOM HASHOAH—HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorated Yom HaShoah—Holocaust Remembrance Day. People around the world gathered together in their communities to remember and to reflect, to mourn the dead, to pay tribute to the survivors, and to honor the sacrifices of the rescuers and liberators.

As a Member of Congress who represents south Florida, Yom HaShoah is particularly meaningful for me and for my constituents as so many Holocaust survivors call our south Florida community home.

I have had both the honor and the privilege to come to know many survivors over the years and be able to call them my friends. You know, you can only learn so much about the Holocaust from history books because the human toll, that is told by survivors.

What is truly eye opening and what really brings things into perspective is sitting down with survivors or family members of survivors and hearing their stories. It is as heartbreaking as it is unimaginable to think that humanity could inflict this kind of hatred, this kind of evil upon fellow human beings, and it is as shameful as it is unconscionable that the indifference of mankind could allow such atrocities to occur.

This is why it is incumbent upon us, all of us, Mr. Speaker, to mark Yom HaShoah each and every year and to re dedicate ourselves to learning from the lessons of the past so we can ensure a better future free of such hatred, free of such intolerance.

On Tuesday, we marked the Days of Remembrance with a beautiful and moving candle-lighting ceremony here in the Capitol rotunda where survivors lit six candles representing the 6 million Jews murdered by the Nazis. It was the first such commemoration since the passing of Elie Wiesel.

Elie Wiesel made it his life mission to share the memories of what had occurred so that the world would know the truth. Elie Wiesel would not let anyone forget the horrors of the past because, as he said in his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech: “If we forget, we are guilty, we are accomplices.”

Elie was only 15 years old when he and his family were deported to the Auschwitz concentration camp facing near certain death. It was at Auschwitz where nearly 1 million Jews were murdered. Almost one out of every six Jews who were killed during the Holocaust were killed at Auschwitz.

Today, Auschwitz serves as a stark reminder of the sins of the past, of the evil of the indifference of mankind, but it also serves as an educational opportunity, an opportunity to bear witness.

As Elie Wiesel said at the dedication ceremony of our United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in 1993: “For the dead and the living, we must bear witness.”

For not only are we responsible for the memories of the dead, Mr. Speaker, we are also responsible for what we are doing with those memories. That is why, since 1988, the International March of the Living has brought over 250,000 participants together from over 50 countries to march a 3-kilometer path leading from Auschwitz to Birkenau.

The march is a silent tribute to all victims of the Holocaust, and as the International March of the Living states: It is intended to inspire individuals, to fight indifference, to fight racism, to fight injustice by witnessing the atrocities of the Holocaust.

This past Monday, April 24, the International March of the Living held its annual march in Poland. And though the march is a silent tribute, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay a vocal tribute to the participants of the March of the Living, as well as to the International March of the Living members, for their part in keeping alive the legacy, in keeping alive the memories of those who perished.

I pay tribute to its efforts to educate, to bring together individuals with survivors so that they can get a better understanding of what blind hatred can do if left unchecked.

And I pay tribute to the International March of the Living for its pledge to “Never Again” and to working to build a world in which we can all...
fulfill our promise of a better future free from hatred, free from bigotry, free from indifference to the suffering of others.

INTRODUCING DRAIN THE SWAMP ACT

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

Mr. DeFazio. Mr. Speaker, so 100 days, Candidate Trump made much about, you know, the pernicious influence of peddlers in Washington, D.C., the revolving door between high-level government political appointees and lobby firms. He called D.C. a swamp, yet that we have been lobbying agencies that lobbied in the prior 2 years. So let’s check in.

Number 1, Chad Wolf, lower right. He has been in charge of TSA, the TSA. He was already in an existing provision, ethics provision that forbids lobbyists from joining agencies that lobbied in the prior 2 years. So let’s check in.

Number 2, Michael Catanzaro. He is the chief of staff of the Transportation Security Administration. For the last 2 years, he has lobbied the TSA to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a new carry-on luggage-screening device. Now, as chief of staff, he is in the position to decide whether the agency will purchase the device as it is being tested and evaluated for use.

Now, how could that be? Well, President Trump eliminated that ethics provision that you couldn’t lobby, join an agency which you have been lobbying for 2 years; so hence, number 1, Chad Wolf.

Number 2, Michael Catanzaro. He is the top White House energy adviser. He worked last year as a lobbyist for energy companies, oil, gas, and coal, and was lobbying to stop or overturn the Obama attempts to deal with climate change, including the Clean Power Plan and various other things, but he is now the top White House adviser.

Okay. Well, we are not doing so good so far. Well, how about the 5-year prohibition? That is pretty stiff. None of these guys are going to leave their lucrative lobby jobs and come and work as a public servant at those low salaries? Of course, there was back to lobbying, right, so that has got to be cleaning up the swamp. Whoops. Oh, no, not so much.

Marcus Peacock, senior White House budget adviser, he is leaving the Trump administration to join the Business Roundtable, 77 days after he started working for President Trump. He is going to lead the policy group on key issues relating to the Trump agenda, including taxes, infrastructure, regulatory reform, and he signed the pledge saying he would not lobby this administration, but he got a waiver, just a little waiver. So much for the 5-year restriction.

Anybody who wants to leave the Trump administration just goes and gets a waiver, and they go right back to lobbying for him. So the revolving door is spinning faster and faster.

But how about the President saying no one should benefit from this kind of public service. Well, Eliot Cutumin, and I have raised concerns about the lease of the Trump Hotel here, which says specifically that no government official shall benefit. No elected official of the United States of America shall benefit. But President Trump says that that is not a problem, and the temporary appointee of head of the GSA says it is not a problem. He is not benefiting. The money is going into trust, and the trust can only use the money to improve the properties or pay down the debt. So, therefore, he doesn’t benefit. Huh?

But then we had a really kind of strange incident this week where the state of Florida said they had to file a lawsuit with Mar-a-Lago on an official government website, ostensibly because they just wanted to show people the winter White House. Of course, they, you know, were showing the rooms and all that. I don’t think they had the rates posted. You still had to call. They took it down after people complained about it.

So we are not doing so good on the drain the swamp stuff. But I want to help the President here, I introduced a bill at the beginning of this Congress, the DRAIN the SWAMP Act. Maybe he doesn’t know these things are going on. Maybe he doesn’t know this guy Peacock got a waiver. Maybe he doesn’t know that these people were lobbying these agencies, and he really does want to drain the swamp.

So I am hoping he will endorse a bill I have introduced, the DRAIN the SWAMP Act, which—instead of having a signed agreement, which can be waived by some random bureaucrat at the White House in secret—would actually put into statute a 5-year ban on returning to lobbying after you have been a high-level political appointee in this or any future administration.

Now, that would really drain the swamp. So the question is: Is the President just going to pretend the swamp doesn’t exist anymore, or would he like to put some teeth in a law that would actually help us drain the swamp and stop this pernicious revolving-door influence peddling that he was so offended by as a candidate but seems to be turning a blind eye to as President of the United States?

HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN RAY KOGOVSEK

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

Mr. Tipton. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor former Congressman Ray Kogovsek, a dear friend who represented the Third Congressional Dis-

district of Colorado before me. I ask that you keep him in your thoughts and prayers as he now faces a challenge far greater than any political race.

Ray is a native of Pueblo, Colorado, and but for his college years and his tenure here from 1979 to 1985, he never left his hometown and returned to. His commitment to his community spread to encompass the entire Third District, which he served after 10 years in the Colorado Legislature where I first met him.

Candidate Trump made much of how about the President saying you won election to Congress in 1978 by 364 votes. In 1980, he faced the same challenger in a Reagan landslide year. He won by 22,000 votes. And in 1982, after redistricting changed half of his district, he handily won again. Ray won because of who Ray is. He is a man of gentle wisdom, wisdom about people, a man with a gut instinct to know what is right, a genuine man, a man who knows no anger.

His achievements in his short time here in Congress were many. From a very young age he built through his outreach and development of a coalition of broad support, to fund Dong to widen a beautiful highway through Glenwood Canyon to make it safer for road travel, to resolving a decades-old boundary dispute for the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, and his work on behalf of the Third District continued after he chose to leave Congress.

He is known for his work on Western water issues and was awarded the prestigious Wayne Aspinall Award by the Colorado Water Congress, an award named after another Colorado congressman who served as chairman of the House Interior Committee.

But I have a sense that what Ray values most about his career in public service, about his advocacy for his district and for the West, are his friendships, the friendships that he found and nurtured here in these halls and beyond.

I want to thank Ray Kogovsek on behalf of the House of Representatives and the Third District and wish him and his family comfort and strength during this difficult time.
All of our witnesses have confirmed what we know to be true: SNAP works. It is a powerful program that helps to alleviate poverty and food insecurity, and it is worthy of our support.

Today I would like to share with my colleagues the most important takeaway from the 21 hearings I participated in as ranking member of the Nutrition Subcommittee.

First, SNAP benefits should not be cut. Forty-two million Americans, including working families, seniors, children, SNAP recipients, and the disabled, struggle to put food on the table. In the richest country in the history of the world, I find that unconscionable. SNAP is a vital tool that helps struggling Americans get back on their feet, and participation has steadily declined as economic conditions have improved.

Second, the current SNAP benefit is inadequate. On average, SNAP households receive about $225 per month, which works out to be a meager $1.40 per person per meal. You can’t buy a Starbucks coffee for that.

As Sherrie Tussler of the Milwaukee Food Policy Action, noted in her testimony before the Agriculture Committee: “. . . people can’t parent well and raise happy, healthy children who are ready to learn, and you can’t work well if you are hungry. If you are wondering where your next meal is coming from, . . . cutting this meager benefit would be a rotten and heartless thing to do, especially as so many in our country continue to face incredible hardships.”

Third, SNAP does not discourage work. The majority of people on SNAP who can work, do work. Almost 70 percent of SNAP recipients aren’t expected to work because they are kids, they are elderly, disabled, or caring for a young child or disabled family member. More than half of SNAP households have one working-age, non-disabled adult do work while receiving SNAP, and more than 80 percent work in the year before or after receiving benefits.

Under current law, able-bodied adults without dependents, known as ABAWDs, are limited to 3 months on SNAP out of every 3 years if they aren’t working. I don’t agree with that provision, but I have come to learn that some of my Republican colleagues want to limit the time that these very vulnerable adults can remain in the program. Make no mistake, such a move wouldn’t help people find jobs; it would only make them hungry and more vulnerable.

As Sherrill Tussler of the Milwaukee Food Policy Action noted in her testimony before the Agriculture Committee: “Somehow, we have determined that punishing people with hunger will motivate them towards work. Hunger doesn’t motivate. It dulls and it makes people apathetic.”

Fourth, case management requires a well-funded, multiyear commitment. Case management that helps connect those in need with tailored services to move out of poverty can be successful, but those investments cost money. We need to adequately fund these efforts.

Lastly, block grants threaten programs that provide an economic ladder. Past Republican budgets have proposed to block-grant SNAP. I have known from decades of experience that funding for block-granted programs erodes over time and does not provide the same responsiveness to economic conditions that SNAP does.

SNAP expands during times of economic hardship and contracts as the economy recovers. It successfully reaches those in need and is only limited by the modest benefit calculation and hurdles to access like the ABAWD time limit. There is no reason whatsoever, based on all of our hearings, to undermine SNAP through structural changes, block grants, further restrictions, more onerous requirements, or cuts.

At a minimum, the next farm bill must do nothing to make hunger worse in this country—period. Instead, we should focus on strengthening our antihunger safety net to make sure anyone who needs modest food assistance can access the benefits to which they are entitled. We need to support and expand innovative programs that help to increase the purchasing power of SNAP, and we need to increase SNAP benefits to provide families who benefit from the program access to more nutritious foods that last them through the month.

Mr. Speaker, today, chefs and advocates from across the country are on the Hill with Food Policy Action and Environmental Working Group to discuss issues related to the farm bill, including our antihunger safety net. I urge my colleagues to listen to these chefs—they are food experts—and pay attention to them, especially when they ask you to support policies that will be aimed at ending hunger now.

THANKING SHERIFF JOHN SANNER FOR HIS SERVICE

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank recently retired Stearns County Sheriff John Sanner for his service to the people of Minnesota. For the past 23 years, Sheriff Sanner has watched over our community, ensuring our safety and the safety of our loved ones. In 1984, he started out as a patrol deputy and was elected sheriff 20 years later.

After the horrific abduction of Jacob Wetterling in 1989, Sheriff Sanner was one of the main officers on the case. He worked for more than 26 years searching tirelessly for Jacob, hoping to finally give Jacob’s family an answer. Years went by and, soon, decades, but Mr. Speaker, Sheriff Sanner persevered, he wore the badge, he searched for Jacob or the Wetterling family. He stood by them until the case was finally solved just this past year, proving his dedication to his job and to the people he served.

Sheriff Sanner, I speak on behalf of all Minnesotans when I say thank you. We wish you a long, peaceful retirement spent with your family.

TRUMP ERA OF IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, “This is a new era. This is the Trump era.” Mr. Speaker, those were the words of the Attorney General, the former Senator from Alabama.

The Attorney General has launched a campaign to paint immigrants as criminals, rapists, gang members, and “cartel henchmen.” In his prepared remarks at the border a couple of weeks ago, the Attorney General planned to say the following: “It is here, on this side of the border, that we must first raise our stand against this filth.”

When he gave the speech he edited out the words “this filth” because, I guess, calling immigrants from Latin America “filth” was even too extreme for this Attorney General. But it remains on the DOJ website. In fact, as far as the Attorney General is concerned, any immigrant who is here illegally is a criminal.

He has ordered the government to prosecute immigrants for even minor offenses to the full extent of the law and to make prosecution of immigrants a top priority—on par with murder, drugs, counterfeiting, and kidnapping.

He has ordered every one of the 94 U.S. Attorney Offices to appoint a special prosecuting attorney so that immigrants are considered public enemy number one, nationwide—not drug dealers, immigrants. According to the latest Federal data, 46 percent of all major federal crimes are immigration related—not narcotics.

The second highest crime prosecuted accounts only for 14 percent of new Federal cases. In the new Trump era, a felony prosecution against an immigrant who has been living and working here peacefully for decades is three times more important than a felony prosecution of a drug dealer.

And that imbalance is not enough for the Attorney General. He wants to prioritize immigrants over all other Federal cases. In the new Trump era, a felony prosecution against an immigrant who has been living and working here peacefully for decades is three times more important than a felony prosecution of a drug dealer.

As Jeff Sessions and Donald Trump want more immigrants criminalized, felonized, and deported. Yes, we are truly in the Trump era.
But let’s be frank. This is not a surprise when Donald Trump descended the gold escalator and announced his candidacy for President. Almost the first words out of his mouth were Mexicans are rapists, murderers, drug dealers, and immigration is turning America into a gang war.

When he was a Senator from Alabama, the Attorney General made a career of associating immigrants with crime and doing his best to defeat reforms that would strengthen legal immigration and reduce illegal immigration. Deportation, criminalization, and restricting legal immigration were the bedrock of this Attorney General’s approach when he was a U.S. Senator.

Our legal immigration system already works fine according to both Senator and Attorney General Sessions, no matter that some people who are receiving their visas today applied for them when Bill Clinton was President and that those applying for visas today will probably get them when Chelsea Clinton is President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, when your constituents say, “Hey, why don’t those immigrants come here legally?” or, “Why don’t they just go back and come back legally?” the answer is clear: as a Senator, our Attorney General made sure that that was impossible.

Next week, millions of Americans will take to the streets to demand against bases deportation, the border wall, prison beds, and drive-by deportations. But it is not because we are soft on crime or love immigrants more than the people who were born here. No. We have a different vision of what the United States is and should always be. We are not an incarcerated nation, a nation hostile to other countries and their people. We are a great nation, a nation that, in her greatness, is a beacon of hope to refugees, a place of opportunity for entrepreneurs, and a democracy with separate branches of government that act as effective checks and balances on unlimited power.

The American people are sensible, fair, and pragmatic, and are correct when they reject the idea that a wall makes sense in the 21st century as the centerpiece of our immigration policy. We are not persuaded by the poetry of the Attorney General when he stands at the border and says: “It is here, on this siver of land, where we first take our stand against this filth.” No, we think of another, better poem, the one at the Statue of Liberty, the lady with her torch in the harbor, who shares our deeply held values as Americans and says every day to the entire world at that harbor: “Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.”

**CONGRESS SHOULD VOTE ON CONTINUING POLICY IN AFGHANISTAN**

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

Mr. JONES, Mr. Speaker, last week was another reminder of the chaos in Afghanistan. Tragically, 200 Afghan soldiers were killed by the Taliban; but, unfortunately, there is no surprise. After 16 years in Afghanistan, absolutely nothing has changed. If anything, it has gotten worse. The American taxpayer, United States military, and the American people are frustrated with the 16 years of continued chaos. That is why Mr. GARAMENDI and I have introduced H.R. 1666 and have been joined by seven of our colleagues. Our bill asks that Congress be able to debate and vote on whether we should or should not continue our current policy in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this poster on the floor as a reminder. Let me say to you today and my fellow colleagues that we have spent over 800 billion tax payer dollars, over 2,200 American servicemembers have died, and over 20,000 of our troops have been severely wounded. The waste, fraud, and abuse is just as bad, if not worse, today than at the very beginning.

Now, some 300 additional marines, mainly from Camp Lejeune in my district, have been deployed to Afghanistan this spring, and we have had no discussion of that on the floor of this House. Mr. Speaker, I am calling on Paul Ryan as Speaker of the House to permit a new debate on our future involvement in Afghanistan and whether or not our young men and women should be sent to war. As there are more than 300 Members of the House of Representatives that were not here in 2001 that have never had a debate or a vote on Afghanistan and the policy of Afghanistan.

It is time that the Congress interject itself. It is our constitutional responsibility to send our young men and women to die for this country, and yet we do not ever have a debate. That is why the bill that Mr. GARAMENDI and I have put out, would simply say that the House will have a debate on whether we should or should not be in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t know why that is asking too much because it is our constitutional duty. Nothing that we vote on in this House of Representatives is as sacred as sending a young man or woman to die for this country.

**CONGRATULATING RABBI ELYSE FRISHMAN ON HER RETIREMENT**

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank my friend and spiritual mentor, Rabbi Elyse Frishman, for her 22 years of exceptional service to Barnert Temple in Franklin Lakes, New Jersey.

After decades of service to the Jewish community, Rabbi Frishman will be retiring this June. Personally, I am very lucky to call Rabbi Frishman my rabbi.

In addition to leading our congregation, she is also the author of the reform prayer book “Mishkan Tefilah,” and a national leader in worship and congregational engagement.

Rabbi Frishman has stood as a model citizen and faith leader, going the extra mile to build and strengthen the community in times of anxiety and fear.

She was recently featured by The Bergen Record for her work to unite the interfaith communities in a common mission, forming dialogues, understanding and studying, and building friendships where they didn’t exist before.

