The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. Lead us this day in Your ways, that our Nation might be guided along the roads of peace, justice, and goodwill.

Grant strength and wisdom to our Speaker, leaders, and Members of both the people’s House and the Senate, to our President, his Cabinet, and to our Supreme Court.

Bless as well the moral and military leaders of our country, and may those who are the captains of business, industry, and unions learn to work together toward the mutual benefit of all, walking in the ways of righteousness and working for the highest good of our beloved land.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within the people’s House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOE MURRAY RIVERS

(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 celebrate the life of one of Savannah, Georgia’s finest, Mr. Joe Murray Rivers, who passed away on April 5, 2017, at the age of 78. Born February 3, 1939, in Savannah, Georgia, Mr. Rivers became a proud public servant in the area he was born and raised.

Mr. Rivers graduated from Beach High School before attending the U.S. Air Force Institute and the University of Maryland, The City College of New York, and Savannah State University. Mr. Rivers later opened the Olympic Sport Shop in downtown Savannah, and it was during this time that he realized the drastic need for improved public transportation. Inspired to solve this issue, Mr. Rivers was elected to the Chatham County board of directors in 1985. Throughout his 20-year tenure, he became a warrior of public transport and cosponsored legislation to solve the transportation problem in the county. In appreciation for the work Mr. Rivers has done, Savannah’s Intermodal Transit Center now bears his name.

Mr. Rivers’ public service extended far beyond elected office and transportation reform. His leadership and compassion towards every member of the community will be sorely missed.

HONORING CLAIRE LOVELL

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Claire Lovell, an accomplished columnist and devoted resident of Seaside, Oregon.

North coast residents are richer for Claire’s presence, and I join them in celebrating her life and her legacy. For 27 years, Claire’s column chronicled the happenings of Seaside with cogent prose and an observant eye.

First known as “Overheard: Notes from Seaside,” and later “Scene and Heard,” her column was the first thing readers went to when they eagerly opened their newspapers. Indeed, some readers bought the newspaper just for her column.

Claire was a Seaside resident for almost all of her 96 years, and no one was better qualified to document the city’s life. Whether she was sharing her observations on politics, popular culture, growing older, or the birth of her first great-grandchild, Claire enriched each topic with her signature verve and keen love of the written word.

In a recent column, Claire wrote: Whether one is 5-years old or 95, as the case may be, life’s small pleasures are very important.
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President Trump spent his first 100 days putting families like Christine's in jeopardy. This must change in the next 100 days for Christine and so many others.

CONGRATULATIONS TO USA TEAM AND HARRISON TURONE ON WINNING GOLD AT CULINARY COMPETITION

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to congratulate the USA Team on winning gold at the Bocuse d'Or culinary competition in Lyon, France.

I would also like to recognize one team member, Harrison Turone, a Nebraska high school graduate. Harrison grew up in Omaha. During his high school career, he enrolled in the Omaha Public Schools Career Center culinary program where he received college credits to the Institute for the Culinary Arts at Metropolitan Community College in Omaha.

In addition to his academic pursuit of the culinary arts, Harrison worked at many restaurants in our area and in California. He then moved to New York to train with Chef Mathew Peters for the USA Team selection for the Bocuse d'Or while working at Per Se restaurant.

After winning the team's selection and the honor to represent the United States, Peters and Turone moved to Napa Valley to train for a year for the Bocuse d'Or competition. The Bocuse d'Or is a prestigious culinary competition that is held in Lyon, France, every 2 years. It is named after the well-known French chef Paul Bocuse. He is recognized as the father of the modern French cuisine and has been awarded “Chef of the Century” by the The Culinary Institute of America.

While fighting Nazi Germany during World War II, he was shot in the chest and treated at a U.S. Army hospital. He was given a transfusion of blood that saved his life.

The United States competed against 23 other countries in the Bocuse d'Or and won. This was the 30th anniversary of the competition, and it marked the first time the United States took home the gold.

I send my congratulations to the entire team and a special congratulations to Harrison Turone. You represented your team and our State admirably.

WHERE IS THE PLAN, PRESIDENT TRUMP?

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as we approach President Trump's 100th day in office, I rise to address the vision, the agenda, and the plans the White House has laid out. Except, Mr. Speaker, there are no plans to speak up.

President Trump promised an agenda that was supposed to make America great again, but no one in America or the international administration seems to know what that includes. As the dust settles on the cruise missile strike in Syria and the dropping of bombs in Afghanistan, where is the plan for ISIS, Iraq, Syria, or Afghanistan that Candidate Trump promised?
The President said his $1 trillion infrastructure plan to create millions of jobs is coming fast, but, again, where is the plan? Instead, President Trump's one-page proposal is a massive $2 trillion giveaway to corporations and the wealthy and doesn't include a penny for infrastructure. That is a missed opportunity.

I could keep going. Where is the plan on fixing America's water infrastructure? Where is the plan on making our cities and towns safer? Where is the plan for affordable childcare that the President promised?

Mr. Speaker, there is a hard truth the President needs to realize: the difficult work of governing on behalf of the American people is more than tweets and photo ops. The President needs to realize: the difficult work of governing on behalf of the American people is more than tweets and photo ops. The President's first 100 days have been all talk and no action.

QUALITY ACCESS AND INCLUSION FOR THOSE WITH DOWN SYNDROME

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of my constituent Evan Rothholz, an energetic, tech-savvy kindergarten student who happens to have Down syndrome.

Down syndrome is a condition that results from having an additional full or partial copy of chromosome 21. Since his diagnosis, 6-year-old Evan, along with his parents, Mitchel and Julie, advocate for others with Down syndrome and help educate families facing this unexpected diagnosis.

I am appreciative of the work of the Pennsylvania Down Syndrome Advocacy Coalition, a group of concerned parents, self-advocates, supporters, committed to achieving quality access and inclusion for all individuals with Down syndrome in the State of Pennsylvania.

As a member of the Congressional Task Force on Down Syndrome, I am very proud to support H.R. 1896, the ABLE to Work Act, which provides more flexibility for thousands of individuals with disabilities, allowing them to save and plan for the future.

It is Evan's hope that individuals with Down syndrome, and all of those in the special needs community, will have the same educational and financial opportunities that are afforded to others.
HEALTH PLAN NEEDS TO COVER PREEXISTING CONDITIONS
(Ms. ROSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, the GOP is trying to pull a fast one over working families. This week, House Republicans and President Trump gave into extreme demands of the Freedom Caucus by colluding on a dangerous amendment that would gut protections for individuals with preexisting conditions, allowing insurers to once again discriminate against sick Americans.

We all know that the ACA isn’t perfect, but we cannot, in good conscience, throw out essential health benefits that have helped working families to get the protections that they need.

The MacArthur amendment would take us back to the days before these key protections helped save lives. Without protections for preexisting conditions, my constituents with serious illnesses and health conditions would face discrimination from insurance companies solely based on their illness.

How can Speaker RYAN seriously tell Americans that this plan is somehow better for people with preexisting conditions? We need a health plan that will help working families pay for their health coverage, not one that puts health insurance out of reach.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act from consideration this week. We pull their abysmal repeal and replace bill with regard to the Affordable Care Act from consideration this week. It was once again another opportunity for Members of Congress in the performance of their duties to have confidence about their working relationship, but in the product that they would wish to move forward.

The Rules Committee was quite blunt to them that, while we were pleased to see them, we wanted to see their work done from now on. I think the American people feel the same way. I think they are willing to take the time to do it right, but it is now time to feel a little bit of pressure towards completing the work that needs to be done.

Mr. Speaker, today we are going to have one of the most distinguished members of the Rules Committee who will speak with us. He shares a role not only as vice chairman of our committee, but he also has an opportunity to sit on the Appropriations Committee; a person responsible as a cardinal for a massive part of not only the Federal Government spending, but the authority and responsibility for the Federal Government to deliver in so many areas in support of the American people.

I will be introducing the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) in just a few minutes, who will also provide details and information on support of the great work that is being done, but why we are doing that for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee are going to continue their work. We are asking this body today to consider this rule to move forth legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin with some good news for my colleagues here in this body. One of the most distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee, the ranking member, Mr. SESSIONS, was given permission to address the House in full for its immediate consideration.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas), the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of debate only. I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern), my friend, the ranking member of the committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule. It is a fair rule that enables this body to continue working in a bipartisan fashion to get our work done for the American people. Essentially, it is to fund the government for one more week as final preparations are made and as the Appropriations Committee finalizes its work.