In doing so, she has long set an example for the families of our congregation. As a parent, I am glad my children are growing up knowing and being led and educated by her in our faith community.

Rabbi Frishman deserves to be held up as a model for public service. And though our congregation and I will miss her dearly, I congratulate her on her retirement, and I hope everyone enjoys the evening celebrating her years of service to us. America and our community has been very lucky to have Rabbi Elyse Frishman.

Thank you, Rabbi Frishman.

**HONORING CAPTAIN JOSHUA TODD BYERS**

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor Captain Joshua Byers, a fallen soldier, son, husband, brother, and friend.

In Sparks, Nevada, Captain Byers lives on as a legacy. His kind heart, patriotic soul, and strong ideals of servant leadership have left a strong and lasting impact on everyone who knew him.

Captain Byers attended Edward C. Reed High School in Sparks, the home of the Raiders. Although not originally from Sparks, Captain Byers moved with his mother, father, and two younger brothers to chase a dream and God’s calling in Nevada.

While at Reed High School, he joined the Naval Junior ROTC program and various other clubs, all while maintaining high grades and/csvs. After high school, he enlisted in the Navy as an deck gunner in the Navy SEALs, ultimately serving in the Middle East and Afghanistan.

In his senior year, he graduated from the Naval Academy with honors, and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Marine Corps. He completed two deployments to Afghanistan, where he commanded a small team of just 12 marines.

In 2001, he was killed in action while on his second deployment.

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

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Captain Joshua Byers, a fallen soldier, son, husband, brother, and friend.

In Sparks, Nevada, Captain Byers lives on as a legacy. His kind heart, patriotic soul, and strong ideals of servant leadership have left a strong and lasting impact on everyone who knew him.

Captain Byers attended Edward C. Reed High School in Sparks, the home of the Raiders. Although not originally from Sparks, Captain Byers moved with his mother, father, and two younger brothers to chase a dream and God’s calling in Nevada.

While at Reed High School, he joined the Naval Junior ROTC program and various other clubs, all while maintaining high grades and a strong work ethic. After high school, he enlisted in the Navy as a deck gunner in the Navy SEALs, ultimately serving in the Middle East and Afghanistan.

In his senior year, he graduated from the Naval Academy with honors, and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Marine Corps. He completed two deployments to Afghanistan, where he commanded a small team of just 12 marines.

In 2001, he was killed in action while on his second deployment.

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

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor Captain Joshua Byers, a fallen soldier, son, husband, brother, and friend.

In Sparks, Nevada, Captain Byers lives on as a legacy. His kind heart, patriotic soul, and strong ideals of servant leadership have left a strong and lasting impact on everyone who knew him.

Captain Byers attended Edward C. Reed High School in Sparks, the home of the Raiders. Although not originally from Sparks, Captain Byers moved with his mother, father, and two younger brothers to chase a dream and God’s calling in Nevada.
unit, and in line to be valedictorian on graduation.

One of his biggest dreams was to attend one of the Nation’s service academies. After he completed his 4 years at Reed High School, he accepted an appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point, Hudson High.

Upon graduating from West Point, he earned an Army Ranger tab and was deployed to Iraq in 2003, where he was killed in action due to an IED explosion.

His legacy lives on at Reed High School, especially in the NJROTC program. Through an award given there by one of the past instructors as well, there is now being more done in order to memorialize a hero who left such a profound impact on those who knew him and were around him.

The NJROTC hallway at Reed High is going to be completely dedicated to Captain Byers, being named the Captain Joshua T. Byers Leadership Memorial Hallway.

In this hall you can find Captain Byers’ uniform, awards, military decorations, and various pictures and stories to help capture the essence of this hero and his mind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask today that we keep the Byers family and Joshua in our prayers and thoughts.

PRESIDENT TRUMP’S PROMISE TO DRAIN THE SWAMP AND 100 DAYS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, we are quickly approaching President Trump’s first 100 days in office, and the swamp he pledged to drain now has been stockpiled with Wall Street’s finest.

President Trump made a big jobs promise to working people across this country in his campaign. But hundreds of steel workers in places like Lorain, Ohio, are being terminated due to continuing Korean and Chinese imports being dumped into this marketplace.

The President seems to have a raft of bankers from Goldman Sachs advising him on the global economy, but where is his trade team that is supposed to protect workers like I represent in the State of Ohio?

This is the backdrop to the 2018 budget that the President has chosen to send up to Congress. His 2018 budget rewards Wall Street—anybody surprised—and hurts Main Streets in places like Lorain and Ohio and Pennsylvania and Michigan and Indiana and Wisconsin, the States that carried him into the Presidency.

Vice President Joe Biden once said: “Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value.”

Well, President Trump’s budget apparently doesn’t value the people of the Great Lakes States because it zeros out the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and other programs under the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin-

ministration and the Environmental Protection Agency that are trying to help us clean up water, the source of all life.

Look what he is doing to job training programs, to Meals on Wheels, to after-school programs in the middle class cares about and are vital to life: slash, slash, slash. More bankers in there from Goldman Sachs and Wall Street.

To make matters worse, the Trump administration has a total disregard for ethics, as they clearly violate the Emoluments Clause of our Constitution.

President Trump and his children have still failed to fully divest their assets and put them in true blind trusts to prevent real and dangerous conflicts of interest.

How about the number of patents that China has just granted to the Trump family, including Ivanka Trump? How about that? When the President has changed his position on China from what he said in the campaign and now it is a little bit different and the patents just got approved after sitting on the.decade, does that strike anyone as unusual?

The Trump administration is not draining the swamp. This President is filling it with broken promises to the American people who are depending on him and his administration to make a difference for people who need attention across this country.

SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Sexual Assault Awareness Month and the need to support those who have been victimized by this terrible crime.

According to the National Sexual Violence Resource Center, nearly 1 in 4 women and 1 in 10 men will experience sexual violence, and 7 out of 10 sexual assault cases are committed by someone the survivor knows.

Nearly 50 percent of female survivors will experience PTSD, or post-trauma stress, and per the Rape and Incest National Network, only 2 percent of those offenders will spend jail time or be convicted of a felony.

Sex trafficking is a prevalent problem, and according to the U.S. State Department, 600,000 to 800,000 people are trafficked across international borders. Of those numbers, 80 percent are female and half are children.

Sex trafficking occurs when someone uses fraud or force to cause a commercial sexual act with an adult or cause a minor to commit a commercial sexual act.

Thus, victims of sex trafficking are also victims of programs that the middle class cares about and are vital to life: slash, slash, slash. More bankers in there from Goldman Sachs and Wall Street.

To make matters worse, the Trump administration has a total disregard for ethics, as they clearly violate the Emoluments Clause of our Constitution.

President Trump and his children have still failed to fully divest their assets and put them in true blind trusts to prevent real and dangerous conflicts of interest.

How about the number of patents that China has just granted to the Trump family, including Ivanka Trump? How about that? When the President has changed his position on China from what he said in the campaign and now it is a little bit different and the patents just got approved after sitting on the.decade, does that strike anyone as unusual?

The Trump administration is not draining the swamp. This President is filling it with broken promises to the American people who are depending on him and his administration to make a difference for people who need attention across this country.

These statistics demand action. I personally know victims of sexual assault, and I have tackled it head-on while as a commander. I started this journey when I was a commander at the Ramstein Air Base in Germany.

When I arrived there in 2008, the number of sexual assault response program—the number one in the Air Force as the number one sexual assault response program—the number one in the Air Force. So I take this issue seriously.

I recently met with Courtney, a constituent in my district in Omaha, who was sexually assaulted while serving as a marine. She shared her story with me, including how she was treated after reporting the rape. And what she told me greatly disheartened me. I now believe that someone who proudly served in uniform was basically ostracized by the very people she served with.

She felt persecuted and ignored for daring to report an assault that should not have occurred, from simple acts of being ignored to having her belongings thrown out of the barracks in black trash bags by her fellow servicemen.

Courtney was not only a victim of assault, but a victim of repeated backlash from superiors and colleagues. Courtney developed PTSD because of not only the assault, but how she was treated for reporting the assault.

In my district office is Makayla, an intern who at the young age of 15 was sexually assaulted by her father. Her parents were divorced, and one weekend when she was alone with her biological father, the horrendous crime took place.

She would live in fear for the next 2 years until, finally, by the grace of God, she told her mom what happened. The days following were a whirlwind, from giving testimony to telling her grandparents what their son had done to her.

The lives of both women will never be the same. However, they both know and both knew that God would turn their trauma into triumph.

Makayla is now a college student at the University of Nebraska Omaha and shares her story at colleges, schools, nonprofits, and other organizations all over Nebraska. After graduating, she wants to work in politics to change the policies surrounding sexual assault cases.

Courtney is also speaking out and has started a blog on social media sites detailing her journey to recovery and sharing her story so others know that they are not alone.
She also will be staying in touch with me about potential legislation and ideas to help those who are victims of sexual assault in the military.

There are many in Omaha who deserve recognition for the work they do every day to combat sexual assault and human trafficking to help victims. The Women’s Center for Advancement helps victims of sexual assault and domestic violence. They have a hotline that victims can call and make that their first step in getting the help they need.

Project Harmony offers victims of child sexual assault the opportunity to take forensic interviews instead of having to appear in court, which can retraumatize the victims.

The Coalition on Human Trafficking is training staff at hotels and motels to be able to identify possible victims of sex trafficking. The goal is to provide the awareness training to all hotels within a 50-mile radius of Omaha, and to date they have trained over 85 locations.

Finally, we can’t forget the members of law enforcement who work tirelessly to catch those responsible for sexual assault and human trafficking. Without them, there would be so many more victims who would still be abused, assaulted, and traumatized.

And while there are law enforcement and others dedicated to stopping these assaults and human trafficking, there is more that could be done.

Earlier this month I joined my colleagues as an original cosponsor on H.R. 2052, also known as the PRIVATE LEAGUES Act, which would amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to provide harsher penalties to anyone who engages in what is known as revenge porn.

The Violence Against Women’s Act of 1994 also helps provide some justice. This federal fund helps investigate and prosecute sex offenders and establish the Office on Violence Against Women in the Department of Justice, a program we must continue to support.

Finally, I have agreed to cosponsor H.R. 1035, the Extending Justice for Sex Crimes Act of 2017, which amends the statute of limitations for a victim of human trafficking or a Federal sexual offense to seek and recover damages.

This bill sets a 10-year statute of limitations from the date the victim discovers the offense or injury and not when the crime occurred to file a civil action. It also extends the statute of limitations for a minor victim to file a civil action for 10 years from the date that the victim turns 18. Currently it stands at 3 years.

Sexual assault and exploitation is a social problem and a crime. We need to step up and assist with prevention of these acts, prosecute the perpetrators, and provide the provisions for resources for victims.
Mr. BUDD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HONORING COACH DON DAVIDSON

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Don Davidson for 50 years of teaching and coaching at Yorkville High School, Aurora Christian, and Parkview Christian Academy.

Coach Davidson’s ability to inspire and energize his students of all ages has led them to hundreds of victories on the basketball court, earning him a place in the Basketball Coaches Association Hall of Fame. Not only does Don hold the second longest home winning streak in Illinois history, with 80 wins from February 1988 until February 1997, but his exceptional coaching has secured 677 career varsity wins, 10 IHSA regional titles, 5 IHSA sectional titles, and 3 ACSI Great Lakes championships.

More importantly, Don is a generous, compassionate mentor who cares deeply about the lives of his students off the court.

Don, thank you for your 50 years of service to our community and, most importantly, for embodying the life of Christ to your students and to their parents, like me.

VOICING SUPPORT FOR SCIENTISTS AND FEDERAL WORKERS

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice support for the dedicated public servants who make this country great.

President Trump campaigned on a promise to drain the swamp, and instead he nominated unqualified Wall Street executives and career politicians for Cabinet and senior-level positions, leaving the next level of appointments almost entirely unfilled, all while threatening to cut the experienced Federal workforce who make our government work well every day.

As the only Ph.D. physicist in Congress, I know that many of these Federal workers and their support staff are scientists who work every day to advance innovation and improve our standard of living. The Department of Energy, for example, relies on scientists with technical expertise to run our national labs. The success of their work depends on long-term sustained funding and a continuity of competent leadership to make their new ideas a reality.

But our President’s skinny budget would destroy scientific funding and force us to give up our place as a leader in innovation, and many of his appointments are insulting jokes. So last weekend I joined the March for Science because it is clear that this administration does not value science and scientific enterprise.

I call on my colleagues here today to support scientists and Federal workers.

And if a swamp needs to be drained, the place to start is Mar-a-Lago.

TAX FREEDOM DAY

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday marked Tax Freedom Day, determined by the Tax Foundation, led by President Scott Hodge. This year, when our citizens have earned enough money to pay their tax bill for the year.

It is alarming that American taxpayers must work 113 days to foot the bill for their annual tax obligation. Collectively, American families spent more on their taxes this year than on food, clothing, and housing combined. This is an abuse of the American people, limiting their ability to spend their own hard-earned wages.

As Tax Freedom Day is pushed later each year, we must commit to commonsense reforms to the Tax Code. The Federal Government takes too much from American workers with an obsessive push to increase taxes, destroying jobs.

I am encouraged by the tax plan President Donald Trump outlined yesterday and look forward to working with him to provide tax reform that will create jobs, simplify the Tax Code, and grow the economy. I am confident that, by working together, we can deliver comprehensive, balanced tax reforms.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues here today to provide tax reform that will make our country the land of Opportunity.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, a labor union’s purpose is simple: to represent its members and to bargain on their behalf. But for millions of Americans who are currently paying union dues, their money is sometimes being used for political advocacy that they may not support.

The First Amendment in our Constitution grants workers around the country the freedom to donate or not to donate to any political cause. As it currently stands, however, union members have to opt out of having their dues spent on certain political activity. This process can be burdensome, and it can be complicated and time consuming.

Instead of asking workers to go through a lengthy process just to avoid funding political causes they don’t support, they should have the choice from the start whether to opt in to that spending or not.

Earlier this week, I introduced the National Paycheck Protection Act that would require an employee’s consent before their labor organization dues are used for any purpose not directly related to collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, union members are Americans before they are Republicans or Democrats, and this simple change would be the first step in the fight for more worker freedom.

DRAIN THE SWAMP

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, while the Medicare for All movement is growing by the day, the crisis of historic proportions.

I remind Congress the funding under discussion would close a Medicaid shortage that was created by the unequal treatment of American citizens in Puerto Rico, fueling a healthcare crisis of historic proportions.

Last year, Speaker PAUL RYAN committed to helping the people of Puerto Rico. As he, himself, recognized, these are our fellow citizens.

Yes, Mr. President, they are American citizens. They have fought, shed blood, and given their lives in nearly every major war, yet they have been treated unfairly for decades.

Donald Trump’s own HHS Secretary recently acknowledged Puerto Rico needs $900 million to fund Medicaid. For once, I agree with the Secretary.

For once, I agree with the Secretary.
THE WORLD’S BIGGEST FISH FRY,
PARIS TENNESSEE

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

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the World’s Biggest Fish Fry, which happens to be this week in Paris, Tennessee. Each year at the end of April, people from all across the country travel to west Tennessee to take part in a week-long celebration that includes parades, a carnival, rodeos, dances, catfish races, and much more.

The Fish Fry, as folks call it in west Tennessee, originated in 1938 as one of the many “Mule Days,” when farmers gathered to trade their products, do their shopping, and enjoy the fellowship of their community.

By the 1950s, the tractor replaced the mule, so the good citizens of Paris and Henry County started a new event that is now known in west Tennessee and around the country to be “The World’s Biggest Fish Fry.”

The festival ends with the main event this Friday, April 28, when more than 5 tons of catfish will be cooked, leading up to a grand 2-hour finale of parades.

I think the Paris-Henry County Chamber of Commerce for their leadership in preserving this great west Tennessee tradition.

HONORING U.S. CHESS TEAM FOR ITS GOLD MEDAL VICTORY AT 42ND WORLD CHESS OLYMPIAD

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the U.S. Chess Team for its historic victory in the 42nd Chess Olympiad held in Baku, Azerbaijan, this past September.

The last time the United States won this competition was 40 years ago at the 1976 Chess Olympiad in Haifa, Israel. At that time, the gold medal was determined by the outcome of a single game that lasted 14 hours and contained 111 moves, and eventually ended in our favor.

The final round in Baku was even more strategic, with the gold medal determined by a brilliant final move. The game was close, but the United States Chess Team took home the gold once again.

Today I would like to honor the six members of the winning chess team as well as their coach. This was a great accomplishment for the United States. I am honored to have the opportunity in Congress to recognize them.

For the next 2 years, the Olympiad trophy will rest and be on display at the World Chess Hall of Fame in St. Louis, Missouri. I look forward to recognizing the team’s accomplishments in my home State.

THE FCC AND NET NEUTRALITY RULES

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the new Trump-appointed FCC Chairman announced his mission to undermine the net neutrality rules that we fought so hard to put in place.

In 2015, over 4 million people submitted comments calling on the FCC to keep the internet open and fair. However, the FCC’s new Chairman, who used to work as counsel for Verizon, wants to turn the internet into a system of pay-to-play fast lanes for Big Money and people who can afford it, leaving everyone else behind in the slow lane.

This hands the levers of access over to big ISPs at the expense of students,
small businesses, entrepreneurs, independent content creators, and millions more.

In today’s digital age, maintaining open and equal internet access is essential to breaking down barriers in education, media, expanding access to jobs and driving innovation in health care, and so much more.

We must stand strong in opposition to the FCC’s attack on fairness, equality, and net neutrality.

CELEBRATING GULFSTREAM’S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Gulfstream Aerospace, the largest private sector employer in Georgia’s First Congressional District.

Gulfstream’s origins as an aerospace company are steeped in American history. During World War II, Roy Grumman built war planes for the United States during the war. After the war ended, he sought a new use for his resources and, in 1958, founded Gulfstream to build business airliners instead.

Mr. Grumman’s first project, the Gulfstream I, made its first flight on August 14, 1958. This purpose-built business aircraft was the first of its kind and revolutionized general aviation. Gulfstream produced more than 200 of the original aircraft, many of which are still operating today. The first project spawned more aircraft models and helped exciting innovations take off.

On September 29, 1967, Gulfstream landed in Savannah, Georgia, where it remains headquartered to this day. Savannah offers optimal land availability, labor supply, transportation facilities, and weather conditions, making it the perfect location to operate.

We have gladly welcomed Gulfstream in our district for the last 50 years, and this impressive company has greatly contributed to the community by employing nearly 10,000 people.

Congratulations to Gulfstream Aerospace on reaching its 50th anniversary, a milestone I am confident it will continue to build on.

TRUMPCARE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the latest version of TrumpCare. Once again, House Republicans have confirmed their approach to fixing health care requires gutting key provisions for people with pre-existing conditions, increasing costs, and offering fewer protections. Letting the States cherry-pick the essential health benefits—the 10 basic medical care categories covered, like emergency care, mental health, addiction treatment, or lab tests—is just crazy.

The obvious problem with eliminating the Affordable Care Act’s essential health benefits is that it will leave people without access to reasonable-quality health insurance. The consumer should know what their health insurance covers.

Without some minimum requirements, insurance companies can offer plans that are not insurance in name only. Anyone who is actually sick and needs care will be left out in the cold.

The essential health benefits make the marketplace viable because they help pool the risk among the whole population. He has accelerated it. Nearly 100 days into his administration, the President has reneged on the fundamental promise that he would clean up Washington.

Today, the Democracy Reform Task Force is releasing a report detailing how the Trump administration has flooded the swamp in the first 100 days. As the report chronicles, President Trump has made a mockery of ethics law and regulation, promoted a culture of secrecy in the executive branch, stacked his Cabinet with Big Money campaign donors, installed a special interest revolving door into the Trump White House, put big money ahead of the public interest, turned the Presidency into a profit-making enterprise, pursued public policy for his personal benefit, and raided the Treasury to pay for vacations and private business promotion.

These are not the actions of a President intent on draining the swamp or restoring power to the voiceless or restoring power to the powerless. Americans of all political stripes are starting to wonder: “Maybe the President isn’t looking out for me and my family. Maybe he is just looking out for himself, his business, and his brand.”

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

SUSTAIN THE RESISTANCE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this is undoubtedly the greatest 100 days of any President in human history. Give President Trump a grade of A-plus for the greatest broken campaign promises in history; the greatest meaningless executive orders, offering showy ceremonies when a mere phone call would have done the job; certainly, the very greatest number of insulting tweets—no President in history has ever come close; the greatest conflicts of interest; the greatest embrace of authoritarian leaders; the greatest gap between reality and fantasy, unquestionably. He talks as a populist and he governs as a plutocrat.

The greatest thing about Trump’s 100 days is that America still exists without a major war or an economic free fall. Every day we survive without a Trump-inspired catastrophe is a great day for our country.

Sustain the resistance and remain hopeful for a Trump-free America.

TRUMPCARE DROPS MILLIONS FROM COVERAGE

(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. I thought the Republican plan for repealing the Affordable Care Act and dropping 24 million Americans from healthcare coverage could not get any worse, but I was wrong. The latest iteration of TrumpCare still drops millions from their coverage, but will now make coverage worse and more expensive for those who can get it.

I believe all Americans deserve protections for the coverage of essential health services and preexisting conditions, not just Members of Congress. Swiss cheese insurance plans that don’t cover ER visits or prescriptions and charge you more if you have ever been sick aren’t worth the paper they are printed on.

This bill undermines our healthcare system in so many damaging ways. And for what?

Let’s not forget that the bill includes nearly $600 billion in tax breaks for drug companies, insurers, and the wealthy. Millionaires would get an average annual tax cut of more than $50,000 while hardworking families and older Americans would struggle to afford meaningful coverage.

I won’t stand for a bill that endangers the well-being of my constituents to benefit the very wealthiest Americans. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

NORTH KOREA

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

April 27, 2017
Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise out of a concern of this administration’s policies to North Korea. I urge the administration to look at recent history.

From 1994 to 2002, North Korea was not developing plutonium and there was no threat of medium- or long-range ballistic missiles. That was under President Clinton’s leadership because President Clinton had come up with a deal to buy the medium- and long-range missiles from North Korea.

Then what happened?

President Bush came and disregarded both the Clinton and South Korea agreement. He left North Korea under the axis of evil, even though they had no relationship to 9/11. It was a mistake of foreign policy.

We know the solution to North Korea. We know they have an army of 290,000. They have 15,000 places of nuclear weapons. There is not a miltaristic solution. The solution is to go back to the direct diplomacy that President Clinton had and to have South Korea engage in that diplomatic solution.

There is an answer to North Korea. We cannot play games with this issue when President Clinton showed the way.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on the campaign trail, the President talked a good game on trade that appealed to working families. But now that he is President, his promises ring hollow.

He promised to stop outsourcing and shipping jobs overseas, but he issued 15 contracts since becoming President, his administration with billionaires, Wall Street operatives, special interest lobbyists, lawyers, and consultants who are drafting policies for the very industries they came from, and he refused to release the White House visitor log so we have no idea what special interest lobbyists he is meeting with.

Trump has refused to release his tax returns or divest his business interests. Can you believe the State Department posted a blog advertising his exclusive Mar-a-Lago resort? Since becoming President, he increased the fees for that resort from $100,000 to $200,000. He has both close allies, Cabinet appointees, and other appointees with questionable ties to Putin and Russia.

His swamp is getting bigger and bigger.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reads the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 280

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the House shall consider the bill (H.R. 1694) to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 522 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes.

The Speaker then proclaimed the resolution adopted.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with friends and family of our former colleague and my personal friend, Earl F. Hilliard, who this weekend will be celebrating his 75th birthday.

While a Member of this body, Earl and I worked very closely together preserving the integrity of Historically Black Colleges and Universities and supporting the preservation and restoration of historic sites and buildings.

This weekend, a gathering will establish a scholarship in his honor in order for more rural Alabama young men and women to have opportunities to further their education.

I want to congratulate my friend for reaching this milestone in his life—a place I got to last year this time—and wish him a happy birthday and further success in establishing benefits for young men and women throughout Alabama.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reads the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 280

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the House shall consider the bill (H.R. 1694) to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 522 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes.

The Speaker then proclaimed the resolution adopted.
Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the cus-
tomary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN),
pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consid-
eration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-
tend their remarks.

The Speaker. Without objection, the request is granted.

The time is now 3:58 p.m. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-
tend their remarks.

The Speaker. Without objection, the request is granted.

The time is now 3:58 p.m. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-
tend their remarks.

The Speaker. Without objection, the request is granted.

The time is now 3:58 p.m. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-
tend their remarks.

The Speaker. Without objection, the request is granted.

The time is now 3:58 p.m. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-
tend their remarks.

The Speaker. Without objection, the request is granted.

The time is now 3:58 p.m. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-
tend their remarks.

The Speaker. Without objection, the request is granted.

The time is now 3:58 p.m. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-
tend their remarks.

The Speaker. Without objection, the request is granted.

The time is now 3:58 p.m. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-
tend their remarks.

The Speaker. Without objection, the request is granted.

The time is now 3:58 p.m. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia?
is a good resolution that, if passed, will provide for the consideration of the underlying legislation, H.R. 1694, which, if passed, will provide the American taxpayer, for the first time, the accountability that they deserve for the $1.87 trillion in taxpayer support thatannie and Prevede received. I am proud to be associated with that.

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself this, that I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Woodall), my friend, for the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I first want to begin by thanking the gentleman for his kind words to his constituents about me on the floor. It means a lot to me, and I appreciate it. I should, however, that, even though sometimes people don’t realize this, Massachusetts has a robust agricultural base, and, in fact, in my district, I have 1,832 farms on over 142,399 acres, compared to the gentleman who has 209 farms on 13,520 acres. So, in addition figure, I’ve brought them on the Agriculture Committee to represent my farms.

I do genuinely appreciate the gentleman’s kind words, but then I look at the rule that we are debating today and it kind of spoils the mood.

Having said that, I just want to say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that here we are again, just 1 day from our government running out of funding and confronting yet another manufactured, totally avoidable crisis, and instead of working on a bill to fully fund America’s biggest priorities, we are back on the floor with—the only way I can characterize this—more filler legislation. It seems my Republican friends care more about filling up the cookie jar that they introduced yet another bill to unexempt Congress from the terrible impacts of this terrible legislation, and I am proud that we can be associated with that.

This rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 1694, as my colleague mentioned, the Fannie and Freddie Open Records Act of 2017. It is a fine bill designed to strengthen transparency at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. I support the legislation. My Democratic colleagues support the legislation. The Republican majority supports the legislation. In fact, I haven’t found one person yet who doesn’t support the bill.

Freedom of information is a good thing, Mr. Speaker, and I support FOIA, but what about the freedom from the threat of a government shutdown?

What about freedom from the threat of a default on our national debt?

What about freedom to know what our President’s conflicts of interest are and to see his tax returns?

What about the freedom from having our healthcare protections ripped away, protections like essential health benefits and protections for people with preexisting conditions? And what about the freedom to know what Congressional Republicans and the White House are doing to our healthcare system behind closed doors?

None of this seems to matter. But the most troubling part of this rule is that it exempts the Republican majority, through Saturday, that allows Republicans to bring anything—and I mean anything—to the floor between now and then.

Now, I understand the importance of rushing this floor when the government is about to run out of money; although, I would point out that we are 7 months into the fiscal year and my Republican friends set this deadline themselves back in December, so there is absolutely no excuse for Congress to come within hours of yet another shutdown. But this is just the latest example of Republican obstruction, obfuscation, and incompetence that has, once again, brought us to the edge of the cliff. And, Mr. Speaker, this is no way to govern.

This rule would allow Republican leadership to rush anything to the floor within hours of it being released. Not just appropriations, it gives them blanket authority to jam us with whatever they want, even if it’s dead of night, around midnight, when the Republicans finally posted their newest healthcare proposal that we were able to confirm just how bad it really is.

Incredibly, this new amendment will make the bill even worse than before. Honest to God, Mr. Speaker, I didn’t know that was possible.

In addition to killing the requirements we seriously care about, crucial, essential benefits like maternity care and prescription drugs and emergency services, this new amendment will also completely gut protections for people with preexisting conditions. In fact, this amendment directly violates the commitment made by President Trump and House Republicans to protect those with preexisting conditions.

This newest proposal will allow insurers to charge an unlimited “age tax” to people with preexisting conditions to make matters even worse. Republicans have set up a system that would allow women to once again be charged more than men for health coverage. It will bring us back to those bad old days when insurance companies could charge women more because they said being a woman was a preexisting condition.

Give me a break.

All of this, on top of a disaster of a healthcare bill that we caused $4 million Americans to lose their healthcare coverage. And in addition, their bill would cut Medicaid by close to $1 trillion, and take that $1 trillion and give it, in the form of tax breaks, to the wealthiest individuals in the country.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the way we should be running this House. All of this is being done to appease the most conservative fringes within the Republican Conference in an attempt to deport Donald Trump so he can celebrate 100 days in office. It doesn’t matter what the details are, he just wants to be able to tout a victory of some sort.

The biggest victory for the American people. This would be a disaster for the American people.

It is no wonder that my Republican colleagues have been overwhelmed by angry calls from their constituents at home demanding that they oppose this reckless and heartless bill. As one Republican remarked: “I spent the whole work period hearing from people pissed about preexisting conditions. This isn’t helpful.” That is one of my Republican colleagues.

Under this rule, these dangerous backroom deals could be rushed to the floor without any proper deliberations, but they will have a very real, very serious, and very dangerous consequence for millions of Americans. Real lives are at stake.

Now, I can’t help but also note that this newest amendment exempts Congress from the terrible impacts of this proposal. Can you believe that? Knowing just how damaging these new provisions; and it was only last night, around midnight, when the Republicans finally posted their newest healthcare proposal that we were able to confirm just how bad it really is.

Incredibly, this new amendment will make the bill even worse than before. Honest to God, Mr. Speaker, I didn’t know that was possible.

In addition to killing the requirements we seriously care about, crucial, essential benefits like maternity care and prescription drugs and emergency services, this new amendment will also completely gut protections for people with preexisting conditions. In fact, this amendment directly violates the commitment made by President Trump and House Republicans to protect those with preexisting conditions.

This newest proposal will allow insurers to charge an unlimited “age tax” to people with preexisting conditions to make matters even worse. Republicans have set up a system that would allow women to once again be charged more than men for health coverage. It will bring us back to those bad old days when insurance companies could charge women more because they said being a woman was a preexisting condition.

Give me a break.

All of this, on top of a disaster of a healthcare bill that we caused $4 million Americans to lose their healthcare coverage. And in addition, their bill would cut Medicaid by close to $1 trillion, and take that $1 trillion and give it, in the form of tax breaks, to the wealthiest individuals in the country.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the way we should be running this House. All of this is being done to appease the most conservative fringes within the Republican Conference in an attempt to deport Donald Trump so he can celebrate 100 days in office. It doesn’t matter what the details are, he just wants to be able to tout a victory of some sort.

The biggest victory for the American people. This would be a disaster for the American people.

It is no wonder that my Republican colleagues have been overwhelmed by angry calls from their constituents at home demanding that they oppose this reckless and heartless bill. As one Republican remarked: “I spent the whole work period hearing from people pissed about preexisting conditions. This isn’t helpful.” That is one of my Republican colleagues.

Under this rule, these dangerous backroom deals could be rushed to the floor without any proper deliberations, but they will have a very real, very serious, and very dangerous consequence for millions of Americans. Real lives are at stake.

Now, I can’t help but also note that this newest amendment exempts Congress from the terrible impacts of this proposal. Can you believe that? Knowing just how damaging these new provisions.

But the new bill to unexempt Congress would require a 60-vote supermajority in the Senate. What are the odds that is going to happen, Mr. Speaker?

This is a victory to trust that they won’t exempt themselves from this terrible plan, to trust that the Senate can muster 60 votes to pass this provision or anything else?

Let me be clear: this maneuver is a procedural sleight of hand. This is legislative smoke and mirrors designed to give Republicans, who tried to pull a fast one and got caught, a talking point.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans wrote this bill to change the lives of millions. Don’t just say: “Trust us. We will pass another bill to fix the fix, and we will get the Senate not to make any changes. Oh, while we are at it, we will get a supermajority in the Senate to support it.” Who do you think you are fooling, Mr. Speaker?

I urge all my colleagues to defeat this unrightful law rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think this is exactly the right way to be moving legislation, and I am proud that we are doing it. Big bills are hard and big
Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleagues, I don’t have any problem with the underlying bill, but I would argue with him that I think most of our colleagues probably don’t know what the hell we are doing here because, in the scheme of things, this is not terribly consequential. I think our problem is the fact that we are at the edge of a crisis when we don’t fund the government by tomorrow, we shut this place down, we shut the government down, and that has an impact on the American people.

I think what our objection is is that the rule that you bring to us here today to consider the underlying bill also allows my Republican friends to bring up anything they want between now and Saturday, including, you know, shameful healthcare repeal bill.

And by the way, when we talk about regular order, it would be nice, especially when it comes to the big things like health care, that we actually do things like hearings and listen to what experts have to say and our constituents, not, you know, that’s whole bunch of people who have a stake in our healthcare system.

The bill that my friends brought to the floor, that they had to pull, never had a single hearing and, in all likelihood, whatever monstrosity they bring to the floor in the future will probably not be the result of regular order. It will be the result of a backroom deal where very few people have any input. So I can’t celebrate today. I am very concerned for the millions of people who might lose their health care. I am concerned for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to vote ‘no’ on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump’s first 100 days have been embroiled in controversy and shrouded in secrecy. The American people deserve a heck of a lot better. They deserve transparency from the government. They deserve to know which special interests are getting face time with the President and his top aides and whether the White House is being used to personally enrich President Trump and his family.

It is our duty, as the people’s Representatives, to hold this administration accountable, an administration that has so many conflicts of interest, financial conflicts of interest, that it is on a roll with corruption. So, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative KATHERINE CLARK’s resolution, H. Res. 286, which would force the White House to release information to us regarding the President’s many potential conflicts of interest, including his tax returns, involvement in his business empire, and White House and Mar-a-Lago visitor logs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. KATHERINE CLARK) to discuss our proposal?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. KATHERINE CLARK) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Massachusetts. I am glad to share in this bipartisan moment of admiration for his work with my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can bring a resolution to the floor. This resolution will ensure that the House meets its constitutional responsibility to conduct oversight of the executive branch by investigating potential conflicts of interest of President Donald J. Trump.
WHEREAS, Mr. Speaker, I filed this resolution today. It has been tabled. I recognize that my friends and I have disagreements—vast disagreements—in numerous areas of public policy, but today we have a chance to talk about one of the agreements that we have. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what folks back home watching think. Do they think, just like the media loves to report, that, golly, those guys can’t even agree on what time to start in the morning?

For Pete’s sake, we have worked a bill through the process, just like we learned about in civics class. Don’t make me sing “I’m just a bill, and I’m sitting here on Capitol Hill.” Mr. Speaker, because that is exactly the process that we all want bills to go through, and we have done that here today.

We can’t even take a moment to talk about how successfully we have worked together, not even a moment to talk about how the process worked, not even a moment to talk about how we delivered for folks. We have to shift the conversation from personalities toward the process itself. And Mr. Speaker, I came here to ask a question to those folks on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the bill today, we have time to talk about every controversy we want. If folks want to go fisticuffs through, and we have done that here today.

Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the House of Representatives directs the following persons to take the following actions:

(1) President Trump is directed to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memorandum, correspondence, or other material pertaining to the Executive Office of the President, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to President Trump’s proposal to maintain an interest in his business holdings, while turning over day-to-day operation of those interests to his sons Donald J. Trump, Jr. and Eric Trump.

(2) In support of transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of the disclosure of tax returns of Presidents and Presidential candidates, the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to provide the Committee on Ways and Means with the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2007 through 2016 for review in closed executive session by the committee. The committee is directed to provide the information to the full House of Representatives.

(3) The Director of the Office of Government Ethics is directed to provide the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives with any legal analysis supporting its March 23, 2017, conclusion that Trump International Hotel in Washington may maintain its lease with the Federal Government, despite an express prohibition on elected officials taking part in the lease.

(5) President Trump is directed to provide to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives on a rolling and ongoing basis, and directs the committee to hold ongoing votes on reporting the contents of such visitor logs to the full House of Representatives.”

Mr. Speaker, I filed this resolution because it appears to me and the American public that Mr. Trump has drained the swamp and funneled it into the Oval Office. Trump’s billionaire, special interest friends are now in charge of policies that impact every American, every family, and every child. Everything from education to health care to taxes are in the hands of people who have never sent their kids to public schools, who have never had to take out a loan to pay for college, and who have never had a medical bill they couldn’t afford—and all of this is in the hands of a President who refuses to release his tax returns.

While Trump fights to keep Americans in the dark about which of his other friends he owes special favors to—whether it is Big Oil, foreign banks, lobbyists at Mar-a-Lago, or the Russians—Republicans seem to be happy to look the other way.

Transparency and accountability are not partisan ideas. Families at home deserve a Congress that works together to be the necessary check that our Constitution provides over this unaccountable administration. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.
myths that things don’t get done around here, dispelling those myths that we don’t respect each other, and dispelling those myths that we can’t work together. I want to dispel the myth that what this underlying rule does is to prevent Republicans from a pathway for doing whatever it is that they want to do whenever it is they want to do it, because that doesn’t really sound like fair play. I wouldn’t want to support such a bill either.