It enables us to continue to serve our constituents. It enables the American people to have confidence not only in what we are doing, but to provide the necessary resources so that this Nation can continue to protect itself also.

I also rise in support of the underlying legislation that is in this rule. This short-term CR, while being far from ideal, is exactly what we need to do so that we can allow our colleagues in the House, as well as the Appropriations Committee and this body, to move forth a bill that will find its way to the United States Senate and to the President’s desk.

For months now, our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, under the great work of our brand-new chairman, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN from New Jersey, have been working towards funding a government agreement while they are trying to reach a long-term bridge.

Yesterday at the Rules Committee, the young chairman, along with the ranking member, Mrs. LOWEY from New York, came and spoke to the Rules Committee not only with great confidence about the work that they are doing, but with great confidence about how they worked well together. It was once again another opportunity for Members of Congress in the performance of their duties to have confidence in their working relationship, but in the product that they would wish to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, today we are going to have one of the most distinguished members of the Rules Committee who will speak with us. He shares a role not only as vice chairman of our committee, but he also has an opportunity to sit on the Appropriations Committee; a person responsible as a cardinal for a massive part of not only the Federal Government spending, but the authority and responsibility for the Federal Government to deliver in so many areas in support of the American people.

I will be introducing the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) in just a few minutes, who will also provide details and information in support of the great work that is being done, but why we are doing that for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee are going to continue their work. We are asking this body today to consider this rule to move forth legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)
basically denied Americans essential health protections that they currently are guaranteed in their health insurance; things like emergency room care, maternity care, mental health care. I can go on and on.

Then with their latest addition to their abysmal bill, they would have even allowed insurance companies to once again discriminate against Americans with preexisting conditions; something that they said that they wanted to protect, yet their adjustments to their abysmal healthcare bill would have allowed Americans with preexisting conditions to be discriminated against.

I mean, when we talk about essential health benefits, I want to stress the word “essential.” They are important, yet they are going down a road that I think is disastrous for millions of American people.

Let us begin by being thankful that we are not going to do great harm to our country this week. Now, there is always next week—we have to worry about that—but at least this week they had the common sense to pull this terrible healthcare bill that they have been working on for so long. Let’s hope that whatever ever see the bill, I think it is important for people to understand what is at stake. There is an awful lot at stake for tens of millions of Americans here today all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, that brings us to today. Let us be clear about why we are here again with yet another continuing resolution, the 29th—you heard that right, the 29th—continuing resolution since Republicans have taken control of the House.

Republicans have nobody to blame for this mess but themselves. They control the White House, they control the Senate, and, unfortunately, they control this House. They were even the ones who set this artificial deadline of April 28 in the first place. That was after Republicans gave themselves a 2-month extension and then a 5-month extension.

Mr. Speaker, this should have all been sorted out last fall, but for 7 months Republicans have played games and delayed and bickered amongst themselves about government funding and health care and other priorities.

What do they have to show for it?

Nothing.

Now, maybe the delay was caused by this obsession from the Republican Conference with repealing the Affordable Care Act and ripping health care away from 24 million Americans. Maybe Republicans have been too busy trying to undo Planned Parenthood, trying to undo important consumer protections put in place by Democrats, trying to tear down commonsense rules to protect public safety and the environment.

Perhaps if Republicans had been responsibly working with Democratic leaders during the past 7 months, we could have already funded our government and we could be getting to work on other things that our constituents sent us here to do, like creating jobs and repairing our crumbling infrastructure.

We could have avoided events that have transpired during the past 48 hours: an emergency Rules Committee meeting, another Republican martia l law rule, and threats of a Saturday session.

Mr. Speaker, to put it bluntly, this is about Republican dysfunction and incompetence, plain and simple. If Congress could be sued by the American people for malpractice, we would be in big trouble. This is indefensible.

I am sure people who are watching these proceedings are scratching their heads saying: What the hell is going on in the people’s House?

For the life of me, I cannot understand why we are constantly at the edge of a cliff. Why does leadership jumps from one manufactured crisis to the next, and has proven ineffective at carrying out even its most basic responsibilities, like keeping the government’s lights on and funding programs that benefit all of our constituents.

But don’t take it from me. Listen to what some of my Republican colleagues are saying about the priorities of their own leadership. Representative Rooney, a Republican from Florida, said: ‘I have been in this job 8 years, and I am wracking my brain to think of one thing our party has done that has been something positive, that has been something other than stopping something else from happening.’

Representative Mário Díaz Balart from Florida commented: ‘It is pretty evident that we don’t have the votes among Republicans to, in essence, claim that that is real.’

Mr. Speaker, when you have members of your own party making these kinds of statements, you really have to question the capacity of the Speaker and his leadership team to govern effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that we are here today to consider another short-term CR. One week—that is all this bill does, keeps the government running for one additional week. Our constituents expect and deserve better from their elected officials.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman, my friend from Massachusetts, for his words of wisdom about the direction we ought to be going. That is what we are going to do; we are going to continue moving.

I find in my job, as I perform my duties, that I have to really interact with a lot of people in government. Over Christmas, I had a chance to visit our troops around the world and look at them and give them the confidence that what we do in Washington will allow them to keep working for freedom and to represent us.

Dr. Francis Collins at the National Institutes of Health, an enormously brilliant man who helped with the genome project, who keeps NIH up and working; and at the National Eye Institute, Dr. Paul Sieving; and so many others who do count on us getting it right, whether it be the United States military, whether it is our border patrol, whether it is human services, but the person who knows these characteristics of what it takes to get agreements is also on the Rules Committee. He is a valuable member of our Rules Committee. He is the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), vice chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, my good friend, for yielding me the time and for those incredibly gracious and generous remarks.

Now, to support the rule and the underlying legislation. By the very nature of Rules debates, everything seems to be partisan because it seems to be sort of shirts and skins as it is on the rules. The reality is the legislation we are talking about has actually been requested by both parties. We had both the chairman and the ranking member in there requesting because they are working together in a bipartisan way to produce a major piece of legislation that will dramatically spending on states government in the range of about $1 trillion between now and September 30.

The important thing to note is that it is a very bipartisan negotiation between two very skillful legislators, Chairman Frelinghuysen and Ranking Member Nita Lowey. When they bring that legislation to the floor, as they will next week, it is going to have some pretty important and pretty major things on it.

We are not only going to adequately fund our military, we are going to increase that. We are going to give the President some things he has asked for in terms of supplemental money for defense to upgrade and improve our military.
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something our friends support, but actually it was Republicans who took the initiative to achieve.

We will see some really important increases in some education programs that give some of our less advantaged citizens the chance to go to TD, GEAR UP. Both prepare individuals for higher education and then have a chance to exploit the opportunity when it comes.

So that bill will have a lot of good things in it that will be bipartisan. My good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) mentioned—and I think appropriately so—that there is a certain amount of dysfunction in the appropriations process. Where we probably disagree is—I have got to tell you, it is not new. Since we passed the Budget Control Act over 40 years ago in 1974, budgets and appropriations have been completed on time exactly four times. It didn’t matter who was in charge. So maybe we ought to go back and look at that. It is not just that we lose something by the imputation by our friends back when they controlled both Chambers in overwhelming numbers and rethink how we do this.

I do agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) that it is important to focus on first things first. And while tax reform is a very important goal that, I think, this Congress could achieve and while health care is a very important goal, which I certainly do not want to take away from this Congress, as it achieves and I think we are working toward, there is no question the most important thing we do around here is fund the government every day. We must make sure that our military has what it needs to protect us and that our border control officials have what they need to make sure they are secure, that we do things like look for cures for Alzheimer’s and cancer at the NIH. To me, that always is the most important thing it has to do.

So, in this bill and in the bill that will follow next week, we are actually doing what we should do. We are putting first things first. Let’s make sure these basics are done for the American people, and then let’s get about the important business of changing their Tax Code and making sure that they have the best health care in the world.

In my view, Congress could have—and to my friend’s point—could have and should have done this months ago. It is what we should have done. But we shouldn’t ask them to write the budget for the very year in which they show up. They simply don’t have their people in place. They are not ready to do what we ought to do. So let me put it this way. I would hope, in the future, we remember that and do first things first.