What this rule does is, contrary to the rules, allow us to bring up suspension bills at any time. Now, what a suspension bill is, Mr. Speaker, as you know, it is a bill that can pass not with a simple majority, but with a two-thirds majority. So this rule says, for the third time, that bipartisanship break out in the next 72 hours, you all should be able to bring those bills to the floor and deliver it for the American people.

Well, dagummit, I support that. I don’t look at that as a way of Republicans to manipulate the system. I look at it as a way for the United States Congress to deliver on behalf of the system, and I am glad we are doing it.

Number two, the bill says, if the Rules Committee acts and we pass a rule to bring a bill to the floor rather than have that bill lay over for a night, you can bring that bill to the floor directly. So my friend is absolutely right when he says that passing this rule would allow us to rush legislation high to the floor. It would rush that common-sense, bipartisan legislation that two-thirds of us would agree on, we can rush those results across the finish line for the American people; and, if the Rules Committee acts and we pass that rule on the floor of the House, it will allow us to consider the legislation that that rule would bring to the floor on the same day instead of waiting 24 hours.

Now, what my friend says about having an opportunity to read the bills is critically important—critically important. I want to point out because, again, folks have so many concerns about what goes on in this institution, I got lots of things I can gripe about, but when we are getting it right, I want to make sure that we are telling folks that we are getting it right.

This tradition of self-flagellation in this institution drives me crazy because we hear ourselves do it. Mr. Speaker, it is not us who bears the cost of that. It is our constituents. It is the board of directors of the United States of America. It is the folks who come beyond us.

We have a responsibility to lead this institution, and when we are doing it right, we ought to tell the American people that we are doing it right. For example, there might be a healthcare vote that comes to the floor of this House in the next 24, 48 hours. I don’t want to have expectations high for that, Mr. Speaker, but I sure would be enthusiastic if that happened. If that were to happen, my friend is exactly right; we will go to the Rules Committee; we will pass a rule; we will bring it to the floor; and we will bring it up the same day. But the language was posted yesterday, and the vote wouldn’t happen until tomorrow. So when folks say let’s leave the language up for a chance for folks to read it, let’s not rush something through, we have got 3 days built into the system.
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That is not a rule of the House. I want to make that clear. There is no rule in this institution that says you have got to present a bill before you can pass a bill to read it and find out what is in it. This is not a rule of this House. It is a policy of ours. It is a policy of who we are and of let’s do this; let’s make this our commitment to make this happen. Mr. Speaker, it does not always happen, but most of the time it does. I celebrate that success.

Again, thinking about those things that unite us instead of divide us, I just listened to my friend, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, make an incredibly eloquent plea for her bill. She said, if we defeat the previous question—that vote is coming up very soon—we will take up her piece of legislation, which was just handed to me about 3½ minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker, I get that sometimes people think that we have such urgent ideas that those ideas need to come to the floor in a hurry. I will settle for either outcome: that it is okay that we bring ideas to the floor in a hurry and that it is okay if you hand somebody a bill 3½ minutes ago and tell them you want to bring it to the floor 30 minutes from now. If that is okay, then let that be okay. If what we need is for bills to lay overnight, then let that be okay.

We have a process here that is built on mutual respect, that is built on years of tradition that men and women paid a tremendous price for, that they provided tremendous leadership for. In the name of short-term political gains, I want to make sure that we don’t tear down those long-term policy successes.

This institution should be a source of pride for the American people. I don’t believe that it is today. The responsibility of making it that source of pride falls on you and me. We are the only ones who benefits from that. We have an opportunity today to do just a little bit of that, and I hope we take advantage of that.

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

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

Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia: he had me at hello, too. If all he said was “hello” and introduced the underlying bill, we would be done. There would be no controversy. The underlying bill is, they brought to the floor under a rule that is atrocious and that, quite frankly, every Member of this House should be ashamed about.

Under this martial law rule, you can bring anything up at any time you want, at a moment’s notice, without people having an opportunity to actually understand what they are going to vote on.

The gentleman talked about they might bring up the healthcare bill between now and Saturday. He said: Yesterday, we posted the text of our new amendment. He used the word “yesterday” loosely. They posted it at midnight last night. I was asleep at midnight; I don’t know about the gentleman.

The bottom line is, there is nothing that says that they can’t change the text again and again and again and again, offer more amendments, because that is what they have been doing since they first began their effort to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act.

On something as important as health care, where Republicans are going to affect millions and millions of people in this country, that could throw 24 million people off of health care, that will cut Medicaid by a trillion dollars, that will compromise Medicare, that will take away essential benefits people ought to know what the heck they are voting on.

We ought to have regular order on these major pieces of legislation. Why is there no controversy? How about a hearing on health care? The idea that we would like the opportunity to know what we are voting on, to do this in a thoughtful way, is offensive to my Republican colleagues. I am flabbergasted by this—to basically defend this process.

We have to use a procedural motion to be able to try to force a debate or bring to the floor the bill of my colleague, KATHERINE CLARK, which basically calls on the President to release his tax returns and calls for some transparency with regard to visitor logs at the White House and Mar-a-Lago. We have to resort to a procedural motion because the Republican majority basically blocks us from bringing anything to the floor under a normal process.

The Rules Committee has become a place where democracy goes to die. Yet that bill that we have before us, the underlying bill that we are going to consider later today, could probably pass on a suspension.

By the way, we have no problem with giving you same-day authority on suspension bills. Those are controversial. We don’t even have a problem, although you should have prepared for this, with you being able to bring a bill to the floor quickly to keep the government running.

It is the broad authority that you have given yourselves to bring anything at a moment’s notice, without anybody having a chance to review it. That is what we have a problem with. Quite frankly, my Republican colleagues are ought to have a problem with that, too.

Mr. Speaker, shortly after taking the gavel, Speaker RYAN said: “I want to
have a process that is more open, more inclusive, more deliberative, more participatory, and that is what we are trying to do." That was the Speaker of the House.

Unfortunately, Republicans do not appear to be trying very hard. The current Congress is on track to become the most closed in history, with an incredible 26 closed rules this year's first quarter out of 42 total rules. The Republican majority shut out all amendments from both Democrats and Republicans on fully 62 percent of the legislation considered by the House under a rule.

Do Members realize that? On most bills, even those that are not allowed to bear amendments. No amendments at all. Under a closed rule, you can't even offer an amendment to fix a typo.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to take a look at this chart. This is in fact a decade and for the first quarter of the year.

Do you see this really long red line on the top? I am happy to bring it over to my colleagues. Here, if you see this line, you will see that the bottom line is that this shows that this Congress has an abysmal record with regard to open, fair process.

When we were in charge from 2007–2010, we averaged only 8 closed rules in the same timeframe. This Congress is more than three times as closed. We have 26 closed rules in the first quarter alone; that is not to mention zero open rules. You are even crushing your record of a year that you beat the all-time closed rule record. This is not something to be proud of.

What has this historically closed process brought to the House? Complete chaos. Virtually no legislative accomplishments. A lousy process usually leads to lousy legislation. We learned that from your awful, disastrous attempt to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act.

This rule continues a lousy process that has been embraced by the current Republican leadership in this House. There is no excuse for this. When it comes to big bills, big legislation, like health care, which is a very personal thing to people in this country, the American people deserve much better than this.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “no” on this lousy rule and stand up to your leadership and demand that they open this House up not only to Democratic amendments but to Republican amendments as well. This is a deliberative body. We ought to be able to deliberate.

On big issues like health care, it ought not to be some bottom-deal that a few people put together. We saw the result of those backroom deals with a lousy, terrible, awful bill that would hurt millions of Americans. We ought to do it out in the open.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I heard a group of constituents ask one of our freshman Members what they found to be the most surprising part of this institution, having served here for about 100 days, and it was with no small amount of joy that they gave exactly the same answer that I would have given after my first 100 days. They said to their constituents: What really surprised me is how earnest, hardworking, conscientious, dedicated, and how committed each and every Member of this institution is.

There are a couple of bad apples that don't follow under that perspective, but, by and large, the surprise when you get elected to Congress is about the high quality of the people who you get to work with, the commitment of the people you get to work with, the conviction of the people who you get to work with.

What you have heard from my friend from Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, is 100 percent authentic. There is no one down here playing for the cameras today. I could make a powerful case that while cameras provide a great deal of sunlight, they create a great deal of unnecessary heat, as well. Folks sometimes are performing for cameras in this institution, but not my friend from Massachusetts.

What you heard from my friend from Massachusetts was absolutely sincere concern about public policy. I agree with him. I believe we should have an open and deliberative process in this institution.

You and I and my friend from Massachusetts don’t work for the leadership. The leadership works for us. There is not one Member of the leadership team who votes for me. I vote for them.

We have an opportunity to direct the way this institution is led. Candidly, I couldn’t be more proud than I am of the way that PAUL RYAN leads this institution. He is not the Republican Speaker. We have a Republican leader. The Democrats have a Democratic leader. PAUL RYAN is the Speaker of the House. I am incredibly proud of the way he leads this institution.

The way to make it even better, Mr. Speaker, is not to cite every single thing that we do as a failure. It is just not so. Let's find those things that we do that we can do better, and let's identify them and work together, but let's celebrate those successes.

For example, my friend pointed to the number of closed rules that have come to the floor. For folks who don’t follow the process closely, a closed rule means there were no amendments allowed.

Well, many of those bills, Mr. Speaker, were bills that the Rules Committee sent out an email to all of Capitol Hill and said: We are bringing this piece of legislation to the floor. Here it is for you to read and digest it. And if you have any ideas about how to make this bill better, you send them to us, and we will take a look.
When we did that, Mr. Speaker, not one single idea came back from the Republican or the Democratic side of the aisle for improving the bill.
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So, yes, the bill came to the floor. The rule was closed not because we are trying to silence the minority, not because we are trying to silence elements of the majority, but because we had a complete legislative success, and it turned out that regular order got it right the first time. We don’t need to identify that as a failure. That is an unmitigated success.

Some of those closed rules, Mr. Speaker, came because we were bringing legislation under the Congressional Review Act. Now, for folks who don’t know the Congressional Review Act, that is that act that was passed so that Congress could go back and review regulations that had been passed by the administration to make sure those regulations followed congressional intent.

By definition, those bills have to be narrow and targeted. We can’t have an amendment about healthcare legislation added to our waters of the United States Congressional Review Act bill. We can’t have folks go and add a pay raise for our military men and women to that Congressional Review Act bill. We want a pay raise for our men and women in uniform. We passed it out of the House. It went to the Senate. The Senate took it up. The Senate passed it. It was sent to the President’s desk for his signature in these first 100 days than any other President since Truman. We have had Republicans running the show, and it was supported for every single one of their amendments was made in order by this rule.

Mr. Speaker, we have lots of things that are going to bring my friend from Massachusetts and I back down to this floor, and we are going to disagree heartily about those. Today we have an example of something that brings us together. I urge all of my colleagues to vote “yes” on this rule that brings our OGR unanimously passed bill to the floor. We are working on some of the toughest issues in this town, and often they are bitterly divided along partisan lines. They are working on those issues that tend to separate Americans rather than unite them. They have sent us a bill today that we support, but it was passed by a voice vote unanimously out of that committee. It then went to the Committee on Rules, where every single Member of Congress was invited to improve it. Three Members of Congress took up the bill, and every single one of their amendments was made in order by this rule.

Mr. Speaker, there are lots of challenges ahead of us. This is one we can put in the books as a success for our constituents back home. I ask for a “yes” vote.

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

**AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 280 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN**

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

Sec. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 280) directing certain officials of the executive branch to provide information to the House of Representatives that will enable the House to meet its constitutional responsibility to conduct oversight of the executive branch by investigating potential conflicts of interests of President Donald J. Trump. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question has been ordered on to the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

**SCC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 286.**

**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 the previous question is a vote against the Republican party leadership and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the U.S. 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 defeating the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

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

Obviously, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools
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Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing S. 496.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 193, not voting 7, as follows:

(ROll No. 230)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas 230</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abercrombie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelheit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barletta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (UT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridenstine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheaney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comstock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costello (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curchello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbelo (FL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Kennedy (AZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSantis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DesJarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz-Balart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan (TN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nay 193</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barragan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonamici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, Brendan F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownley (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capuano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car바</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caruso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Danny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeFazio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delauro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelBene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSaulnier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doggett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle, Michael P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espaillat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esty (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fudge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Voting 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith (MO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornberry (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valadão</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walders, Mimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young (AK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young (IA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 192, not voting 12, as follows:

(ROll No. 230)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes 226</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adcox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barletta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (UT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridenstine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheaney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comstock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costello (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuber (FL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Kennedy (AZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSantis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DesJarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan (TN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nay 192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barragan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonamici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, Brendan F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownley (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capuano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car바</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caruso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Danny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeFazio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delauro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelBene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSaulnier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doggett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle, Michael P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espaillat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esty (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fudge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Voting 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith (MO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornberry (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valadão</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walders, Mimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young (AK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young (IA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moore, VARGAS, KILMER, NOLAN, DEMINGS, HUFFMAN, and Mrs. TORRES changed their vote from “aye” to “nay.”

Mr. GROMMICH changed their vote from “nay” to “aye.”

Moore, VARGAS, KILMER, NOLAN, DEMINGS, HUFFMAN, and Mrs. TORRES changed their vote from “aye” to “nay.”

Moore, VARGAS, KILMER, NOLAN, DEMINGS, HUFFMAN, and Mrs. TORRES changed their vote from “aye” to “nay.”
ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCEDURE FOR H.R. 1180, WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Rules Committee issued an announcement outlining the amendment process for H.R. 1180, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2017, which will likely be before the Rules Committee next week.

An amendment deadline has been set for Monday, May 1, at 10 a.m.

The text of the bill is available on the Rules Committee website.

Feel free to contact me or my staff if you have any questions.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION COORDINATION AND PLANNING AREA REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 496) to repeal the rule issued by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration entitled “Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform,” on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Lewis) to have the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This 5-minute vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 3, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

YEAS—417

Mr. VALEDAO. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollover No. 230.

Announcement by Committee on Rules regarding Amendment Procedure for H.R. 1180, Working Families Flexibility Act of 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollover No. 230.
Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2015

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representative Joe Wilson be removed as the co-sponsor of H.R. 2015. He was incorrectly listed when it should have been Representative Frederica Wilson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the Chair appoints the gentleman (Mr. Collins) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, the Fannie and Freddie Open Records Act of 2017. I want to start by thanking the sponsor of this bill, Chairman CHAFFETZ, for working with the Democratic members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to address concerns that we raised as well as concerns raised by the Federal Housing Finance Agency. The bipartisan cooperation that was demonstrated on this bill should be a model for this body.

This bill would apply the Freedom of Information Act to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac while they are in conservatorship or receivership. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are stockholder-owned, government-sponsored enterprises chartered by Congress, that purchase mortgages and pool them into mortgage-backed securities to create liquidity in the mortgage market.

There are some practical concerns with the underlying bill because it would apply FOIA to these private companies for the first time. The amendment Chairman CHAFFETZ will offer addresses some of those concerns, which I will discuss when we consider this amendment.

I would like to discuss some concerns with language that was added in this bill at the Rules Committee to address the estimated cost of the bill.

CBO estimates that this bill would impose the administrative costs of Fannie and Freddie by $310 million, with $10 million of that resulting in direct spending. This bill would address those costs by requiring commercial requesters to pay for processing FOIA requests made to Fannie and Freddie. This would be a significant change from the way FOIA typically works.

The American public should not be in the dark when it comes to what Fannie and Freddie are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I urge you to support the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I urge you to support the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.
would charge commercial requesters. Whatever cost estimation methodologies Fannie and Freddie choose to use, the methodologies will almost certainly be challenged, potentially leading to litigation, which would be handled by the Department of Justice.

It is highly likely that banks would file FOIA requests to obtain information about the business practices and holdings of Fannie and Freddie. The costs charged to them for their requests would then be passed on to consumers.

I believe this language was intended to be helpful, but it is one result of applying to private companies a statute designed to apply to government agencies. We should carefully analyze this provision and its likely consequences as this bill moves forward in the legislative process. There may be a better way to address this issue.

I also hope that the chairman will continue to seek ways of expanding transparency in government, and that the committee's next step will be to require the disclosure of White House visitor logs.

The White House recently reversed what had been the Obama administration's policy of disclosing the records of who comes and goes from the White House. The president of Judicial Watch, Tom Fitton, said: "This new secrecy policy undermines the rule of law and suggests this White House doesn't want to be accountable to the American people."

I look forward to working with the chairman to address this very troubling reversal of a critical government transparency policy.

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend from Florida for the opportunity to speak on this bill. And as a member of the House Financial Services Committee, I am grateful for the bipartisan leadership in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in bringing this bill to the floor, for it is time that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac languish in Federal conservatism following their collapse from the 2008 housing crisis, it is time to apply FOIA to these GSEs and bring accountability and transparency for the American taxpayers.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, as you can see, this is a bill that I think has broad bipartisan support. It is something that we need to do for the taxpayers who have invested so much into Fannie and Freddie over the years. Let's make them subject to FOIA.

I urge support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, printed in the bill, it is considered in this committee as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of rules Committee Print 115-14 modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-96. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

"H.R. 1694
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,"

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the "Fannie and Freddie Open Records Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. APPLICABILITY OF FOIA.

(a) APPlicability to Government Sponsored Entities in Conservatorship.—Section 522 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(n) The National Housing Emergency Mortgage Assistance or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall complete all documents under this section during any period such enterprise is under conservatorship or receivership pursuant to section 1367 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4161)"

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to any request filed under section 522(a)(3) of title 5, United States Code, on or after such effective date, relating to any record created before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. COMMERCIAL REQUESTERS.

For purposes of subsection (n) of section 522 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 2(a), each enterprise described in such subsection shall establish a fee schedule such that first year the fees for requests for records intended for a commercial use cover the costs of administering such subsection (n), which shall be estimated as $40,000,000 in the first year.

In each subsequent year such enterprise shall evaluate whether the fees collected under the prior year's fee schedule were sufficient to recover all actual costs of administering subsection (n) and revise the fee schedule to recover the costs of administering subsection (n) in the following year and any outstanding costs of administering subsection (n) from the prior year that were not collected through fees in the prior year. Each such enterprise shall make the revised fee schedule and a detailed explanation of the prior year's costs and projections of future costs that were used to justify the fee schedule publicly available online for 10 days prior to the fee schedule going into effect.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those in part B of House Report 115-96. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ROSS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-96.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, as the designee of the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, strike line 10 and all that follows through line 16 and insert the following:

"(n)(1) This section shall apply to the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation during any period such enterprise is under conservatorship or receivership pursuant to section 1367 of the Federal Housing Marketplace for Commercial Use and Administration Amendments of 2004 (12 U.S.C. 4161).

The effective date of this section shall be 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection, the exemption described in subsection (b)(4), relating to trade secrets and commercial or financial information, shall apply without regard to whether such information was obtained from a person outside the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, as the case may be.”

Page 1, line 18, after “on the date” insert the following: “that is six months after the date”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 280, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Ross) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, the manager’s amendment that I am offering on behalf of Chairman CHAFFETZ makes technical and conforming changes to the bill.

Applying FOIA to Fannie and Freddie while the entities remain in conservatorship will better ensure that the American people know what their government does with their taxpayer dollars. But, if and when Fannie and Freddie are in conservatorship or the entities need to be able to operate as commercially competitive businesses.

This amendment clarifies that Fannie and Freddie may use exemption 4, which protects sensitive commercial information from disclosure, regardless of whether information was obtained from a person outside of Fannie or Freddie, to protect their financially sensitive materials from public disclosure.

Mr. Chairman, recognizing the administrative labors involved in setting up FOIA shops, the amendment also addresses the implementation date. Fannie and Freddie will likely need to hire staff to create their websites, and identify records to be made publicly available as a matter of course.

The manager’s amendment, therefore, provides Fannie and Freddie 6 months after the bill’s enactment to establish their respective staffs and protocols to administer FOIA.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would make improvements that address concerns raised by FHFA.

The manager’s amendment would make several important improvements to the underlying bill. This amendment would provide Fannie and Freddie 6 months time to implement the bill. This time is important to ensure they have staff and procedures in place to process FOIA requests.

This amendment would also clarify that Fannie and Freddie could use exemption 4 of FOIA in the same way that FHFA can currently use it to protect trade secrets and commercial or financial information generated by Fannie and Freddie.

Exemption 4 protects “trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential.” Exemption 4 requires that that information can only be protected if it comes from an outside source rather than being generated by an agency itself.

Without the language added by this amendment, there would have been uncertainty as to whether confidential business information that would have been protected if Fannie or Freddie sent it to FHFA would have been protected when those entities were, themselves, responding to FOIA requests.

I appreciate Chairman CHAFFETZ’ willingness to work with us in addressing these concerns, and I urge all Members to support this manager’s amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Ross).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115–96.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, after line 16 insert the following new subsection (and redesignate the subsequent subsection accordingly):

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION—Nothing in this Act may be construed as precluding the application of any of the exemptions described in section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to subsection (a) of such section, as added by subsection (a).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 280, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to first commend Chairman CHAFFETZ for introducing H.R. 1694, the Fannie and Freddie Open Records Act of 2017. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and members of the committee for all of their hard work on this legislation.

H.R. 1694 would amend the Freedom of Information Act, FOIA, to make its provisions apply to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac when the two entities are in Federal conservatorship or receivership. My amendment makes commonsense improvements to the underlying bill to ensure that all nine FOIA exemptions apply to government-sponsored entities in conservatorship.

By passing this amendment, we will ensure that personal privacy and sensitive information is appropriately protected, while ensuring the highest level of transparency for the American taxpayers.

I am pleased to have the support of Chairman CHAFFETZ on this amendment, and I urge all of the Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, FOIA does not require that all records be released to requesters. The FOIA statute allows agencies to withhold information under nine exemptions, which were designed to protect truly sensitive information that would be harmful to important interests if released.

Just last year, Congress clarified that the expectation—and now the legal requirement—is that agencies can withhold information when it is necessary to prevent harm to the interest that the exemption was intended to protect. The Johnson amendment clarifies that Fannie and Freddie would be allowed to withhold requested information under those nine exemptions, just as any other agency would be permitted to withhold information, if the enterprises reasonably foresee that disclosure would harm a protected interest.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken, and the CHAIR announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CLAY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 115–96.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlwoman from the Virginia Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), I offer amendment No. 3.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendment made by this Act, may be construed as prohibiting restricting the disclosure of information regarding any proposed new product or significant new product term prior to loan...
Applying FOIA to Fannie and Freddie under this bill strengthens the guarantee that government-sponsored entities are fulfilling their mandate to stimulate homeownership rather than being in the business of supporting profitable, private equity investors on the backs of taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment further clarifies the legislation’s assurance of applicable disclosures as a mechanism to keep Fannie and Freddie consistent with their Federal charters to stimulate homeownership. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

The amendment was agreed to. Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1694) to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.
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AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 3 p.m.

FANNIE AND FREDDIE OPEN RECORDS ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 280 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1694.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly rise and rise the chair?
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IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1694) to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia in the chair.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the provisions of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 115-96 offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-96 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 410, noes 5, not voting 15, as follows: [Roll No. 232]

AYES—410

Abraham
Adams
Adcock
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrasso
Barzante
Bass
Beatty
Bechard
Bergman
Bugs
Bilirakis
Bush
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Brooks
Bustos
Butler, Brendan
Crowley
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bret
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Bucshy (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Buchanon
Budd
Burgess
Bunten
Butterfield
Byrne
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)

Donovan
Doyle, Michael
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Duncan
Elsison
Emmer
Engel
Eskoo
Espe
Ettich
Evans
Evans
Evans
Evans
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fontenot
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franke (AZ)
Froino
Frull
Gabard
Gallagher
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Greci
Green, Gene
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hastert
Harrar
Hastings
Mr. WEBSTER of Florida changed his vote from "aye" to "no," as follows:

Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. McCOLLUM, Messrs. CRAWFORD, EMMER, Mrs. MCMILLIN, and MRS. BURGESS changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on a rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 232.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 232.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the House of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1694) to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 280, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the bill from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 5, as follows:

Prominent politicians and their party affiliations were included in the list of those voting, with the yeas leading by a significant margin.
Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore ordered a recorded vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question on the table.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
invaded for the West to take their chunk of Poland’s freedom.

Years later, we won the Cold War, and Poland joined NATO. But Poland has never been truly free because Mr. Putin—mother Russia—has controlled Poland’s energy. Mr. Putin has punished Poland in their desire to be free by slowing natural gas exports in a cold, Polish winter that became much colder.

Uncle Sam is about to put the Russian bear on permanent hibernation by exporting American liquid freedom. Our liquified natural gas will leave Sabine Pass in June heading to Poland.

The Russian bear is on the run. Let American liquid freedom reign.

DISTRICT SCHOOL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

MRS. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the talent and hard work of the youth in New Jersey’s 12th District.

This weekend, a group of East Brunswick High School students were recognized as the best team from the Northeast in the We the People competition. Competing against more than 1,200 students, this team demonstrated knowledge of constitutional principles in both historical and contemporary contexts.

This weekend, students from John Witherspoon Middle School of Princeton and West Windsor-Plainsboro South High School will come to Washington to compete in the final round of the 2017 National Science Bowl.

To all of these students: The guidance of your teachers, Alan Brodman, Bill Merritt, and Sunila Sharma, and your hard work is evident, and New Jersey’s 12th District is very proud of you.

It is an honor to represent a district that continues to emphasize the importance of STEM and civic education, and encourage our Nation’s youth to thrive.

FIRST 100 DAYS OF PRESIDENT TRUMP’S ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the first 100 days of President Donald Trump’s administration.

In his first 100 days, President Trump has enacted more pieces of legislation than any other President since Truman, whose earliest Supreme Court confirmation since 1881, eliminated many onerous regulations to restore economic optimism and opportunity, protected the sanctity of life, and driven illegal border crossings to a 17-year low. His accomplishments are truly remarkable.

I have appreciated President Trump’s willingness to listen and work with Congress on major pieces of legislation. His effort to work with Congress is a breath of fresh air.

President Trump made several promises to the American people, and I am encouraged by his efforts to fulfill them. Mr. Speaker, the American people are watching both the President and those of us in Congress. They will not accept broken promises or half-hearted measures. They want results. I look forward to working alongside President Trump to keep our promises.

PRESIDENT TRUMP’S PROMISE TO DRAIN THE SWAMP

(Mrs. DEMINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, the President made big promises on the campaign trail to drain the swamp. He promised that his Washington would look different. Well, it doesn’t look different, but not in the way he promised.

Instead of ethics reform, his administration rolled back ethics provisions that prevented officials from serving in Federal agencies that they lobbied in the last 2 years.

He promised to tackle campaign finance, saying that he wouldn’t accept campaign donations from special interest groups. Instead, he has invited the special interests into his Cabinet, appointing them into the highest positions.

He promised he would ask Congress to pass campaign finance reform that prevents registered foreign lobbyists from raising money in American politics. Instead, it turns out that some of his closest confidants and former campaign advisers have made millions lobbying foreign governments.

He promised he would release his own tax returns, but has not. The American people have no way of knowing how he or his family businesses stand to benefit from these tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this is not draining the swamp. Everyone is accountable, especially those in the highest levels of our government.

CONGRATULATING DARLENE JOHNSON

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Darlene Johnson of Woodland, Washington, on being nominated for two Woman in Transport Awards of 2017 by Transport News International. She was given these well-deserved awards for Best Woman-Owned Land Logistics Company in the Pacific Northwest, and Most Inspirational Woman in Land Transport in the Northwestern U.S.

Throughout her career, Darlene has done everything in her power to serve her community. She currently sits on the Woodland Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors where she advocates for stronger environment for businesses in southwest Washington. Darlene’s tenacity and dedication motivate and inspire those around her, me included.

Not only does she advocate for local businesses, but she is a local businesswoman herself. Darlene, along with her husband, Jim, operate Woodland Truck Line, Inc. It is fitting that she is receiving this award for successfully running a business in an industry that is commonly thought to be male dominated.

Those who know Darlene, like, I do, know that if Darlene were to start a business in any other industry, she would go over, under, or right through any obstacles in her way.

Darlene’s service to our community does not go unnoticed. There is not an issue affecting the Woodland community with which she is not actively involved.

She currently is deserving of this prestigious award on behalf of southwest Washington. I congratulate her and wish her the best in her future endeavors and continued success in transportation.

LET’S START FOCUSING ON MAIN STREET AND AMERICAN WORKERS

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, President Trump campaigned throughout this country, including my home State of Pennsylvania, as a great populist, as a champion of the working class.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank President Trump and his administration for revealing their true intentions yesterday when they released their Wall Street written and designed tax plan—a giveaway for millionaires and billionaires. And not one thing—not one—for 99.9 percent of the working American people.

Mr. Speaker, we do need tax reform, and you would see broad bipartisan support for that. But it has to be real. It has to be paid for. And it must include relief for those three-quarters of the American people who pay more in payroll taxes than they ever do in individual income taxes. Enough of focusing on Wall Street and the corporate income tax rate, and let’s start focusing on Main Street and American workers.

HEALTHCARE DEBATE IN OUR NATION

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, as President Trump and Republicans in Congress work toward finally delivering the American people relief from ObamaCare, it is important to remember how we got here and why we find ourselves in this position today.
We are approaching the fork in the road for health care in our country. We have a choice of two paths, and they lead to very different outcomes.

Obamacare’s regulatory behemoth is collapsing the individual market and is paving the way toward a disastrous result, namely, socialized medicine—and the crowded waiting rooms, scarce access to physicians, and low-quality health care that comes with it, not to mention an unprecedented accumulation of power in Washington, D.C. This is not conjecture. Barack Obama, Harry Reid, and a whole host of Obamacare supporters have been completely candid about their ultimate goal of a single-payer healthcare system, which could then seamlessly devolve into socialized medicine.

The time to right our course is now. Republicans are offering the American people a better way, one that fosters choice, lowers healthcare costs, and improves Americans’ health outcomes. We have two clear and very distinct options. Let’s make the right choice and pull back from the brink of socialized medicine.

PRESIDENT TRUMP’S FIRST 100 DAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. McClintock) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. McClintock. Mr. Speaker, the last four elections have defined one of the most dramatic political realignments in our country’s history.

In these elections, we have seen a net shift of 64 U.S. House seats, 12 U.S. Senate seats, 10 Governors, 919 State legislative seats, and the Presidency shift from Democrat to Republican.

This happened in large part on three overarching mandates from the American people: revive the economy, secure our borders, and restore our healthcare system. If President Trump can accomplish these three objectives, his administration and this Congress will be remembered as one of the most successful and beneficial in our Nation’s history.

In working toward these goals, President Trump has faced the most bitter, virulent, and partisan opposition that any President has endured since the election of 1860.

We have seen the radical left in full display across our Nation with its appalling incivility, its intolerance of other points of view, and its disrespect of our democratic process and constitutional institutions. Sadly, this opposition narrative permeates much of our press and academia.

Yet, despite these obstacles, as we mark the first 100 days of this Presidency, there is ample reason to celebrate the new direction that President Trump and Congress have taken and the progress that we have made.

Our overarching mandate is to revive our economy and restore prosperity to millions of struggling American families who have suffered the most disappointing decade in more than 80 years, buried under an avalanche of Obama-era regulations and taxes.

American workers finally have an advocate in the White House. This President has freed more legislation in his first 100 days than any President since Harry Truman. And many of these bills, as well as his executive orders, have begun repealing the heavy regulations that have been sinking our economy.

One study estimates these actions have already relieved our economy of $68 billion ofdestructive regulations. That comes to about $500 for every family in America.

The Keystone pipeline alone will produce thousands of construction jobs, billions of dollars of private investment, and, when completed, 830,000 barrels of Canadian crude oil entering American markets every day.

And what has happened? Well, consumer confidence is up 3 points since the election. The S&P is up 11 percent, the NASDAQ is up more than 15 percent, and the Dow is up 13 percent. 317,000 more Americans are working today than on the day the President took the oath of office, unemployment has dropped three-tenths of a point, and the labor participation rate has started to inch upward once again.

It is not yet “morning again in America,” but the faintest shades of light are appearing on our economic horizon.

The second great mandate was to secure the borders after many years, when millions of illegal immigrants made a mockery of our Nation’s sovereignty and our rule of law. Wages for working Americans stagnated, jobs dried up, and social services have strained as a result.

Well, finally, we have a President who takes our Nation’s security and the sovereignty of our borders seriously. Renewed enforcement has, by all accounts, boosted morale of our immigration agencies dramatically, and criminal aliens are finally being deportation—already showing a 32 percent increase in deportations compared to the last administration. Because of this new resoluteness, illegal border crossings have plunged by some 60 percent.
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Now, healthcare reform is the third of the mandates. That requires congressional action, and here is where some courageous souls have taken the initiative. As we approach the 100th day of the administration, it appears legislation will soon be moving to the Senate, and, before long, the collapsing, one-size-fits-all bureaucracy of Obamacare will give way to a healthier and more vibrant healthcare market, where Americans will have the widest possible range of choices to meet their own needs with the supported tax system to ensure that these plans are within the financial reach of every American.

Ultimately, though, the success of this administration will not be measured by 100 days or by talking points from politicians. It will be measured by a simple question that every American will ask for himself or herself: Am I better off today? As we approach this first checkpoint in the course of this administration, there is strong reason to believe the answer to that question will be a decisive yes.

This is a period of great change, and great change brings great controversy. But I believe that this President and our Nation can take increasing confidence from these first 100 days and can take great strength in knowing that a day is fast approaching when we will awaken and realize it is, indeed, morning again in America.

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

FIRST 100 DAYS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Woodward) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. Woodward. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you yielding and being willing to stick around with me this afternoon. I have a great pleasure this afternoon, and that is to talk about successes that we have had together.

I was down on the floor earlier when we were debating the rule, and I was talking to my Democratic colleagues on the Rules Committee about the good work that was going on in the Rules Committee; the good work that was going on on the House floor. In fact, we brought the bill—it was a rau-

...
hear folks talking about success, and success is what marks these first 100 days.

Again, there has been more legislative activity than any other President and Congress—collaboratively Congress, House, Senate, Republicans, Democrats, more legislative activity than we have had in any Congress and White House combination since Harry Truman.

Mr. Speaker, we had the first Supreme Court confirmation in the first 100 days since 1881—since 1881. Now, it is with no joy that I share with you that the Supreme Court is such a powerful institution, Mr. Speaker. I think too often we fail to get the job done legislatively, and the Court steps in and legislates from right across the street. That wasn’t the job that the Constitution envisioned. That wasn’t the job assigned in Article III, but it is the job that has been taken on by default. So it has become increasingly important that we make sure the Court is staffed.

I supported the Senate having hearings on the Garland nomination last cycle. I supported the Senate having hearings on the Gorsuch nomination this cycle after deciding that the last session went 4-4, which meant we could sustain the underlying Court’s decision, but we couldn’t decide these important questions that were still a source of confusion across this country. And now we have a fully staffed Supreme Court again—the first time since 1881. We have seen a Supreme Court confirmation in the first 100 days of a new administration.

Seventeen, Mr. Speaker. It has been 17 years since illegal border crossings reached this low level. I am going to come back to that. But what I am saying is that words matter. And what the President has said is: we are going to grow the most robust economy the world has ever seen, but we are going to do it with a legal visa program that makes sure folks are coming and going in accordance with U.S. law. And simply that change in attitude, Mr. Speaker, simply that change in attitude from “we are going to ignore the law” to “the law matters” has brought illegal crossings down to a 17-year-low.

Mr. Speaker, 728; that is the number of millions of dollars saved with the President’s first foray into cutting Federal budgets. His first foray into cutting Federal budgets, he started taking a look at Federal contracts. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what it is like to be a new President of the United States, particularly one that doesn’t come out of a legislative department tradition but has a full-staffed Supreme Court as new as it comes to the content, but what is not new is so much of the process.

The President has been looking at contracts, Mr. Speaker, that have contracts his entire life. He took a look at the beginnings of the Pentagon contracts and said, by golly, we can do better for the American people; 3728 million on project number one saved for the American taxpayer.

That brings us to number 16, Mr. Speaker, and that is 16 years since consumer confidence in this country has been as high as it is today. Enjoy traveling down the district, Mr. Speaker, and I am talking to folks. We are a divided community, like every community is in the country. Some folks believe one thing; some folks believe another, but they are united on issues, but sometimes we are divided on issues. And voter after voter after voter says: Ron, I am not sure what is going to happen, but I feel like we are going to have opportunity. It has been 16 years since consumer confidence has reached this high of a level.

Now, with that increase in confidence, Mr. Speaker, comes an incredible obligation on the 435 of us to deliver. This isn’t confidence that is based on nothing happening. This is confidence that something is happening. We have real obligations to fulfill those promises, those commitments that we all made during the last election cycle. I think we have the men and women in this Chamber who can do it. But it has been 16 years since the American people believed that we could.

I want to put those border crossings in perspective, Mr. Speaker. There has been a 61 percent decline in border crossings in President Trump’s first 100 days.

Now, I come from Georgia. We have got a robust agricultural economy in Georgia. And I tell my constituents day in and day out, if you are not going to raise your son or daughter to pick carrots in south Georgia; if you don’t aspire for your son or daughter to be the very best cabbage picker that we have in the State of Georgia; if you are not aspiring to be part of that agricultural workforce that will help us get crops out of the field, we are going to need somebody who is aspiring to do that hard work. And it is hard work, Mr. Speaker.

Well, if we can agree that these aren’t jobs that American citizens are losing, these are jobs that are adding to the American economy, then we need a legal visa program to let folks come in and to let folks go out. I went on a bipartisan codell, Mr. Speaker—a bipartisan codell, Republicans and Democrats, traveling together to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras talking with families.