Still, it is never too late to do the right thing, as my mom used to say. And what I think we ought to do is pass this rule, pass this bill, give our friends, the appropriators, the time that they need to negotiate a final bill. I am confident we will do that; I am confident we will do it on a bipartisan basis. Mr. Speaker, and I am confident we will be here with a bill the American people can be proud of because that will have been negotiated in good faith, it will be bipartisan, and it will give us the stability that we need from now until September 30.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, also I want to recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for another birthday today. The gentleman from Oklahoma was very silent last night at the Rules Committee. He didn’t let us know he was 29, so let it be the 29th net appointed. So I would hope, in the future, we remember that and do first things first.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have a number of the day for my colleagues. I feel like I am on Sesame Street. This is the 29th closed rule this year. This is the 29th CR of this Republican majority. And the government is about to shut down when the calendar flips after midnight. So, 29 must be the number of the day.

I want to wish the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) a happy birthday. Maybe he is 29, so it all kind of fits together.

I would just say to my colleagues, as an indication of how dysfunctional this place is: How do you get 29 closed rules in 4 months? How do we run a place in such a closed manner?

This is supposed to be a deliberative body. We are supposed to be debating issues. People are supposed to have a give-and-take on matters of importance. We have had 29 closed rules in the first 4 months of this year. It is unprecedented.

As I have been saying time and time again, when you have a lousy process, you usually end up with lousy legislation. I think that is the case with regard to the repeal and replace of the Affordable Care Act.

Here we are at the last minute trying to keep the government open for a week so we could have more time to keep it open for the rest of the year. I mean, this is not the way this place should be run.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a former member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. The majority is not serving the interest of the families we represent back home. They are not focused on lifting the economic prospects of our small businesses and hardworking families. They are not focused on education.

Instead, we are debating what could be the smallest, least extension of government funding ever: 1 week. Are you kidding me? We have just come back this week from a 2-week recess. You think that the Republican Party would have had the wherewithal to be able to fund the government as required through the end of the fiscal year, which is only September 30. This was leftover business from last year.

And the majority is not serving the interest of the families we represent. Has the majority party brought a bill to the floor of the House that we can debate on jobs, on lifting Americans that work hard every day? No.

The majority party, after the very serious military strike on Syria, could have brought a debate about an authorization of the use of military force where the Congress has been derelict for years in having the debate about a country that has been at war for 16 years. That is very important. People expect us to address the difficult issues, but they haven’t brought that debate.

Across the country this week, a lot of students in high school are deciding where they are going to attend college or university. We could be having a debate on how we help those families and students afford the cost of a college education or address the student loan crisis. But, no, that debate hasn’t been brought.

There is going to be a big march in Washington again this weekend on the changing climate. We could discuss and debate the cost of the changing climate, extreme weather events. Boy, many folks back home in the State of Florida are having to look at increased insurance costs, property insurance costs, infrastructure costs because of
the changing climate, but that debate hasn’t been had.

Instead the Congress has been consumed with a healthcare bill that rips coverage away from families, harms Medicare, raises cost on everyone, and they were stuck in a debate this week about ending the guarantee protection that families now have if they have a preexisting condition. Remember, under the Affordable Care Act, you can no longer be discriminated against if you have a preexisting condition like cancer or diabetes. They were consumed with: Well, how do we end that and send that back to the States to do that? Thank goodness that bill hasn’t been brought to the floor.

Instead, here is an extension of running the government. Again, how small. Maybe it does match what is happening in the White House. With the flip-flopping, unfocused President, this Republican majority is having real trouble governing the country.

I understand the President is consumed with an investigation of associates from his campaign over collusion with the Russians. He is consumed with conflicts of interest and how he doesn’t want to be transparent, whether it is his taxes or the emoluments under the Constitution.

The American people deserve better, and that is what brought me to the floor today. I didn’t have to come and talk about the rule that is on the floor. I’m just simply saying, at the time of the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, last night at the Rules Committee, we had a debate where we focused our attention not only on the legislation, but also on the need to get this done. I appreciate the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR). the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and their attention to the ideas that they have. They do have ideas, and they do have decisions that would help make this process even better. We are here today for the right reason.

I would advise the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) that I do not have any further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time pending his close.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that there is a lot of frustration on our side because of what is obviously a dysfunctional House. The fact that we are here again at the last minute trying to just keep the government running really is unfortunate. It is sad because it is not like we didn’t know about this date. We have known about it for a long time.

My Republicans friends set this date. They have had months and months to figure out a way to keep the government running. They, again, are in control of the Senate. They are in control of the White House. Once again, we have a manufactured crisis where we are right at the edge of a cliff, and the best we could do today is kick the can down the road for a week and we will have this little debate again next week.

Perhaps the leadership of this House actually should be focusing the people’s business instead of legislation that is about messaging or press releases, perhaps if they focused on the people’s business rather than trying to undermine basic healthcare protections for people, we wouldn’t have these crises all the time.

I said at the beginning of my remarks that we can breathe a sigh of relief today because my friends on the Republican side are not bringing up their abysmal repeal and replace of the Affordable Care Act bill.

They have been changing it and changing it, and there was some rumor, President Trump was saying that they would probably bring a bill up to pass it in his first 100 days because somehow it is more important to do something in 100 days than it is to get it right. But, nonetheless, they added another provison which they claim makes it more palatable to their Members. But I want my colleagues to understand that what they have done is made a bad bill worse.

The American College of Physicians sent us a letter to all Members, Democrats and Republicans, and I will just read one sentence from it. “This amendment” that my Republican friends added to their healthcare bill “would make the harmful AHCAs even worse by creating new coverage barriers for patients with preexisting conditions and weakening requirements that insurers cover essential benefits.”
increase the number of persons with healthcare coverage, or advance another benefit to the public interest in the state, including the guarantee of coverage for persons with pre-existing conditions. Secretaries shall approve applications within 90 days of determining that an application is complete.' (Emphasis added in italics.)

In other words, as long as a state attested that there was a “benefit to the public,” insurers would be once again allowed to charge more for people with pre-existing conditions, or decline to cover needed benefits like physician and hospital visits, maternity care, contraception, mental health and substance-use disorder treatments, preventive services, and prescription drugs.

This would take us back to the days when people had to fill out intrusive insurance company questionnaires so they would not lose health coverage, even as their health history, even before being advised what the premium would be based on their individual health conditions. Uniquely, the rating, which bases premiums based on the expected costs associated with all persons in the insurance pool (adjusted only by age, tobacco use, and family size), the Limited Waiver Option would allow insurers in states that obtain a waiver to again charge people exorbitant and unaffordable premiums for existing conditions.

Before the ACA, insurance plans sold in the individual insurance market in all but five states typically maintained lists of so-called ‘‘declinable’’ medical conditions including asthma, diabetes, arthritis, obesity, stroke, or pregnancy, or having been diagnosed with cancer in the past 10 years. Even if a risk pool would not explicitly repeal the current law’s ‘‘guaranteed-issue’’ requirement—which requires insurers to offer coverage to persons with pre-existing conditions like these—the ‘‘issue without community rating allows insurers to charge as much as they believe a patient’s treatment will cost.’’ The result would be that many patients with pre-existing conditions would be offered coverage that costs them thousands of dollars more for the care that they need, and in the case of patients with expensive conditions like cancer, even hundreds of thousands more.

An amendment to the AHCA reported out of the Rules Committee on April 6th to establish the Invisible Risk Sharing Program,’’ which would create a fund that states could use to reimburse insurers for some of the costs associated with insuring sicker patients, would not offset the actual harm done to patients with pre-existing conditions by allowing the Limited Waiver of community rating and essential benefit protections. The pre-ACA experience with high-risk pools was that many had long waiting lists, and offered inadequate coverage with high deductibles and insufficient benefits. Unless a national high-risk pool is supported with a massive infusion of funding it will not be sufficient to cover the millions of people with pre-existing conditions that would need or charged more for coverage under the AHCA. One paper estimates that a national high-risk pool would cost $178.1 billion a year.

Financially, the AHCA would cost $178.1 billion a year. According to a recent independent analysis found that the AHCA’s repeal of current law required benefits would result in average out-of-pocket spending increasing $1,952 more for cancer drugs; $1,807 for drugs to treat heart disease; $1,127 for drugs to treat lung diseases; $1,807 for drugs to treat mental health conditions; $1,127 for mental health admission for mental health; $4,555 for inpatient admission for substance use treatment; and $8,501 for maternity care. Such increased costs would make it practically impossible for many patients to avail themselves of the care they need. The result will be delays in getting treatment until their illnesses present at a more advanced, less treatable, and more expensive stage, or not keeping up with life-saving medications prescribed by their physicians.

Allowing states to eliminate the EHBs will threaten our nation’s fight against the opioid epidemic. A study concluded that with the current opioid epidemic, the inability to pay for health care was a factor in 1.253 million people with serious mental disorders and about 2.8 million Americans with a substance use disorder, of whom about 222,000 have an opioid use disorder—all of their insurance coverage.” Finally, allowing states to drop important benefits like maternity, substance use disorder treatment, and preventive services will do little to reduce premiums. A report by Milliman found that the main drivers of premium costs were ambulatory patient services, hospitalization, and prescription drugs. These are crucial services that form the core of any health insurance plan.

To be clear: while some younger and healthier persons might be offered lower premiums in states that obtained a “Limited Waiver” of community rating and essential health benefits, it would be at the expense of making coverage unaffordable for those who need it most, older and sicker persons, and result in skimpy “bare-bones” insurance for many others that does not cover the medical treatments they would need if and when they get sick.

Finally, even without the Limited Waiver Amendment, ACP continues to believe that the AHCA repeals the provisions allowed under our previous support of the AHCA, we cannot support the bill. However, we urge Congress to continue to work with stakeholders on a solution that provides meaningful coverage.

The amendment proposed this week would dramatically worsen the bill. The changes included in the amendment would place greater risk by allowing states to waive the essential health benefit standards, which could leave patients without access to critical health services and treatments. Patients, including those with pre-existing conditions, such as cancer patients and those with chronic conditions. For these reasons, and out of deep concern over the concerns about the AHCA, we cannot support the bill. However, we urge Congress to continue to work with stakeholders on a solution that provides meaningful coverage.

The latest version of the AHCA continues to put health coverage in jeopardy for many Americans. Our top concern is what this change could mean for older and sicker patients, including those with pre-existing conditions such as cancer patients and those with chronic conditions. For these reasons, and given our strong concerns about the AHCA, we cannot support the bill. However, we urge Congress to continue to work with stakeholders on a solution that provides meaningful coverage.

The amendment proposed this week would dramatically worsen the bill. The changes included in the amendment would place greater risk by allowing states to waive the essential health benefit standards, which could leave patients without access to critical health services and treatments. Patients, including those with pre-existing conditions, such as cancer patients and those with chronic conditions. For these reasons, and given our strong concerns about the AHCA, we cannot support the bill. However, we urge Congress to continue to work with stakeholders on a solution that provides meaningful coverage.

The College strongly believes in the first, no harm principle. Therefore, we continue to urge that Congress move away from the fundamentally flawed and harmful policies that resulted from Health Care Act and from the changes under consideration—including the proposed “Limited Waiver” amendment—that would make the bill even worse for patients. We urge Congress to instead start over and seek agreement on bipartisan ways to improve and exist on the ACA. The College welcomes the opportunity to share our ideas for bipartisan solutions that would help make health care better, more accessible, and more affordable for all Americans in a way that avoids great harm on them as the AHCA would do.

Sincerely,

JACK ENDE, MD, MACP, President

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we have a press release from the American Hospital Association. Their line here is: “Our top concern is what this change could mean for older and sicker patients, including those with pre-existing conditions such as cancer patients and those with chronic conditions” could suffer. “This amendment proposed this week would dramatically worsen the bill.”

[From the American Hospital Association—April 27, 2017]

STATEMENT ON THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

(By Rick Pollack, President and CEO, American Hospital Association)

The latest version of the AHCA continues to put health coverage in jeopardy for many Americans. Our top concern is what this change could mean for older and sicker patients, including those with pre-existing conditions such as cancer patients and those with chronic conditions. For these reasons, and given our strong concerns about the AHCA, we cannot support the bill. However, we urge Congress to continue to work with stakeholders on a solution that provides meaningful coverage.

The amendment proposed this week would dramatically worsen the bill. The changes included in the amendment would place greater risk by allowing states to waive the essential health benefit standards, which could leave patients without access to critical health services and treatments. Patients, including those with pre-existing conditions, such as cancer patients and those with chronic conditions. For these reasons, and given our strong concerns about the AHCA, we cannot support the bill. However, we urge Congress to continue to work with stakeholders on a solution that provides meaningful coverage.

The amendment proposed this week would dramatically worsen the bill. The changes included in the amendment would place greater risk by allowing states to waive the essential health benefit standards, which could leave patients without access to critical health services and treatments. Patients, including those with pre-existing conditions, such as cancer patients and those with chronic conditions. For these reasons, and given our strong concerns about the AHCA, we cannot support the bill. However, we urge Congress to continue to work with stakeholders on a solution that provides meaningful coverage.

The College strongly believes in the first, do no harm principle. Therefore, we continue to urge that Congress move away from the fundamentally flawed and harmful policies that resulted from Health Care Act and from the changes under consideration—including the proposed “Limited Waiver” amendment—that would make the bill even worse for patients. We urge Congress to instead start over and seek agreement on bipartisan ways to improve and exist on the ACA. The College welcomes the opportunity to share our ideas for bipartisan solutions that would help make health care better, more accessible, and more affordable for all Americans in a way that avoids great harm on them as the AHCA would do.

Sincerely,

JACK ENDE, MD, MACP, President
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, the AARP issued yet another statement saying: “This harmful legislation still puts an age tax on older Americans and puts vulnerable populations at risk through a series of backdoor deals that attempts to shift responsibility to States.’’

I include in the RECORD the statement from the AARP.

AARP MAINTAINS OPPOSITION TO AMENDED HEALTH BILL
AGE TAX, WEAKENING MEDICARE, BACKDOOR CUTS TO PREEXISTING CONDITION PROTECTIONS WOULD HARM FAMILIES
WASHINGTON, DC—AARP Executive Vice President Nancy LeaMond released the following statement today in response to the amended House bill that would create an “Age Tax;” increase premiums, eliminate protections for pre-existing conditions, cut the life of Medicare, and give sweetheart deals to big drug and insurance companies.

In a letter sent to all 435 members of the U.S. House of Representatives, AARP re-stated its strong opposition to the bill and urged its Members to vote NO on the proposed legislation. AARP believes this legislation will have a significant harmful impact on the health of millions of older Americans as well as the most vulnerable groups, including poor seniors and disabled children and adults:

“This harmful legislation still puts an Age Tax on older Americans and puts vulnerable populations at risk through a series of backdoor deals that attempts to shift responsibility to States. Older Americans need affordable health care and protections.

This legislation still goes in the opposite direction, increasing insurance premiums for older Americans and not doing anything to lower drug costs.”

“AARP continues to oppose legislation that would impose an Age Tax, eliminate protections for pre-existing conditions, weaken Medicare, erode seniors’ ability to live independently because of billions of dollars in Medicaid cuts, and give sweetheart deals to drug and insurance companies while doing nothing to lower the cost of health care or prescription drugs.

“We intend to let all 38 million of our members know exactly how their Representative voted. We’ll communicate the results of the vote in our widely-circulated publications, in email alerts, in our online channels, and through the media. Again, we urge all Representatives to vote against the American Health Care Act in its current form.”

MEDIcare
Our members and older Americans believe that Medicare must be protected and strengthened for current and future generations. We strongly oppose any changes to current law that could result in cuts to benefits, increased costs, or reduced coverage for older Americans. According to the 2016 Medicare Trustees report, the Medicare Part A Trust Fund is solvent until 2028 (11 years longer than pre-Affordable Care Act), due in large part to changes made in the ACA. We have serious concerns that the American Health Care Act repeals provisions in current law that have strengthened Medicare’s fiscal outlook, specifically, the repeal of the additional 0.9 percent payroll tax on higher-income workers. Repealing this provision would result in a $28.8 billion improvement in Medicare’s fiscal outlook.

It would also result in the reduction of the Hospital Insurance trust fund over the next ten years, would hasten the insolvency of Medicare by up to four years, and diminish Medicare’s ability to pay for services in the future.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS
Older Americans use prescription drugs more than any other segment of the U.S. population, typically on a chronic basis. We are pleased that the bill maintains the Medicare Part D coverage gap (“donut hole”) protections created under the ACA. Since the enactment of the ACA, more than 11 million Medicare beneficiaries who have fallen into the coverage gap have saved over $26.8 billion on the improved coverage for prescription drug costs due to the “donut hole.”