You remember the women and children crisis there: unaccompanied minors coming across the border? I talked to family after family, and they said: Ron, listen, I don’t want to be an American citizen. I don’t want to go to America. I don’t want to be in America. I am happy here at home. But dad, or my husband, he generally travels to that border season, and turns around and comes back home when that season is over.

Well, you all are getting so tough on your border security, you are not handing out legal visas to do this work, that now my husband or my dad can’t come back home when the growing season is over. So now we are all picking up, and we are trying to get into America, too, so the family can stay together.

Well, it makes perfectly good sense to me if you were that family. It makes no sense if you are the American taxpayer. You recognize that you have jobs that need to be filled. You recognize you have skills that you are not training your children to fulfill, and you don’t want to change the visa program to make that happen.

The President has committed to growing the economy. We know that is going to mean legal access in and out of the country. There was a 61 percent drop in illegal border crossings in the first 100 days.

I will tell you what else that means, Mr. Speaker. That means, instead of our border patrol men and women working that border under very difficult conditions, instead of our law enforcement, instead of all of the instruments of homeland security that we are focused on families crossing the border, with a 61 percent decline in this human traffic crossing the border, law enforcement can now focus on the real security issues to this country; to the drugs coming across the border; forbid the thought to weapons of mass destruction crossing the border.

There have been tremendously important accomplishments here in the first 100 days; so much more that we will be able to do together.

Mr. Speaker, there were 25 Iranian entities sanctioned by the Trump administration in the first 100 days. That is what we did together in this Chamber. We will remove, Mr. Speaker, we will remove the Iranian sanctions language in a bipartisan way to send the word to the leaders of Iran that while we have great respect for your citizenry, we cannot tolerate a nuclear Iran. We do not trust you to be a member of the league of nations with nuclear capabilities, and the answer is no as you pursue those very dangerous dreams.

Well, you will remember, President Obama negotiated a deal with the international community and with the Iranians. I wish he hadn’t, but he did. We had sanctions. Those sanctions are now gone. Iran is pursuing very much the same path that I would have expected them to pursue, given the deal that was the negotiator to the weapons of mass destruction and the world continues to be a dangerous place.

Well, we have rules on the books today, laws on the books today that allow the government, in consultation with Congress, in cooperation with Congress based on statutes passed by Congress, to get involved unilaterally as the United States of America in trying to prevent a nuclear Iran.
There were 25 different entities identified by this administration as helping the Iranian Government to pursue those dangerous and illegal nuclear goals sanctioned and reined in. It is going to make a difference. It is going to make a difference to national security. It is going to make a difference to international security.

Mr. Speaker, $18 billion—you can’t see this slide, but already in 4 months on the job, 4 months in cooperation with the Canadians, we have saved $18 billion through the elimination of red tape. I don’t mean $18 billion that is a one-time deal, Mr. Speaker. I mean $18 billion annually in wasteful compliance costs erased by this administration, again, often in cooperation and consultation with Congress.

When I go back and tell you that this President has signed more bills into law than any President since Harry Truman in cooperation with this Congress, I am talking about many of the bills did exactly this: cut the tape, saving the American taxpayer money. Those bills, very often, were brought through the Congressional Review Act process. That is a process, as you know, Mr. Speaker, that allows the Congress to take a look at the regulations that the administration promulgates.

We pass the laws; the administration writes the regs; we get to go back and look at the regs to make sure they represent the true intent of the legislation.

Well, in many instances so far this year, Mr. Speaker—in fact, in more instances than any other time in American history, we have decided that those regulations do not reflect the intent of Congress. In fact, often they are running directly contrary to the intent of Congress. We have eliminated those $18 billion annually in savings to the American taxpayer.

Remember the Keystone pipeline, Mr. Speaker. This administration approved the Dakota Access pipeline. Think back, Mr. Speaker. We are going to disagree on things. I am perfectly comfortable with the disagreements that this body has. But when the application for the Keystone pipeline was delivered to the administration, it took longer for the past two administrations to approve the Keystone pipeline—and by approve it, I mean ultimately they rejected it. It took longer for them to consider and reject the Keystone pipeline than it took for Americans to build the Hoover Dam from start to finish.

I want you to think about that. When we are talking about jobs; when we are talking about the economy; when we are talking about America being that beacon of hope, and freedom, and opportunity across the country; when we are talking about the tremendous need for public works projects in this country, every single American can do when they put their shoulder into it, it took longer in the 21st century to get an answer to whether or not you are allowed to build a pipeline than it took to build the Hoover Dam from start to finish. That is bad for all of us.

That is bad for every Republican, every Democrat, every Independent. Every single American citizen needs economic opportunity. Every single American citizen needs the certainty of knowing if the pipeline is bad, let’s cancel it and let’s move on. But let’s not sit and wait and delay. Let’s not debate and debate. Let’s get to an answer.

In the first 100 days on the job, President Trump got to an answer. President Bush and President Obama, combined, again, over 8 years of delay. President Trump, first 100 days, approved this.

What does this mean? Well, it means that the oil coming out of Canada is going to come to America to be refined. Remember, the Keystone Pipeline debate, Mr. Speaker, was never about the environment and whether or not the Canadians were going to harm the oil about that. The Canadians were loud and clear: We are going to get this oil out of the ground. We are either going to get it out of the ground and send it to America to be processed, or we are going to get it out of the ground and send it to China to be processed. You pick.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is an easy choice. If I get to be king of Canada, I can make different decisions about their environment. But while Canada has sovereignty and gets to make its own decisions about its natural resources, we get to decide: Are American citizens going to profit from the processing of this oil or is China going to profit from the processing of this oil?

When this oil gets processed, who do you think is doing it in the most environmentally sensitive manner, Mr. Speaker? You tell me. If there’s a single colleague in this body that believes the Chinese are better stewards of the environment than the Americans are, then you needed to vote “no” on the Keystone pipeline. But if you believe that we care more about Mother Earth than the Chinese do, if you believe that American rules and regulations protect the environment more than the Chinese rules and regulations do, then you needed to be a supporter of the Keystone pipeline.

In his first 100 days, President Trump took this source of indecision and confusion and provided certainty. That is not academic, Mr. Speaker. That certainty is directly connected to jobs.

You can’t see it from where you sit, Mr. Speaker, but I am talking about over 500,000 new jobs not connected to the pipeline, individually. There are over 500,000 new jobs not connected to the pipeline. Not this number. I am talking about this approach to governing that says people deserve a “yes” or a “no” answer. People deserve certainty. People deserve fast responses. People don’t need to hang in the lurch.
Today we have an opportunity to do that for the very first time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to take you back to where I began, and that is that we have a choice in this country. We can focus on those things that divide us all day every day. We can do it. I still believe there is more that unites us as a nation than divides us as a nation, but if you choose to spend your time talking about those things that divide us, you can fill up a day.

If you choose to spend your time talking about those things that are broken yet proffering no solutions to fix them, you can fill up a day. If you choose to spend your day talking about why everybody else is a lazy son of a gun and only you have access to the truth, you can fill up a day, and then a week, and then a month, and then a year, and then a Presidential cycle, and then a decade, and then a generation.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you will recognize that working together we have already passed more laws in 2017 than any other Congress and President working together since Harry Truman, if you will recognize that we have taken the uncertainty out of the Supreme Court so that uncertainty in the legal arena will exist no longer—if you recognize that a thorny issue like illegal immigration that has been so difficult to solve because we haven’t been able to figure out how to deal with the border security aspect so that we can go on and deal with the other thorny issues, those border crossings are down, which means our opportunity has increased for dealing with those problems that have plagued our Nation for so long.

I can give you one example of that, Mr. Speaker. I am going to digress.

I have got a family in my district trying to bring a relative into the country. They have been working on it for 11 years—11 years. All the talk that goes on in this body about immigration, nobody is talking about helping my constituents from Haiti. Nobody is talking about passing a law to make it easier to get your family member in from Haiti. Nobody is talking about those families that have been separated while trying to follow the law of the land. Nobody is talking about those families that have paid out of pocket to go through the legal process, all the money, all the delay to do it the right way. Nobody is talking about fixing it for those families.

Let’s fix it for those families because we all agree that is a better way. If you want to get your adult child in from Mexico, Mr. Speaker, you needed to file your paperwork in 1993 for their number to be coming up legally today—1993, to do it the right way and have their number to come up today.

What became a 25-year process to bring a family member into this country is the right answer? Of course folks are going to do it the wrong way.

If you want to bring your adult brother or sister in from the Philippines, you had to file in 1994 for their number to be coming up legally today. Who believes that is the right system? The system is broken. We don’t have enough trust together to repair that system. By eliminating the illegal border crossing’s immediate challenge, the President has created the headroom for us to work together on issues that we can absolutely solve.

93. Mr. Speaker, this number of millions of dollars saved in contract negotiations thus far—in fact, not even thus far, but contract negotiations on one single Pentagon project that the President has inserted himself in.

For all the things you may think the President knows, doesn’t know, you agree with, you disagree with, you have to know that he knows how to drive a hard bargain. You have to know that he knows how to negotiate big contracts.

The American taxpayer is not satisfied with the way we have been doing it, with the way former White Houses have been doing it. We have an opportunity to come together and do it better, and the President is leading us in that way.

And that all culminates, Mr. Speaker, in 16. That is the number of years since consumer confidence in this country was at its current levels. You can do that math if you would like, Mr. Speaker. It will take you back through an entire 8 years of Democratic control of the White House, and it will take you back through an entire 8 years of Republican control of the White House.

The American consumer does not care whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. The American consumer cares whether or not they think their job is secure.

The American consumer does not care if you are a Republican or a Democrat. The American consumer cares whether prices are higher tomorrow or lower tomorrow.

The American consumer does not care about our petty, silly, inside-the-beltway Washington arguments. They care about whether America is going to be stronger for their children and grandchildren a generation from now. And it has been 16 years since American consumers have the optimism that they have today.

I will say it again, Mr. Speaker. We can cooperate. We can do business. We can do it the right way. It is similar to the tax plan that candidate Trump spoke about during the campaign.

So we will do our best with what has been put forward as a plan, but this plan, in our estimation, when you look at what it contains, really amounts to nothing more than a one-page document full of handouts to the rich.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Steve Mnuchin, yesterday said, during a press conference, there is no plan. Or better yet, in this body fussing, griping, complaining—there are lots of things that are wrong and lots of folks to blame for it—or we can recognize the big hopes and dreams that the American people have placed on this President and this Congress and this time in our history. We can recognize that there is still more that unites us in this country than divides us in this country. We can still recognize that folks care very little about us and our families and care very much about their community and their families.

With that as our touchstone, Mr. Speaker, call me an irrational optimist, but I think there is absolutely nothing that we can’t do together, and I look forward to playing a role in that. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
He didn’t listen when women and their allies took to the streets in the biggest march in American history to demand that he respect women, protect Planned Parenthood, and support equal rights for women.

And this President certainly didn’t listen to the millions of Americans who were outspoken in their opposition to the Republican healthcare plan that essentially took $1 trillion off of the backs of working people and folks who need health care across this country and transferred it to the wealthiest in our country.

The reality is this President, unfortunately, has not been listening to the American people. If you look at that healthcare plan, just as an example, only 17 percent of the American public actually supported TrumpCare. This President has not been listening, to now put forward another plan on health care that again suggests that we should actually take away essential health care, people, take away the opportunity for people to have pre-existing conditions covered, and, once again, leaving an additional 24 million Americans stripped of their health care.
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So in this tax press conference yesterday, it became very clear that the administration doesn’t have really an idea of exactly what the plan is going to look like, except for the fact that it will be good for business.

Secretary Mnuchin said: “Under the Trump plan, we will have a massive tax cut for businesses. . . .” Despite all of President Trump’s broken promises, we have to believe that this may actually be true. Let’s not forget that the Secretary of the Treasury was a C-level executive at Goldman Sachs and his loyalties have been with Big Business.

The tax plan, as we have been given it on this one-page document, is a gift-wrapped tax cut to the highest earners and corporations. The claim is that it was written to create jobs and spur economic growth and help low- and middle-income families, but what it really does is drastically reduce tax rates for Big Business to just 15 percent. That tax break isn’t just for corporations; it is also for pass-through firms.

Let’s be clear about what pass-through firms are. Pass-through firms are entities that wealthy people and companies use in order to funnel money and have lower tax rates. Among these companies is the Trump Organization.

This is why, in asking for the President’s tax returns, this is not just an ask that doesn’t have any meaning. It is not a partisan ask. We have 190,000 Americans in the streets in red States and blue States asking. When we know what exactly the President’s tax returns are, then we have the ability to make sure that we understand, as the American people, whether any plan he proposes is in the interest of the American people or whether it is in his own financial interest.

According to the Center for American Progress, 70 percent of partnership and S corporation income goes to the top 1 percent of households by income. So when you propose a tax cut for these pass-through entities, we are talking about a tax cut for the people in the top 1 percent of this country. We are not talking about a tax cut that benefits middle class, working families.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities provided a specific example where a lawyer making $1 million a year could funnel their income through that pass-through and could actually save $180,000 a year. There is no doubt that this President would himself benefit from this tax plan, although we can’t say exactly how much, because we haven’t seen the tax returns and we don’t know exactly which financial interests he has and how much he would benefit.

However, his own lawyers reported that nearly all of his 500 or so businesses are—don’t be surprised—pass-throughs. If we accept this assertion from his lawyers that his assets are worth more than $10 billion but not surprisingly, that wasn’t asked of this tax plan or tax ploy, depending on how you want to see it, would actually save the President of the United States millions of dollars, but it would not benefit millions of working families across this country who actually need to see our tax system reform so that it is more fair.

When asked how these tax cuts were paid for, Secretary Mnuchin said they would be so effective at bolstering the economy that it would pay for itself. Now, we have seen trickle-down economics before in this country, and it is a nonsensical idea that this tax plan would bolster the economy. We have seen the disastrous effects of trickle-down economics by low-income and middle-income families.

The Tax Foundation estimates that reducing the business rate for companies and pass-throughs to 15 percent would actually reduce revenue in this country by $3.5 trillion over 10 years. They also found that, at the very best, the plan would only spur enough growth to pay for less than half the cost of the tax cuts. Low-and middle-income Americans would ultimately pay the price, not Big Business.

Now, this is similar to what we saw in the healthcare plan. In the healthcare plan, if you remember, what we saw was a proposal to cut $880 billion from Medicaid and take that money and essentially give a trillion dollars in tax cuts to the wealthiest.

So if you were in the top 4 percent of income earners in this country, you would have gotten a tax cut of about $200,000 a year. But if you were in that age that we call seniors, between 50 and 64, you would have an age tax and you would have to pay up to $15,000 more on your premiums. So that is why some of my colleagues across the aisle actually called that healthcare plan a downpayment on a tax plan. It was supposed to be the beginning of a tax reform plan that, again, moved more money to the wealthiest in our country.

The result?

More than 333,000 residents changed their income to funnel through pass-throughs in the first year alone.

What happened in Kansas when this was pushed through?

State revenue went down by an additional almost 2 percent, costing $206 million in 2013 and $472 million the following year.

Today, the State faces a $1.1 billion shortfall, and residents are paying the price in lost programs and services.

But the promise that was made at the time that this plan was pushed through in Kansas—the same kind of plan that is being proposed today at the Federal level—the promise that was made was that it would kick-start the economy.

Unfortunately, that hasn’t happened either. Economic growth in Kansas is happening at just half the national average.

Because here is the thing: tax cuts don’t just pay for themselves, and there are plenty of experts on both sides of the aisle that will attest to that. A sheet of paper is not a plan, and everyone knows it.

When reporters pressed Secretary Mnuchin and the National Economic Council Director Gary Cohn for details, they failed to provide anything of substance. A reporter asked Cohn three times what the tax cut would look like for a family of four making $60,000 per year.

I have a lot of those families, Mr. Speaker, in my district. I believe we have those families in red States and blue States, working people across this country who believe that America should be and must be a land of opportunity for people who work hard. Maybe they are not the richest people in the world. Maybe they are not the richest top 1 percent in this country. But they work hard, they earn a good living, and they deserve to have fairness in our tax plan.

Now, when Mr. Cohn was asked three times by this reporter what the tax cut would look like for a family of four making $60,000 a year, he replied it is “gonna mean a tax cut” three times in a row. Instead of giving answers, though, and when he was pressed, reporters were told over and over again that they would get more information later and that the administration is in “robust talks.”

Well, I am a Member of the House, and I assure you those robust talks are happening with the House and the Senate. We all represent the people of the United States. We want to all be a part
of the conversation, and we demand to know specifically, as we look at this plan, how this President, his family, and his Cabinet will benefit from the tax plan. That is only fair, Mr. Speaker, that we understand exactly how this tax plan would benefit the person who is paying the tax plan.

Is this tax plan for the American people to see relief, or is it for the President and his best friends to see relief? The reality is that this is about an issue that American people deserve to know whether they can trust this President and this administration to act on their behalf. So far, unfortunately, this administration has continued to throw the middle class under the bus, whether it is threatening to cut funding for Meals on Wheels, which is part of the budget proposal in cutting the CDBG programs, or whether it is in proposing a healthcare plan that cuts vital health care from millions of Americans. So we are intent to stay extremely vigilant.

I see that we have a couple of colleagues from the Progressive Caucus. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a colleague on the Judiciary Committee, a strong champion of the American people.
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days that you cannot worry about the American people? Is 100 days more important than the mother who is traveling to work 3 and 4 hours? Is 100 days more important than the traveling salesmen who need the kind of infrastructure and roads that you think? Is the country America that need the kind of rural electric system that helps them? or those that need clean energy? or those that need research for the next cure for sickle cell anemia?

Is your 100 days so important that you cannot provide resources for law enforcement and firefighters and first responders, that you cannot provide help for the national parks, the National Endowment for the Arts, and you cannot provide direction to the Department of Justice, which has turned itself into the injustice, unjust department, exploring ideas of taking away the one thing that you can be proud of, and that is the deportation rights as citizens in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, so the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), my distinguished vice chair and co-chair of this Special Order hour, may control the remainder of this hour, I yield back the balance of my time.

PRESIDENT TRUMP’S TAX PLAN
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman JAYAPAL for leading us in this Special Order to discuss President Trump’s tax proposal, which we received this morning—or last night. The public discussion on taxes has been going on for several weeks now in anticipation of the release of the President’s proposal.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans took to the streets, from the East to the West, the North to the South, all over America. Hundreds of thousands of people marched on the little people, simple demand to President Trump, which is that he follow the precedent and the policy that was pursued by the last nine Presidents, going back to Richard Nixon, for a half century of releasing tax cuts, and this President promised to do as a President, saying he would do it after his audit was completed, and then he got into office and then just changed his mind and said this would be, I guess, another one of the broken promises that he would deliver to the American people.

So why is this a big deal? Why is it important that we get to see the President’s taxes?