We do have strong concerns that the fee on manufacturers and importers of branded prescription drugs, which currently is projected to add more than $24 billion to the Medicare Part B trust fund between 2017 and 2026,” will be repealed by the American Health Care Act. Rather than repeal this fee for Medicare, AARP believes that we need to reduce the burden of high prescription drug costs on consumers and taxpayers, and we would be willing to work with you on bipartisan solutions.

INDIVIDUAL PRIVATE INSURANCE MARKET
About 6.1 million Americans age 50-64 currently purchase insurance in the non-group market, and nearly 3.2 million are currently eligible to receive subsidies for health insurance coverage through either the federal health benefits exchange or a state-based exchange (referred to as the Exchange). This significant reduction in the number of uninsured since passage of the ACA, with the number of 50-64 year old Americans who are uninsured age 50-64 who purchase coverage next year, while a total of 24 million Americans would lose coverage over the next 10 years. This is especially troubling given that in the aggregate, Joint Committee on Taxation’s (JCT) assessment “the non-group (individual) market would probably be stable in most areas...under current law.”

Affordability of both premiums and cost-sharing is critical to older Americans and their ability to obtain and access health care. A typical 50-64 year old seeking coverage through an exchange for an individual annual income of under $25,000 and already pays significant out-of-pocket costs for health care. We have serious concerns—reinforced by the CBO—that the American Health Care Act under consideration will dramatically increase health care costs for 50-64 year olds who purchase health care through an exchange, due both to the change from 3:1 (already a compromise that requires uninsured older Americans to pay three times more than younger individuals) to 5:1 and reducing current tax credits for older Americans. CBO concluded that the bill will substantially raise premiums for older people and force many into lower quality plans.

Age rating plus reduced tax credits equal an unaffordable age tax. Our previous estimates on the age rating change showed that premiums for current coverage could increase by up to $3,200 for a 64 year old, while reducing premiums by only about $700 for a younger enrollee. Significant premium increases for older consumers will make insurance less affordable, will not address their expressed concern about rising premiums, and will only encourage older workers to remain in the enrollment numbers for younger persons.

In addition to increasing premiums from the age rating change, the bill reduced the tax credits available to millions of Americans to help purchase insurance. We estimate that the bill’s changes to current law’s tax credits alone could increase premium costs for a 55-year-old earning $25,000 by more than $2,300 a year. For a 64-year-old earning $25,000, that increased premium rises to more than $4,400 a year, and more than $5,800 for a 64-year-old earning $15,000.

Overall, both the bill’s tax credit changes and 5:1 age rating would result in sky-rocketing costs insurance premiums and significant out-of-pocket costs for older Americans. In their analysis, CBO found that a 64 year old earning $26,500 a year would see their premiums increase by $12,900—758 percent—from $1,700 to $14,500 a year. In addition, older workers could also face higher out-of-pocket costs because the bill eliminates cost-sharing subsidies which help reduce the impact of their copays and deductibles. It cannot be overstated how much this bill would erode recent gains in health care coverage and affordability for 50—64 year olds, leading to the number of uninsured and financial hardship for millions of older Americans.

Current law prohibits insurance companies from denying coverage to an American due to a preexisting condition. We are extremely concerned that the bill may now repeal pre-
existing condition protections and would once again allow insurance companies to charge Americans more due to a pre-existing condition. We estimate that 40 percent of 50- to 64-year-olds (or around 35 million people in this age group) have a deniable pre-existing condition and risk losing access to affordable coverage. We strongly oppose any weakening of the essential health benefits and pre-existing condition protections which benefit millions of Americans.

**MEDICAID AND LONG-TERM SERVICES AND SUPPORTS**

AARP opposes the provisions of the American Health Care Act that would allow states to cap financing structure in the Medicaid program. We are concerned that these provisions could endanger the health, safety, and care of individuals who rely on Medicaid for the essential services provided through Medicaid. CBO found that the bill would cut Medicaid funding by $880 billion over 2017-2026. By 2026, CBO expects Medicaid spending to be about 25 percent less than what it projects under current law. Medicaid is a vital safety net and intergenerational lifeline for millions of individuals, including over 17.4 million low-income seniors and children and adults with disabilities who rely on the program for critical health care and long-term care services (HCBS) for assistance with daily activities such as eating, bathing, dressing, managing medications, and transportation). Older adults and people with disabilities in the home and community-based services (HCBS) for assistance with daily activities such as eating, bathing, dressing, managing medications, and transportation). Older adults and people with disabilities in the home and community-based services (HCBS) for assistance with daily activities such as eating, bathing, dressing, managing medications, and transportation).

Of these 17.4 million individuals: 6.9 million are ages 65 and older (which equals more than 1 in every 7 elderly Medicare beneficiaries); 4.5 million are living with disabilities; and about 10.8 million are so poor or have a disability that they qualify for both Medicare and Medicaid (dual eligibles). Dual eligibles account for almost 33 percent of Medicaid spending. While they comprise a relatively small percentage of enrollees, they account for a disproportionate share of total Medicare and Medicaid spending.

Individuals with disabilities of all ages and older adults rely on Medicaid services, including home and community-based services (HCBS) for assistance with daily activities such as eating, bathing, dressing, and helping with personal care; and other benefits such as hearing aids and eyeglasses. People with disabilities of all ages also rely on Medicaid for access to comprehensive acute health care services. For working adults, Medicaid can help them continue to work; for children, it allows them to stay with their families and receive the help they need at home or in their community. Individuals may have low incomes, face high medical costs, or have already spent through their resources paying out-of-pocket for LTSS, and need these critical services. For older adults and people with disabilities living in their homes and communities, HCBS are critical. The current LTSS system is in crisis and not only will HCBS be cost-effective but also will improve quality, and provides affordable coverage to all Americans.

Sincerely,

NANCY A. LEAMOND, Executive Vice President and Chief Advocacy and Engagement Officer.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association sent letters to Speaker Ryan and Minority Leader Pelosi saying that “We are deeply concerned that the AHCA would result in millions of Americans losing their health coverage. Nothing in the ‘so-called’ ‘MacArthur amendment remedies the shortcoming of the underlying bill.’” And then they say that, basically, this bill would allow states to cap financing structure in the states that are already providing HCBS to low-income seniors, especially those living with the most severe disabilities and rare medical conditions. The bill would likely result in millions of Americans losing their current health insurance coverage. Nothing in the MacArthur amendment remedies the shortcoming of the underlying bill. The amendment does not offer a clear long-term framework for stabilizing and strengthening the individual health insurance market to compete with other forms of care. The MacArthur Amendment would also allow states to apply for waivers from critical consumer protections included in current law, including guaranteed issue, prohibitions on preexisting conditions, and guaranteed renewability. The current ban on health status underwriting protects individuals from being discriminated against by virtue of their medical conditions. The bill also eliminates critical consumer protections included in current law, including guaranteed issue, prohibitions on preexisting conditions, and guaranteed renewability. The current ban on health status underwriting protects individuals from being discriminated against by virtue of their medical conditions.
Look up the word “essential.” It says, absolutely necessary, extremely important. That is the definition of essential. And so when we talk about essential health benefits, that is what we are talking about.

I have one additional speaker. I was going to close, but I would ask indulgence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts was speaking, I rushed to the floor because he was making such eloquent and important statements, and I wanted to make sure to join him on recognizing that, though we are pushing the can down the road, we know what the mindset of the administration is in terms of funding this country. As a member of the Budget Committee, we revved the sky high, and to air dismay, it was a budget that harmed and hurt and undermined the governing of this Nation.

I think it is important to match the Affordable Care Act with the outside needs of living and thriving in this Nation. So my Houston Housing Authority has now stopped vouchers for families in Section 8 housing for fear of not having the money. They had breaking news 2 days ago telling those families don’t show up because we have no resources. What an outrage to cut, in the skinny budget, $6 billion cut. Do you realize that one minute.

Mr. Speaker, today we are here because Chairman FREELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member LOWEY came to the Rules Committee and asked us to please consider the offer that they were laying on the table, and that is to fund the government for 1 more week, with an assurance that they would work 1 more week to complete their work.

You heard the gentleman, the Honorable TOM COLE, distinguished gentleman from not only Oklahoma, but a gentleman from the Appropriations Committee, reinforce how important the work is.

So we may push this to another 7 days, but that is what we are pushing the hearts and minds of Americans. We are creating a disaster.

And I can’t appreciate the fact that law enforcement will be losing funding. The Department of Justice and the Civil Rights Division in spite of who is leading that Department, it is a Department for the vulnerable.

So I thank the gentleman for providing me with this time, but I wanted to make sure that we added this long litany of those who will be negatively impacted and that America is not about that. America is about serving all of the people of the United States. Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for his indulgence.

I would just close by saying I think it is sad that we are here at the last minute trying to kick the can down the road to keep the government running for 1 additional week. This could have been avoided and, again, it could have been avoided if, instead of trying to take away people’s health insurance, instead of trying to take away people’s essential health benefits, instead of trying to cut Medicaid by $900 billion and taking that money and giving a tax break of close to $1 trillion to the richest people in the country, that we actually focused on our job, which is keeping this government running.

But my colleagues on the Republican side are in charge. We are where we are. We have to keep the government running.

Having said all of that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida and the gentlewoman from Texas for their comments about trying to focus us on the activities that perhaps they would want or not want.

Mr. Speaker, today we are here because Chairman FREELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member LOWEY came to the Rules Committee and asked us to please consider the offer that they were laying on the table, and that is to fund the government for 1 more week, with an assurance that they would work 1 more week to complete their work.

You heard the gentleman, the Honorable TOM COLE, distinguished gentleman from not only Oklahoma, but a gentleman from the Appropriations Committee, reinforce how important the work is.

We have heard from our colleagues on the Democratic side how important the NIH is, Francis Collins, the work that he does there; the United States Military; Secretary of Defense Mattis; the men and women that protect us; those people that are in Homeland Security. That is what we are going to focus on, so that and just that is the way it is.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 178, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 289, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Speaker reads the title of the joint resolution. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore announces that the fourth printout of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99) is now before the House and that it is a motion to reconsider that resolution. 

The Speaker fills the chair.

The Speaker calls for further action upon the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99).

The Speaker: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present H.J. Res. 99, a joint resolution that makes further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes.

This is the third continuing resolution during fiscal year 2017. We should be voting today on a bipartisan omnibus appropriations act, not another continuing resolution. It is our duty and responsibility to complete our important work of funding the government for the rest of fiscal year 2017.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore announces that there is no objection to the adoption of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99). The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99) was agreed to.

I ask unanimous consent that all Members mark and include extraneous material which to revise and extend their remarks. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have the right to revise and extend their remarks.

The Speaker: The Speaker fills the chair.

The Speaker: The Speaker announces that the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99) is now before the House and that it is a motion to reconsider that joint resolution. The Speaker calls for further action upon the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99).

The Speaker: The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 99.

The Speaker: The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 99.

The Speaker: The Speaker announces that the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99) is now before the House and that it is a motion to reconsider that joint resolution. The Speaker calls for further action upon the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99).

The Speaker: The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 99.
As if this process weren’t difficult enough, it occurs as the majority is seeking to strip health insurance from 20 million Americans and repeal protections against insurance company discrimination for millions more. Meanwhile, President that Trump continues to trot out false and damaging comments about the omnibus negotiations.

It is my hope that these games will end so that we can come together to support investments that create jobs, improve infrastructure, provide a quality education for every student, and invest in technology and biomedical research that will benefit hardworking Americans.

To achieve this, we must make progress on eliminating poison pill riders and advancing shared priorities in an omnibus appropriations act. Next week, we must not consider a fourth continuing resolution, but instead have a positive, bipartisan bill after this unnecessarily lengthy process.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to be here in the House. I am not pleased that we are considering a continuing resolution. To that extent, I presume that I share the opinion of the chairman of the committee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I presume, as she has just articulated, that I share the opinion of the ranking member from New York.

Mr. Speaker, we are now 7 months into fiscal year 2017. We have 5 months remaining, and the majority party has been unable to fund government for the balance of the fiscal year. They have over 218 votes in this body, and they have over 50 votes in the Senate. Now, you need 60 votes in the Senate, so it is more complicated. I understand that. But they now have a Republican President.

As we did for the 2016 budget, which we passed in December of 2015 to the balance for September 30, 2016—I know all those dates run together—it was my desire and my advice, Mr. Speaker, that we do the same thing last December: pass an omnibus, take all the bills that the Committee on Appropriations has spent literally hundreds of hours hearing and making decisions on, make the compromises necessary in a democratic body so that 218 votes would be available.

Now, the American public, if they have been watching closely, will see that not a single major appropriation bill has passed this House without Democratic help, so that everybody in this body knows that whatever is done in a major fiscal bill has to be done in a bipartisan way. The good news for this House is Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN understands that well, based upon his experience and his observations, and, in my view, is willing to work together. I know that that also applies to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

I had the opportunity to be on the Committee on Appropriations for 23 years. I am still a member of that committee on leave because I am a whip at this point in time. I am going to vote for this continuing resolution, but I want to put my colleagues and the education for every student, and invest in technology and biomedical research that will benefit hardworking Americans.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I urge every one of my colleagues—there are not a lot of people on the floor, Mr. Speaker, but I hope they are watching—first to understand that the basic responsibility that we have of ensuring the functioning of the government of the people of the United States is one that we ought to perform in a responsible, effective, and timely fashion.

Mr. Chairman, I will work with you, and I will work with Mrs. LOWEY over the next few days to ensure that next week we have a product that can pass this House because it has bipartisan support and is in the best interests of our country.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Speaker’s intention is that we have a bill filed Monday night so, in the Speaker’s words, we can give 72 hours to review that bill and then pass it on Thursday.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield H.J. Res. 99, “Making Further Continuation Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2017.”

This resolution is an imperfect vehicle for appropriations for FY 2017, because it does not fully fund the government for the entire fiscal year and it keeps in place sequestration.

H.J. Res. 99 goes against what the Speaker’s words, we can give 72 hours to review that bill and then pass it on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, the Continuing Resolution before us extends current Fiscal Year 2017 government funding by seven days, through May 5, 2017, at its current rate, which means a continuation of the across-the-board cut of .19% for all accounts, defense and non-defense, contained in the expiring continuing resolution that was approved December 8, 2016.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that we have again been placed in the position of having to fund the government through the device of a continuing resolution rather than through the normal appropriations process of considering and voting on the twelve separate spending bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 99 is far from perfect, but it is a modest and positive step since it ensures that funding for appropriated entitlements will continue at a rate maintaining program levels under current law and, for a week at least, prevents congressional Republicans from shutting down the government again and manufacturing a crisis that only harms our economy, destroys jobs, and weakens our middle class.

The government shutdown of 2013, which was manufactured by the Republican majority last year and cost taxpayers $24 billion. The enormous harm and disruption of the lives of federal employees and the people they serve, however, was irreparable.
As I stated, Mr. Speaker, this Continuing Resolution is not perfect and it only funds the government until May 30, 2017. As veteran and seasoned Members of Congress, we have been in this challenging position before. But working together—in a spirit of goodwill, bipartisanship, and realism, I believe we can reach a long-term agreement that will avert a shutdown of government operations and the disruption a shutdown causes to the lives of millions of Americans who depend upon federal programs to do their jobs, educate their kids, care for their parents, and contribute to their communities.

Our constituents look to the Congress and the President to make responsible choices and decisions to keep the nation safe, the economy prosperous, and to make necessary and prudent investments in education, healthcare and research, transportation and infrastructure, economic development, science, the arts and humanities, and the environment.

This is, after all, just another way of saying that the American people expect their leaders in Washington to be guided by the Constitution’s preamble and to pursue policies and the resources that will "establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare'':

"To establish justice" and "To promote the general welfare'':

1. Full funding for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the Health Resources and Services Administration and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in order to protect our kids and our communities from the dangers of Ebola, Zika, and HIV/AIDS.

2. Protects the adequacy, solvency, and integrity of the Medicare and Medicaid programs, which provide health sustaining support for 70 million Americans.

3. Fully funds the National Institutes of Health research programs so that patient access to lifesaving treatments is not delayed.