Well, America was conceived in popular, democratic revolution against royalty, against monarchy, against aristocracy. We, as a people, overthrew a king who imposed tea taxes on small businesses, on the little people, but exempted his tycoon buddies in the East India Corporation, a king who constantlysweeted the commoners with high taxes to pay for his lavish expenses and traveling jaunts and vacations around the world with the royal family and the royal court, a king who never paid any taxes and never disclosed his own entanglements with foreign governments. We rebelled against that kind of government. We demand accountability. We demand transparency here.

Mr. President, please read the Constitution. We have no kings here. We have no slaves here. We have no czars here. We have no serfs here. We have equal citizens, free citizens with equal rights.

We allow no titles of nobility here, which is a point you might mention to your Secretary of State, who still carries that disgraceful title conferred upon him by Vladimir Putin, the Russian Order of Friendship.

In America, no one is above the law and all of us are subject to it. As Tom
Paine put it, in the monarchies, the king is law; but in the democracies, the law is king.

The President of the United States owes an undivided loyalty to the people, the laws, and the Constitution of the United States, not the oligarchs of Russia, not the hotel owners of the world, not the Bank of China, not the dictators and kleptocrats and tyrants of the Earth. The President owes undivided loyalty to the people of the United States.

So we ask the question: Where are your taxes?

How can we determine whether the President has conflicts of interest or is collecting illegal emoluments from foreign governments if he won't show us the names of the people and the corporations that he is in active partnership with all over the world? We simply can't do it.

But how can we dream of undertaking to completely reform and revise the tax policy of America unless we see the President's tax returns in order to determine whether he is going to benefit from the policies that he is now advancing? We can't do it.

Forgive me, but is there anyone left in America who thinks that this President would propose a tax reform that would hurt his own individual, personal, or business interests? If you believe that, you are too innocent to be let out of the house by yourself at this point in the Trump administration.

So then we arrive at work and we receive this huge single piece of paper is the Donald Trump tax plan. It is not a bill. It is not a study. It is not a plan. There are not even complete sentences in it. There are sentence fragments in it. It is not even a press release.

But it has got a few key ideas, apparently, that he is asking the Republicans in Congress to lead us to pass by tomorrow in order to make the 100-day deadline which the President has disdained. But he wants to make the 100-day deadline because he understands now that there is some kind of milestone that he wants to suddenly be able to achieve.

Well, what is in here?

Well, first, the Treasury Secretary, Mr. Mnuchin, set out a test for tax reform in which he said there will be no absolute tax cut for the upper class. Well, this plan totally defies that promise. It betrays that promise. It provides this huge tax cut for the wealthy, while middle class families receive very little benefit, at the same time that social programs are being sliced and diced all over the Federal Government.

We all know that the tax plan will provide a huge benefit to Donald Trump himself. Now, we know this only because one of his tax returns leaked out, suspiciously, and some think, from the White House, the 2005 plan, leaked on TV—nothing before that, nothing after.

But even taking this 1 year which, presumably, is most in the President's favor, President Trump would save over $28 million in taxes under the 1-page plan that got passed around Congress today. Most of that money comes through the reduction of the pass-through business income tax rate, reducing it from the 30 percent range to 15 percent.

But then it also proposes abolishing, and I know it because it says right here, bullet No. 3 under bullet No. 5, repeal the alternative minimum tax. He wants to repeal the alternative minimum tax.

Now, what is this AMT? AMT does not stand for “all money to Trump.” AMT stands for the alternative minimum tax. And what it means is, if you are superwealthy and you have got an army of lawyers on your side and you can structure your corporate bankruptcies and your personal business losses—of which President Trump has many—in such a way as to make it possible for you not to pay any taxes for a long time, the alternative minimum tax says, well, there is something that everybody has got to pay. There is an alternative minimum tax. We are not going to let anybody’s clever lawyering bring them below a certain rate.

On that rule, we know that Mr. Trump, in that 1 year we know about, 2005—you probably saw it on Rachel Maddow. In that 1 year, he paid millions of dollars only because of the existence of the alternative minimum tax. In other words, all of his deductions and corporate bankruptcies and clever lawyers’ tricks that got him down to zero, presumably, in all these other years that he won’t show us, none of them could stop him from having to pay something, because the alternative minimum tax says let’s not press a good joke too far. We understand you are very wealthy. We understand that there are loopholes that have been injected into the law, but we are not going to let anybody fall below a certain minimum threshold.

You could think of it kind of like equivalent to the minimum wage for working people. The alternative minimum tax is kind of the minimum wage that the wealthiest people in the country pay us, as opposed to escaping all of their taxes.

Well, Donald Trump now wants to abolish the alternative minimum tax. He just wants to get rid of it. That doesn’t sound like a very good idea. It is going to dig a superbig hole for us and dig the deficit much further.

Let’s talk about the deficit. Well, I thought—look, I love the fact that we can’t do it.

But I thought that the heart of Republican Party orthodoxy is you don’t blow up the deficit with outrageous tax proposals or spending proposals. They call us tax-and-spend liberals. They are cut-the-taxes-and-spend conservatives. I don’t even know what makes them conservative anymore. I call myself a liberal because the heart of the word “liberal” is liberty. I call myself a progressive because the heart of the word “progressive” is progress. And if we are not making progress, then what are we doing in government?

But after seeing this plan, I realize those of us on our side of the aisle can call ourselves conservatives, too, because we want to conserve the land, the air, the water, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, political democracy, our alliances with foreign governments and foreign democracies, Social Security, health care for the people, and we want to preserve as much of a balanced budget as we can get to. On the other side of the aisle, they are calling themselves conservatives, and I don’t know why because if they back this proposal, then they are blowing a multitrillion-dollar hole in the deficit.

This plan is not remotely revenue neutral. The earliest estimates are that it will blow a 6 or $7 trillion hole in the deficit. That, of course, is a way to put unsustainable pressure on the other commitments we have made as a Congress, as a people, Social Security commitments to the people, and Medicare commitments to the people for health care. We cannot afford this irresponsible and reckless tax plan that has been sent to Congress by the President. It is a return to discredited, failed, supply-side economics. All they can say is they will blow a $7 trillion hole in the deficit, but they are going to make so much money back through all the economic activity that we will be able to make money on that. If you believe that, then you will believe Mr. Trump’s promise that he is going to release his tax returns next year or the year after that.

Look, we do need tax reform in America because this system is regressive, and this system is opaque and complex. We need some real reform. But this is not remotely the answer, this one-page mimeographed sheet of some really bad ideas.

Let me just say one other thing that seems to have snuck in there: repeal the estate tax. They want to repeal the estate tax. This might be the greatest betrayal of all—not because President Trump has ever supported it, but because the Founders of America were determined to have an estate tax. I am talking about Thomas Jefferson, Tom Paine, and Ben Franklin. The original Americans wanted this to be a country of economic opportunity and freedom for people. But they thought the idea of inherited wealth passed down from generation to generation was a major threat to the idea of equality and democracy for all. They saw that it would be unsustainable if you had huge fortunes—nowhere near as huge as they are today—but huge fortunes being
passed down from generation to generation. That would lead us to an aristocracy; that would lead us to a monarchy; and that would lead us to Presidents of the United States who would think that they don’t have to show you their tax returns. Presidents of the United States who think it is okay to spend public money on fancy vacations for their family and Secret Service all over the country and the world and having a winter or a summer escape at Mar-a-Lago, Florida, and so on. Go back to the people in the town of Redford, to the citizens of America, read Thomas Jefferson about inherited wealth.

Now, our laws today don’t even have the estate tax or the inheritance tax starting until millions of dollars. The vast majority of Americans are not even affected by it. It applies right now only to the smallest sliver of the wealthiest Americans. I think—and forgive me for not having the facts in front of me—again, we are just getting this information right now, but I think the amount is now somewhere around $4.5 million. So if you die with $4.5 million, your estate is not going to be taxed. That is enough to send the kids and the grandkids to college. It is enough for people to have a house or two houses. That is not bad. But the fact that we would tax beyond that means that we are not going to get a society that is based on inherited wealth and deep, profound political and economic inequities. But we would turn it over to the Founders of the country, and also, by the way, totally antithetical to the vision of Adam Smith who is the big hero to my conservative friends on the other side of the aisle.

Adam Smith was someone who said: You don’t want to have inherited wealth in a society like that. That is dangerous. It will promote idleness and irresponsibility among the people who inherit hundreds of millions or billions of dollars. It will increase political inequalities and class tension in the society, and it will lead to irresponsible behavior by the people who have that kind of wealth.

People will get the idea that they can buy a public office. In America, public office is something that you earn. It is not something that you buy; but, right now, there is a model for elective politics around the country which is you don’t have to be involved in politics, you don’t have to be involved in social movements, you don’t have to be involved in public service, and you don’t have to do anything for anybody. As long as you have got enough money, you can go in, you can buy the consultants and the pollsters, and you can go right to the head of the class, and then you can get into office.

What is so dangerous about that? Well, look around the world. What is happening? There is a whole new model of government that is popping up from Putin’s Russia to Duterte’s Philippines to Orban’s Hungary to Le Pen’s France. And the model is this: that people get into office, and government becomes a moneymaking operation for them and their friends, for a tiny elite. That totally contradicts the promise of America. Our Founders were concerned with making sure that there would be public virtue, that we would put people in office who were committed to the common good, not to enriching everybody, not to the goal of enriching themselves or their hotel partners or people they are in business with in Russia or in Saudi Arabia or all over the world. That is not the model. In America, the government has got to be devoted to the people.

So, America, read the fine print here. This tax plan contradicts everything that we were founded on as a country. It upssets the very idea of democracy—abolishing the estate tax—abolishing the alternative minimum tax, driving all the wealth up the income and wealth ladder. That is not America. We have got to stand up for what American values really are. We are not Russia. We are not a kleptocracy. We are not not Azerbaijan. We are not Saudi Arabia. This is the United States of America. We need a government that is committed to the economic success of every family and of every person. We need a government which is working. The Women’s March set the whole context for discussion about what is going to happen here because we know that President Trump campaigned like William Jennings Bryan, like he was a big populist. He was going to be on the side of the working people. But he got in, and the Rothschilds, the Goldmans, the Sachs, have come to run his government. It is a Wall Street Cabinet. It is the wealthiest Cabinet in the history of the United States. That is who this government represents today. That is what this tax plan represents today.

So they are going to try to jam it down Congress over the next 24 hours. We are going to do everything to stop it. We need the help of the American people to stand up and say: No; what is going on here is not what we want. We need the help of the American people. We need a government that is committed to the economic success of every family and of every person. We need a government that is working. The Women’s March set the whole context for discussion about what is going to happen here because we know that President Trump campaigned like William Jennings Bryan, like he was a big populist. He was going to be on the side of the working people. But he got in, and the Rothschilds, the Goldmans, the Sachs, have come to run his government. It is a Wall Street Cabinet. It is the wealthiest Cabinet in the history of the United States. That is who this government represents today. That is what this tax plan represents today.

We are voting on bills every day we are in session. As I understand it, there was a time when Congress could be in session, have hearings during the day, maybe vote in committee but not actually have votes on the floor during the day. But I think over the years, the concern has been if we are not voting on the floor where it is recorded, then people might not show up. There is certainly a body of evidence to support the country being better off when Congress doesn’t come into session.

I had read that one of our Founders, Thomas Jefferson, for all his wisdom and his incredible draft—was the first draft of the Declaration of Independence—Jefferson was not actually there in Philadelphia to help draft the
Constitution in 1787. But I had read that he sent a letter and remarked that if he had one thing that he could get into the Constitution—realizing, of course, it was too late at that point—but it would be a requirement that no bill could be voted on in Congress until it had been filed for a year.

Some might immediately respond: well, gee, there are so many bills that we pass as emergency bills; and I would respond that yes, and usually those things that are drafted so quickly are more problematic than otherwise legislation that goes through a lengthy and more diligent look at what is in the bill before it is passed.

In fact, if we had such—and I am not advocating that we have this constitutional amendment—but I am noting, Mr. Speaker, the merits of having bills on file for a lengthy period of time so people have a chance to think about it, talk about it, weigh the merits, and go back to our districts and talk about the merits there.

Of course, I am not talking about going back and having these fake news townhalls where people who supported opponents demand townhalls, and they have their playbook for how you go about it, how you intimidate your Member of Congress and keep intimidating until your Member of Congress becomes a coward and he is afraid not to have, or she is afraid not to have, a townhall. And then once you have co-opted them into having a townhall, then you have your playbook for how you totally disrupt the townhall.

That is not what I am talking about. I am talking about going all over your district talking to people eye-to-eye, heart-to-heart, and finding out where people are. It is incredible how people have come to be hurting over the last 8 years.

For all the talk that President Obama had about Fat Cats on Wall Street, it was as if there was a wink and a nod: Okay, I am going to refer you guys on Wall Street as Fat Cats, but I am going to make you richer than you have ever been. I am going to stack the deck in your favor. All you have to do is endure me calling you Fat Cats, making references to you being so greedy. I may even refer to you being Republican, even though probably more of you donate to me than did my opponents. But that will be our little game. Then, of course, when I am out of office, you can pay me $400,000 for giving you an hour of my time. That is another wink and nod. It is just a friendly reward for how good I did for you while I was President.

Let’s face it, the Democrats got through the Dodd-Frank bill that was supposed to punish the banks that brought us to the brink of ruin, but instead of punishing or reining in the investing behemoth Wall Street that brought us to the brink of ruin, Dodd-Frank has overseen the demise of hundreds, even thousands of community banks that did not bring us anywhere close to the brink of economic disaster. In fact, they were the backbone.

As President George W. Bush was going out of office, he got $700 billion handed over to the Treasury Department that many people like those at Goldman Sachs who helped bring us to the brink of desperation. In fact, I only saw one of the contracts that were drafted by the Treasury Department some years back. Lo and behold, it was one of the firms that was appropriate for the Treasury to contract with. Goldman Sachs was right in there.

Of course, with the disdain that Secretary Paulsen had for Goldman Sachs, he wasn’t about to let their competitor, Lehman Brothers, survive. He was able to keep them from surviving, not helping them. God bless Ford Motor Company. They were able to turn down any government assistance that GM and Chrysler took.

There was a remedy, if we hadn’t panicked and followed the advice of former FDIC Chairman Issac. I found out from my Democratic friend BRAD SHERMAN that he actually was the one that first brought former Chairman Isasa to me. And I advocated against a good solution that would not have caused us to take what was referred to by socialists the day after it passed as the biggest step toward socialism in the last 50 years, and that was the Federal Government taking the shots with the investment banks on Wall Street, much to the ruin of so many community banks.

We gave advantages to the big banks. We hurt the community banks who were not able to compete as well. God bless all of those that have hung in there. I hope that we can rectify things better than that.

The bottom line, I think, testifying about what the Obama years were really about—acknowledged by President Obama—a few years ago, he actually acknowledged that his Presidency oversaw a record that had never happened before in U.S. history. Ninety-five percent of the income in the United States—that was under Obama’s policies—95 percent of all American income went to the top 1 percent in America.

If you were looking for one fact to really characterize the abuses of the president and the policies that would be in contention. Ninety-five percent of the income went to the top 1 percent, not under George W. Bush, not under George H.W. Bush, not under Ronald Reagan, not under Richard Nixon, not under Dwight Eisenhower, not even under Harry Truman. I had under Barack Hussein Obama’s policies.

During his Presidency, the way the deck was tilted against the middle class and shrunk as the poor in America grew under Obama’s policies, we actually went back to our history. Ninety-five percent of the income went to the top 1 percent income earners. That is pretty amazing.

I do personally, Mr. Speaker, think that has something to do with the Republicans gaining the majority in the House, in the Senate, and getting the Presidency. Americans, by a huge margin of electoral votes, and if you look at Donald Trump and who voted for Hillary Clinton, it pretty well establishes the Democratic Party as the fringe party of America. They won the fringes, other than some major cities here and there, they are the fringe.

All across America—the bulk of America, when you look at the map, voted to change course. Let’s try something different so that 95 percent of America’s income doesn’t end up in the pockets of the top 1 percent—those same 1 percent that will be paying former President Obama $400,000 for 1 hour of his time.

Where have we heard that recently? Wow, I don’t believe that was George W. Bush speaking to the disabled veterans getting that kind of money. Oh, yes, I recall now. It was Hillary Clinton. It was Bill Clinton. Bill Clinton earned massive amounts for speeches with his wife who is Secretary of State. And, wow, all of those tens, hundreds, millions of dollars coming to the Clinton Foundation amazingly at the time that this company that ends up being controlled by the Russians are allowed by Hillary Clinton to buy 25 percent or so of our uranium production.

Let’s recap briefly what the Clinton family has done for us. Well, we know that in the nineties when it comes to foreign affairs, North Korea was a threat to the world, to freedom, because they had a crazy leader, Kim Jong-il, and the world was concerned that North Korea might get nuclear weapons.

So what happened through the Clinton administration?

Well, they sent Wendy Sherman and some other folks and they negotiated with the North Koreans and said: If you sign and say you are agreeing not to develop nuclear weapons, we will make sure you have everything you need to make nuclear weapons, but you will have to sign saying that when we give you everything, make sure you have everything to make nuclear weapons, you just won’t make them into nuclear weapons.

I mentioned before, it reminds me of that routine Jeff Foxworthy talks about when he was not in the very well financially and a guy comes to take his car because he hasn’t been able to make his payments, and he said: Look, man, please don’t take my car. If you take my car, I can’t do any more gigs and I can’t make my car payments, and then I have no chance of paying you.

The guy said: Buddy, I am sorry, but my instructions were to either take the car or cash or a check.

Foxworthy said: Clinton, You mean I can just sign something and you will take that and leave me alone? Oh, I can give you a check. I didn’t know that was going to be good enough.
I thought about Kim Jong-il thinking: You mean you will give me everything I need to create a bunch of nuclear weapons and you will accept my signature and that is good enough for Wendy Sherman and all those other people, Under Secretary of State under Bill Clinton?

It is amazing that she has had the nerve to come out critical of any other Secretary of State after the disaster she presided over.

Yes, he was glad to sign whatever the Clinton administration wanted him to sign. He said: Sure, if Ms. Sherman wants me to sign something, I will sign whatever you want. And in no time, what does he have?

Nuclear weapons.

President Obama comes into office and the whole world is concerned about Iran getting nuclear weapons.

What do they do?

They said: Let’s send Wendy Sherman and some of these smart people like John Kerry, who doesn’t now how to pronounce Genghis Khan. Let’s send them over there to negotiate with Iran so that maybe we can keep Iran from developing nuclear weapons the same way some of these same people kept North Korea from developing nuclear weapons.

So what happens?

They go over and they give the largest supporter of terrorism in the world massive amounts of cash. By massive, I mean pallets of cash and checks; however you may want it. There is no telling. They may have sent some gold or platinum. Who knows? Plutonium.