4. Does not convert funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention into block grants which would hinder the nation’s ability to respond swiftly and effectively to public health crises like Ebola, Zika, and HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if all members of the House and Senate work together, we can reach agreement on an appropriate budget framework that invests in the American people, preserves our national security, and keeps faith with the values that have served our nation well and made the United States the leading nation on earth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 239, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution 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 382, nays 30, not voting 18, as follows:

[Vote roll No. 236]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison</td>
<td>Ellison</td>
<td>Ellison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rmmer</td>
<td>Rmmer</td>
<td>Rmmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rngs</td>
<td>Rngs</td>
<td>Rngs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rngh</td>
<td>Rngh</td>
<td>Rngh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruhoo</td>
<td>Ruhoo</td>
<td>Ruhoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repallat</td>
<td>Repallat</td>
<td>Repallat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (CT)</td>
<td>Ret (CT)</td>
<td>Ret (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (NY)</td>
<td>Ret (NY)</td>
<td>Ret (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (CA)</td>
<td>Ret (CA)</td>
<td>Ret (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (IN)</td>
<td>Ret (IN)</td>
<td>Ret (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (TX)</td>
<td>Ret (TX)</td>
<td>Ret (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (FL)</td>
<td>Ret (FL)</td>
<td>Ret (FL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (PA)</td>
<td>Ret (PA)</td>
<td>Ret (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (NC)</td>
<td>Ret (NC)</td>
<td>Ret (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (IA)</td>
<td>Ret (IA)</td>
<td>Ret (IA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (SD)</td>
<td>Ret (SD)</td>
<td>Ret (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret (NE)</td>
<td>Ret (NE)</td>
<td>Ret (NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vote was 382-30, not voting 18.

[End of roll call]

As amended, the joint resolution was agreed to, and ordered to be engrossed for the information of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk was instructed to accept the agreement of the Senate and return the bill to the House, with the amendment agreed to by the Senate.
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PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 235 and “yea” on rollcall No. 236.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 235 and 236. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on vote 236. I would have voted “nay” on vote 235.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on April 28, 2017, due to a family medical issue. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “Yea” for rollcall vote 235. “Yea” for rollcall vote 236.

THE JOURNAL
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

Pursuant to the rule 1, the Journal stands approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM
(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.) Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY), the majority leader, for his focus on that issue because we agree, of course, that Democrats and Republicans both overwhelmingly voted for that, and it passed.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 1180, the Working Families Flexibility Act, sponsored by Representative MARTHA ROBY. This bill would give employees the option to convert the overtime hours worked into paid time off. Mr. Speaker, hard-working Americans who work more than one job or in the private sector deserve the same flexibility that public sector workers have enjoyed for decades. By passing this bill, we will give American families greater choice in how they spend their most important resource, their time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider legislation providing further appropriations for the 2017 fiscal year. I am encouraged by the reports I have received from our Appropriations Committee regarding these negotiations, and I look forward to a strong vote on this agreement next week.

Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are possible. If any items are added, I will relay scheduling information to Members as soon as possible.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for the information on the schedule for next week. I would ask him with respect to Korea, that being on the floor—also, as I understand, the committee has been working on a Syria sanctions bill. Obviously both of those areas are critically important.

Does the gentleman have any information when we might anticipate the Syria resolution coming forward as well?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. This is a critical area and one that we do want to make sure we speak with one voice and a bipartisan voice.

I have spoken to the committee chairman. He is continuing to work on this. And I anticipate, not next week but in the future, that coming to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his focus on that issue because we agree, of course, that is a serious and volatile matter with which we need to deal in a hopefully effective way.

Two items, one that the gentleman mentioned. We just passed a continuing resolution, as the gentleman noted. And pursuant to our discussions, Democrats and Republicans both overwhelmingly voted for that, and it passed.

I don’t know whether the gentleman heard my remarks on the floor, but what I had indicated is—and I have indicated to him privately—that we Democrats are in a position of not supporting an additional continuing resolution.

In my discussions with Mrs. Lowery, our ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, she believes that there is a possibility to get an agreement between the two parties, but it appears that the committees themselves have reached a point where they think they will need additional assistance from leadership, I presume, on
both sides of the aisle to resolve some of the thorniest issues that are still outstanding. I want to thank the majority leader and the Speaker. In our discussions yesterday on the floor in private—they weren’t, I don’t think, private discussions because there were other people around. Both the Speaker and yourself are desirous of getting this done before the end of the weekend, posting something either as early perhaps as Sunday or as Monday night on an omnibus, which would fund government between next week and the end of the fiscal year September 30.

So the first question would be: We share that objective in common, I presume; is that accurate?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

This week, I want to thank the gentleman even for his comments earlier in the week. I know they might not have been the same comments as the rest on the other side of the aisle. It was our anticipation that we would have not have to do a continuing resolution. I do believe that the committee is very close. It is the intention of the committee to get to an agreement. I hoped to get to an agreement as early as today, knowing that we do want to provide to the Members 3 days so they can read through the entire bill and that we can vote on this before the end of this short-term CR.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that, and I would urge the Speaker and the majority leader to engage with others because I think that would be useful in facilitating the reaching of an agreement. I know that Leader Pelosi and I will also be available to the extent that we could facilitate that.

I know there are some thorny, tough issues still outstanding, but I know the majority leader agrees with me that the committee of government on a sporadic basis on a continuing resolution is very bad for morale of the Federal service, very bad for anybody who wants to plan on how to execute their obligations and responsibilities, and frankly very disconcerting not only to the American people but to people around the world who contemplate the shutdown of the Government of the United States of America on which so much of the world relies for some degree of stability. It is simply not a thing that we ought to be doing. So I would urge the leader and myself to be as engaged as we need to be to get us to that objective next week.

Secondly, Mr. Majority Leader, I know there is discussion about a healthcare bill. The Affordable Care Act, as you know, we think is working. We think, working together, we can make it better. I know the majority leader and his party disagree with that and want to see it repealed and that there is legislation to do that.

The majority leader did not mention it in his comments, but does he anticipate the American Health Care Act, with or without amendments, being considered next week? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Mccarthy. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know we have had many discussions in regards to this, and we have a very strong difference of opinion.

I would believe those individuals that have lost their doctors and that have lost their health care entirely, that they do not have someone providing it. If you look within Tennessee and one-third of the entire country, they only have one provider. There are challenges. We cannot continue to sit back and just watch ObamaCare fail. We have to do something about it.

We had committees work through a bill. We have made great progress over the Easter break. Members have been talking to one another. Members have been shown a new amendment to add to the bill. They have been looking at it this week, and I anticipate as soon as Members have looked through that that we will bring that bill to the floor.

I don’t have anything scheduled for next week. But as soon as a bill is scheduled, we will notify you. I anticipate the Members reading through it this weekend, and, as soon as possible, we will bring that bill to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that comment. The gentleman is certainly correct, we have very substantial disagreements. We believe the Affordable Care Act is working.

I was pleased to see the administration, at least in the short-term, indicate that they will not take actions to undermine it or sabotage it without passing a replacement, without having the ability to give to the American people an option. I think the administration did the right thing. I hope they will continue to do the right thing in making payments consistent with the law.

We will have a very significant debate on that bill. Therefore, I would urge the majority leader if, in fact, the majority leader is going to bring that bill to the floor at some point in time, that significant notice be given so that not only Members of Congress, but that the American people can have the opportunity to assess the ramifications—in our perspective, the very serious adverse ramifications—that the passage of the American Health Care Act would have on the health care and the cost to every American of health insurance.

The President, as you know, has indicated that he wants to make sure—and he said he would support a program where every American has insurance, and he would support something like the Affordable Care Act.

The President, as you know, has indicated that he wants to make sure—and he said he would support a program where every American has insurance, and he would support something like the Affordable Care Act.

I have told the people that, if he sends such a bill down, I would be inclined to support such a bill. He has not, of course, sent such a bill down.

So, Mr. Leader, the bottom line is I am simply saying that this will be a very controversial issue and deserving of very significant debate, discussion. Hopefully, we will get significant notice as to when the majority leader expects to bring it to the floor so that we could be prepared for that debate.

I yield to the gentleman.

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

And yes, we have had a lot, ample debate already, through committee and part of the floor, but it is our anticipation that we will give you plenty of notification.