It will be interesting in the years ahead to just see how terrible the agreement was and how we are finding out—it seems like almost every night in the news we find out some other disaster that the Obama administration provided the crazy supporters of terrorism in Iran. I don’t mean the rank-and-file people.

We get the impression possibly a majority of Iranians like Americans. They wish they did not have radical Islamists in control, but they are. The Obama administration provided them murder thugs who have killed, been responsible for the death of so many in the past, and no doubt will be again in the future, and they are on their way to having nuclear weapons, just like the Clinton administration oversaw with North Korea.

In the meantime, though at the end of the Bush administration, the President Bush administration actually was making our borders more secure. It never came out during those days, but the Republicans in the Texas delegation in Congress were having meetings once every couple of weeks with people in the Bush administration—Karl Rove, Chertoff—a lot of good things that they were doing, and they were getting every couple weeks. We wanted to know what advancements, what progress had been made in the preceding two weeks in securing our border. They were taking steps to do that.

President Obama takes over, and what happens? It is like the floodgates were opened. As the Border Patrol have said to the drug cartels who were responsible for opening up every inch of the border, if you cross over in one drug cartel’s sector, you must make sure you have their permission. Normally that means you must pay or agree to work for them when you get to the U.S. city where you are going.

That is why they called the Department of Homeland Security their logistics, that all the drug cartels had to do is get these people across the border. They would pay thousands to the drug cartels to get them across. They were used as a distraction. They sent them across. The Border Patrol would have to in-process them in accordance with our laws. Of course, they were doing that, they would tell you privately, yes, we know there are drugs coming across at other points in the river down there south of McAllen and southwest of McAllen, but they knew.

We are basically told they are bound to be bringing drugs over while they keep us tied up. What a business model.

Then the Department of Homeland Security would help many of those people to the places that they would have addresses for, and, as I witnessed myself, there were times when our Border Patrol would say: well, you certainly didn’t come up with all the thousands. And ultimately admit that they are going to let me work some of that off when I get to the city where I am going.

In other words, they would be their drug mules, they would be their drug smugglers. God, forgive us, we would get into sex trafficking. The Obama administration allowed this massive network to take off.

At the same time, we heard from FBI Director from working with ISIS cells in every state, we had the drug cells locating all over the country in the last 8 years, we had ISIS creating cells that would be activated at some point and begin to kill Americans, and so it shouldn’t have been that big of a surprise to those who were really paying attention that Americans were ready for a change. Not on the fringes, but Americans across the heartland were ready for a change, and they voted for Donald Trump.

This week, I don’t know if we are going to vote tomorrow on the American Health Care Act. I indicated now, with the changes that have been made, I think probably 30 percent or so of the Freedom Caucus are going to agree. Because, I mean, we have gotten the best we can get. If we don’t do something, people in my district who are just overwhelmed with the prices of their health insurance premiums, the cost of health care, the high deductibles, meaning they are paying for insurance they are probably never going to get anything out of—they have got to have help.

That is one of the reasons, one of the biggest reasons I was a holdout because even though I think CBO was talking about premiums continuing to increase up to 2026, and then 10 years from now start down a little bit, people in east Texas could not afford for premiums to go up. You know, I think it was probably more accurate they would be going up for 3 years.

But with what we have done, and the agreement we got—I am telling you, President Trump is a great man to negotiate with. He doesn’t want to get a deal done. He was extremely cooperative. He actually can be quite enjoyable to negotiate with. He is an amazing man. But we were having trouble with leaders in the House and the Senate. President Trump would agree to things, and we would have trouble getting it past our own leadership.

Some of us felt all along, if you let the conservative group sit down with the Tuesday Group, we could probably get some things worked out, and really, bottom line is, that is what happened. Tom MacArthur is a very dear friend. I know he wants what is best for the people in his district. He is doing all he can to serve them. I know that is what the Tuesday Group wants to do. They want to serve their constituents. We all do.

So now where we are—and hopefully we will have votes and we can get this done. But we have gone from a bill that has been great support of American people, and now we have gotten an agreement to include provisions that eliminate the taxes immediately that would have been kept in place for the future. Under our agreement, the language is there, those taxes are out immediately. There has also been added a work requirement for people who are Medicaid recipients. If they are able to work, then they should work. If they don’t have a job, they still will need to do some work under requirements, much like the welfare requirements that were passed in the 1990s by the Republican House and Senate. For the first time in 30 years, a single-mom income, when adjusted for inflation, started going up after the work requirement was added.

We have also agreed to language that will make sure that people who have preexisting conditions can’t be shunned by the insurance companies. If you are 26 and you are living with your parents, you can still be on their insurance. I don’t know why we have even an age limit at all. Those things will still be there, despite all the fear mongering that some on the other side of the aisle have done back in Texas that I know of support of the American people.

Let’s make no mistake, this is not a full repeal. There is still a lot of work to be done. But the MacArthur amendment will allow the repeal of some of the mandates—not the preexisting condition or the 26 being on parents’ insurance but some of the other mandates that have spiked the insurance costs so high. While this revised version still
they thought that didn't violate their ers. They were nondenominational; so and James Madison and so many oth-
participated in by Thomas Jefferson that we possibly can, as the church
have effective national days of prayer
which we will bring down the costs of health in-
does not fully repeal ObamaCare, it will bring down the costs of health insur-
May 01, 2017 Jkt 079060 PO 00000 Frm 00038 Fmt 7634 Sfmt 0634 E:
and pray, as I hope most Americans do, that, we will have to have help. At least 75 percent were saying: We have got to have help. So we look forward to working with the Senate and trying to make it even better as it goes through the Senate. I think I have got just a minute. I just wanted to note, the observance an-
I deeply regret, though, that we thought we were going to be able to fulfill the vision of Anne Graham Lotz, the new chairman of the National Day of Prayer. She took over for Shirley Dobson, who did a magnificent job for the last 25 years as the national chair. She had to do it in the rotunda, and all that would require, like for the Holocaust observance, would be a unanimous consent agreement in the House and Senate, and then it would have been in the rotunda. It would have needed to have been after 5. Even through Thursday or have another day, it was clear, and she had agreed, the National Day of Prayer folks had agreed, but any Senator can put a hold on such a thing, and one Senator did. Senator SCHUMER put a hold on the National Day of Prayer being in the rotunda. I hope and pray some day Senator SCHUMER will realize that the best way to avoid a Holocaust in the future is to have effective national days of prayer from the rotunda and everywhere else that we possibly can, as the church services have been held in the Capitol, participated in by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and so many others. They were nondenominational; so they thought that didn't violate their Constitution. But it looks like this will be the area that Senator SCHUMER cannot stop from being used. It is totally under the control of the House. I want to thank Speaker RYAN for allowing the use. We will be in statuary hall where nondenominational Christian churches were held on Sunday. It was the largest Christian church in Washington for much of the 1800s. So that is where in 1900, and this Sunday we won't have a Senator who will put a hold on it next year, and Billy Gra-
music rights.
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1178. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendment to Class C Airspace: Little Rock, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0610; Amdt. No.: 7-CAA-6] received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1179. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendment to Class E Airspace: Monongahela, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9102; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AEA-6] received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1180. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendment to Class D and Class E Airspace: Savannah, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9101; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-14] received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1181. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendment of Class C E Airspace: Louisville, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0681; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-4] received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1182. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace: Savannah, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0694; Amdt. No.: 13-39, 406-11] (RIN: 2120-KK03) received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1183. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Rulemaking for certain retirement plan contributions picked up by governmental employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.


1185. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2017-26) received April 21, 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.

1186. A letter from the Chief, Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31126; Amdt. No.: 3729] received April 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1187. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a letter certifying that the conditions of Section 135(i)(6) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, including as amended by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-17), have been met as of April 18, 2017 (H. Doc. No. 115-32); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 289. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 99) making appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-97). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. KIND, and Mr. CREST): H.R. 2183. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced excise tax rate for portable, electronically-aerated bait containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCaul (for himself, Mr. MERKEL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. THORNBERY, Mr. LANGHVIN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. RICHMOND): H.R. 2184. A bill to support meeting our Nation’s growing cybersecurity workforce needs by expanding the cybersecurity education pipeline; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PITTENGER (for himself and Mr. ZELDIN): H.R. 2185. A bill to require the President to transmit to Congress determinations and certifications of whether foreign financial institutions listed in Attachment 3 or Attachments 4 through 6 of the Comprehensive Plan of Action have facilitated transactions or provided services for foreign terrorist organizations, sanctioned foreign persons, or Iran’s Revolutionary Guard Corps or any of its officials, agents, or affiliates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GORMERT, and Mr. GARRETT): H.R. 2186. A bill to require any amounts forfeited to the United States Government as a result of the criminal prosecution of Joaquin Archivaldo Guzman Loera (commonly known as “El Chapo”), or of other felony convictions involving the transportation of controlled substances into the United States, to be used for security measures along the Southern border, including the completion of a border wall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRACOS (for himself, Mr. FLIESCHMANN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee): H.R. 2187. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of certain retirement plan contributions picked up by governmental employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. HUNTS, Mr. SCSA, Mr. MCSCULLIN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KATKO, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CONWAY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. DONOVAN): H.R. 2188. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the major metropolitan area counterterrorism training and exercise grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mr. FARENHEILD, Mr. SWALLO of California, and Mr. ISSA): H.R. 2189. A bill to amend section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to requirements for domestic in-kind services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD: H.R. 2190. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to revise certain regulations relating to aircraft boarding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DEANTS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HIUENGA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALLACE, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. STEFANIK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUNT, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RHODAN, Mr. BRIDESTONE, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. KNOTH, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. TIBIERI, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FORSTENBERY, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. CHERNY, Mr. BURGDORF, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BIRD, Mr. BASIN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCHWERIN, Mr. BACHAU, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HOLINGSWORTH, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GATZ, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. LATT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. FASSO, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. GOODY): H.R. 2191. A bill to require the Administrator of the Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a new community development program to be administered by the Internal Revenue Service to eliminate the non-application of certain State waiver provisions to Members of Congress and congressional staff; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. WO马克, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CONyers, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 2193. A bill to grant States authority to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws on remote transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2194. A bill to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate e-cigarettes and personal electronic vaporizers, to reduce and mitigate the respiratory health risks resulting from cigarette smoking through the responsible regulation of e-cigarettes and personal electronic vaporizers as a tobacco harm reduction strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BLUM (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. COFFMAN, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2195. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for access of the Special Counsel to certain information; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2196. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow whistleblowers to disclose to certain recipients to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CURBelo of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GrijALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KASTENHEIM, Mr. LAUFOVICH of New York, Mr. LOWENSTEN, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. NOR-TON, Mr. PASRELL, Mr. PITERS, Mr. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARABANES, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2197. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency materials pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROY of Texas (for herself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2198. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that calls to medical Sub-Command Centers operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs be quickly redirected to the Veterans Crisis Line; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. KINDEL):

H.R. 2199. A bill to improve Federal land management, resource conservation, and use of Federal real property, by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to develop a multipurpose cadastral system of Federal real property and identifying inactive and underutilized Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. JACKSON Lee, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2200. A bill to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 2201. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain micro-offerings from the registration requirements of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2202. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize appointment of Doctors of Chiropractic to regular and reserve corps of the Public Health Service Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself, Ms. MURDOCK of Florida, Mr. BORDALLO, Mr. GIULIANI, Mr. DUETCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BLUMENTAVER, and Ms. GABRIELL):

H.R. 2203. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to establish prize competitions for innovation of health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HULTGREN (for himself and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 2204. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study regarding the privacy of information collected under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2205. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTR (for herself, Mr. GUI-JALVA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTH, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. McNERNY):

H.R. 2206. A bill to authorize the President to reestablish the Civilian Conservation Corps as a means of providing gainful employment to unemployed and underemployed American youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TIEDE LIEU of California, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WALZ, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. TSONGARIS, Mr. LANGFIREN, Mr. SCHREIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 2207. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 2208. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide funding for the Workforce Investment Network, for summer and year-round employment opportunities for youth ages 14 through 24; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 2209. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the work opportunity credit for certain youth employees, and to extend empowerment zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MERHERR and Mr. DEVERA):

H.R. 2210. A bill to designate the community living center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Butler Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the "Sergeant Joseph George Kusick VA Community Living Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. LOBONDO):

H.R. 2211. A bill to provide for the award of medals or other commendations to handlers of military working dogs and military working dogs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself and Mr. CICILIEN):

H.R. 2212. A bill to promote competition in the market for drugs and biological products by facilitating the entry of low-cost generic and biosimilar versions of those drugs and biological products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committees concerned.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. MCCUAL, Mr. HURD, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CUÉLLAR, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. NORTON):

H.R. 2213. A bill to amend the Anti-Border Security, Trade, and Infrastructure Protection Act of 2015 to authorize certain regulatory waiver authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 2214. A bill to prohibit the payment of salary to Members of Congress in the event of a Government shutdown, to direct the Congressional Budget Office to submit daily reports during the period in which a Government shutdown is in effect on the effects of the shutdown on the economy and the costs of the shutdown to taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committees concerned.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTAVER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONVYS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HICK, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KIERNAN, Mr. KHURN, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. TIEDE LIEU of California, Ms. MCGOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NORTON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SCHRA-DE, Mr. SHEMAM, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 2215. A bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. POE of Texas (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTAVER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONVYS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HICK, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KIERNAN, Mr. KHURN, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. TIEDE LIEU of California, Ms. MCGOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NORTON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SCHRADE, Mr. SHEMAM, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 2216. A bill to provide that certain project works on the St. Croix River, Maine,
are not required to be licensed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS:
H.R. 2220. A joint resolution to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase for 2 years the residential energy credit and the investment tax credit with respect to solar property with a nameplate capacity of less than 20 kilowatts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee:
H.R. 2218. A bill to expand the Big Laurel Branch Wilderness and Sampson Mountain Wilderness in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. ROYCE of California (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. LOVE):
H.R. 2219. A bill to increase the role of the financial industry in combating human trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SINEMA:
H.R. 2220. A bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and other active service benefits performed when a Government shutdown occurs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMUCKER:
H.R. 2221. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuance of resolutions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mrs. BEATTY):
H.R. 2222. An amendment to section 426 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to provide incentives to grantees under the Continuum of Care program to re-house all former members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. CARP-POLO of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MOUTHON, Mr. FUCAN, and Mr. WALEY):
H.J. Res. 100. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against al Qaeda, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and the Afghan Taliban; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:
H. Res. 227. A resolution directing certain officials of the executive branch to provide information to the House of Representatives that will enable the House to meet its constitutional responsibility to conduct oversight of the executive branch by investigating potential conflicts of interests of President Donald J. Trump; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:
H. Res. 228. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should pass no law that would exempt from its obligations or provide any other special consideration to elected or appointed Federal employees or any other Federal employee; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAROT (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. RADENWAGEN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BLUM, Mr. ESPLIO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BACON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. COMER, Ms. ADAMS, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COÑÓN of Puerto Rico, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):
H. Res. 229. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of April 30 through May 6, 2017, as “National Small Business Week” to celebrate the contributions of small businesses and entrepreneurs in every community in the Nation; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, and Mrs. BEATTY):
H. Res. 230. A resolution expressing support for celebrating the fourth week in April as Every Kid Healthy Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEERS, Mr. QUILLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BEYER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MAXINE waters of California, Ms. MOORE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. PUDSEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCMICHERY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN of California, Mr. LAWRENCE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):
H. Res. 231. A resolution promoting and supporting the goals and ideals of the Fair Housing Act and recognizing April 2017 as Fair Housing Month, which includes bringing attention to the discrimination faced by everyday Americans in the United States in housing and housing-related transactions on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, familial status, disability, and religion; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MICHELLE Lujan GRISHAM of New Mexico:
H. Res. 229. A resolution designating April 30, 2017, as "Elders of Los Nuevos Celebrating Young Americans"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:
H.R. 2198. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McCaul:
H.R. 2194. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PITTENGER:
H.R. 2198. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:
H.R. 2198. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. Congress has the power and authority to enact this legislation according to Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACK:
H.R. 2197. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. McCaul:
H.R. 2198. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. Section 8 of Article I. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

 Amendment XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. McCaul:
H.R. 2198. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. 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 and Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. CARDENAS:
H.R. 2198. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—“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 and Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:
H.R. 2198. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:
H.R. 2198. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. Section 8 of Article I. The Congress shall have power to lay and call taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. NOEM:
H.R. 2193.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HUNTER:
H.R. 2194.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUM:
H.R. 2195.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 2197.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 2198.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. CRAMER:
H.R. 2199.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
H.R. 2200.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18.

By Mr. EMMER:
H.R. 2201.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:
H.R. 2202.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. HANABUSA:
H.R. 2203.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 2204.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:
H.R. 2205.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Ms. KAPTUR:
H.R. 2206.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 with specific power to provide for the general welfare of the United States, to regulate commerce among the several states, and with the Indian tribes of the Constitution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:
H.R. 2207.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:
H.R. 2208.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:
H.R. 2209.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. LANCE:
H.R. 2211.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: “Congress has the power to . . . make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.”

By Mr. MARINO:
H.R. 2212.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 1, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive.

By Mr. MARINO:
H.R. 2213.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by the clause “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.” and

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause “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. McSALLY:
H.R. 2214.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:
H.R. 2215.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. O’HALLERAN:
H.R. 2216.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. PERL:
H.R. 2217.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes:” as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:
H.R. 2218.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.

By Mr. ROYCE of California:
H.R. 2219.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article 1, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Ms. SINEMA:
H.R. 2220.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. SMUCKER:
H.R. 2221.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7.

By Mr. STIVER:
H.R. 2222.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Sec 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SCHIFF:
H.J. Res. 100.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Consolidated Authorization for Use of Military Force Resolution of 2017 is constitutionally authorized under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 11.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS
Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. ARRINGTON
H.R. 90: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. Perlmutter and Ms. DelBene.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. Mast.
H. Res. 31: Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 129: Mr. Heck, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. King of New York, Mrs. Hartzler, Mr. Olson, and Mr. Lipinski.
H. Res. 161: Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Ms. Sheaporter, Mr. Raskin, Ms. Lofgren, Mr. McGovern, Mrs. Beatty, and Ms. Eshoo.
H. Res. 172: Mr. Kinzinger, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Perlmutter, Ms. Meng, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Meeks, Ms. Titus, Ms. Jackson Lee, Ms. Connolly, Ms. Bass, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Mr. Castro of Texas, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Suozzi, Mrs. Torres, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, and Mr. Nadler.
H. Res. 220: Mr. Lipinski.
H. Res. 222: Mrs. Norm.
H. Res. 223: Mr. Espaillat.
H. Res. 252: Mr. Fortenberry and Mr. McGovern.
H. Res. 269: Mr. Fleischmann and Mr. Moulton.
H. Res. 272: Mr. LaMalfa.
H. Res. 281: Mr. Larsen of Washington and Mr. Taylor.

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. 2015: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. Budd.