We have already posted the amendment to make sure everybody has the ability to read it, and it has already been there 3 days. It is just 8 pages long, and we have provided the 3 days already. But we will give you, as soon as it is scheduled for the floor, notice of it coming.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 2017, TO MONDAY, MAY 1, 2017

Mr. Mccarthy. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, May 1, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING MANNIE JACKSON

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mannie Jackson, a legendary basketball player at both the University of Illinois and Edwardsville High School, on his induction into the Smith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

Born in a railroad boxcar in southern Missouri, Mannie excelled at Edwardsville High School before attending the University of Illinois. He was one of the first African-American letter winners and starters for the Illini. After graduating, Mannie played for the Harlem Globetrotters.

While Mannie was a tremendous player, he also purchased the Globetrotters and helped revive the franchise, leading the team to 12 straight years of double-digit growth.

Mannie also continued his career as a philanthropist. He founded the Illinois...
Academic Enrichment and Leadership Program at the University of Illinois and has partnered with leaders at Lewis and Clark Community College to create the Mannie Jackson Center for the Humanities.

I have the privilege of meeting Mannie on multiple occasions and have nothing but admiration and respect for what he does to help others. It is an honor to congratulate him on his induction to the Naismith Basketball Hall of Fame.

I am even more proud to recognize all of the contributions he has made to this world.

21ST CENTURY CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today is Arbor Day, and I rise to reintroduce my bill, the 21st Century Civilian Conservation Corps Act.

In drafting this bill, I was inspired by the CCC Act first established by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1933 as part of his New Deal. This historic initiative generated more than 3 million jobs, especially for America’s young people, and inspired a widespread appreciation of America’s wealth of natural resources and our responsibility as stewards of these assets.

Through current Federal programs like the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and other conservation and restoration investments, Americans are once again connecting the dots between clean water, clean land, clean air, and thriving regional ecosystems and economies.

With recent attacks on programs that help our Great Lakes, we should remember we don’t have to choose between protecting our environment and natural treasures and creating jobs.

We can do both at the same time.

Just Ohio and Michigan, alone, need 20 million new trees planted to make up for the devastation that the emerald ash borer and Asian longhorned beetle have done to our forest populations.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and its goal of putting young people to work across our country that will prosper our Nation and steward its resources forward. I am confident the young people of America will welcome this challenge.

AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Autism Awareness Month and the more than 3.5 million Americans currently living with an autism spectrum disorder.

Today it is estimated that 1 in 68 people will be born with autism. There has been a significant increase in the number of people born with autism in just a decade.

With an increase in diagnoses of Americans with autism spectrum, it is important that we expand research and provide adequate resources for people on the spectrum. By increasing awareness, we seek to support the numerous families along with millions of individuals managing an autism disorder.

The earlier autism can be diagnosed and treated, the better chance that person has to pursue an independent and productive life. Thus, it is crucial that our early childcare programs, and especially our schools, have the knowledge, resources, and ability to provide assistance to those with autism.

I also wish to acknowledge my friend and former constituent, Vincent McLaughlin, who serves as an inspiration for autism awareness. Vincent, like many Americans with autism, is an active and devoted member of his local community and proudly serves as a member of his local volunteer fire department. For years, Vincent has tirelessly worked on autism and to serve as an example of just how beneficial early treatment can be.

Autism should not be a barrier to preventing Americans from achieving success and pursuing happiness. It is to that goal that I stand here today to recognize all Americans with an autism disorder, and I am proud to acknowledge April as Autism Awareness Month.

PROTECT EVERY COASTAL COMMUNITY IN OUR NATION

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I am deeply troubled by the Trump administration’s executive order expected to be signed today that will potentially expand offshore oil drilling in the Pacific, Atlantic, and Arctic Oceans. My constituency, the central coast, knows all too well the havoc wreaked from gas and oil platforms off our coasts. We cannot afford another disastrous oil spill.

California’s coastal region generates over $1.9 trillion per year in GDP. This order poses a direct threat to our local tourism economies and the success of local businesses, which are undeniably tied to a clean coast and healthy, thriving ocean ecosystem.

It is crucial for Congress to pass my bill, H.R. 767, California Clean Coast Act, to permanently ban drilling off California’s coast and to take further action to protect every coastal community across our Nation.

42ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF THE VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, April 30, will be the 42nd year of the conclusion of the Vietnam war.

The conflict started between Communist-backed North Vietnam and the U.S.-supported Government of South Vietnam in November 1955 and went on for another 20 years.

While the motives and justification of the war were sensitive and controversial to many, what needs to be recognized is the service demonstrated by our brave men and women who risked their lives to do their duty asked of them. Many of them made the ultimate sacrifice. For that sacrifice, our Nation is eternally grateful.

Of the nearly 3 million Americans who served in Vietnam, 58,220 laid down their lives in that service. We can find their names forever enshrined right down the road here in Washington, D.C., at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall.

Oftentimes, those who did return were not treated well or properly welcomed home for having served in a war they did not create or ask for. Finally, and thanklessly, that America has improved for our Vietnam veterans in recent years as we honor their service. Much still needs to be done in regard to the effects of Agent Orange and other health issues.

Of the 75 living Medal of Honor recipients, 52 earned their medal in Vietnam. In total, there were a staggering 260 soldiers awarded the Medal of Honor for heroic acts in the Vietnam war.

As we commemorate the 42nd year of the fall of Saigon and the dissatisfactory ending of the war in Vietnam this Sunday, we must be thankful for the millions who served in what seemed a thankless role then, who risked their lives in battle for freedom, and for the many still missing or those who did not make it back alive.

TRIBUTE TO JOHNNY MATA ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I first want to rise and salute a very special friend of mine, Johnny Mata, on his 80th birthday.

Longtime Houston activist and leading founder of the Greater Houston Coalition for Justice, Johnny, we love you because you have been a fighter for justice all of your life. I look forward to coming home and celebrating you, not only as a fighter for justice, but as a great American, and certainly one who served in the United States Army.

I know that Johnny would not mind me making mention of the fact that, in the 100 days that this President has served, not only has he not provided any service to the American people in terms of providing for their comfort, but today he will celebrate his 100 days by going and speaking before the National Rifle Association, where over 80 percent of those members believe in responsible gun safety, but not one word
Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my constituent and longtime friend Mr. Johnny Mata on his 80th Birthday.

Johnny Mata is a longtime Houston activist who is the presiding officer of the Greater Houston Coalition for Justice.

He has been a champion of social justice, education, and civil rights in Houston and across the State of Texas fighting to improve the criminal justice system.

He served with distinction in the United States Army and later joined the Gulf Coast Community Services Association, where he served for 32 to years helping struggling families to make better lives for themselves.

His life has been a commitment to service on behalf of those less fortunate, particularly in the Latino communities where his outspoken voice against prejudice and injustice has had a profound effect on our criminal justice system.

Johnny Mata has held numerous leadership positions including six terms as the Director of two local districts and two terms as Texas State Director for the League of United Latin American Citizens.

He is responsible for bringing to the forefront issues regarding law enforcement and education in the Hispanic community and has been nationally recognized for getting public school districts to hire more Hispanic educators and administrators.

In 1999, Johnny Mata founded the Greater Houston Coalition for Justice, an umbrella organization of more than 25 civil rights and advocacy groups dedicated to raising awareness of human rights issues and to addressing deficiences in the Greater Houston area’s criminal justice system.

In the same spirit as Cesar Chavez, Johnny Mata is an inspiration to us all because of his kind spirit and humble heart that allows him to continue his fight for the least of these and for those who just need an opportunity to achieve the American dream on a level playing field with fair and equal justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Johnny Mata for his deep and abiding commitment to the causes of social justice and equal rights and offer him the very best for his continued success fighting for change and also to recognize his contributions to this country on his 80th birthday.

Johnny Mata is an American hero.

**TRUMPCARE 2.0**

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, with TrumpCare 2.0, Republican leaders took a bad bill and made it worse.

On top of causing at least 24 million more Americans to be uninsured, raising costs for middle class families, imposing an age tax on older Americans, and making everyone pay more for less coverage, this bill now guts protections for patients with preexisting illnesses and essential health benefits: guaranteed coverage for things like prescription drugs, emergency care, maternity care, and mental health. All this while still giving billions in tax breaks to millionaires.

Stop being ideologically driven. Put people above partisanship. Put patients first, and let’s work for a bipartisan plan to reduce out-of-pocket costs for care and medicine for all Americans.

**AFFORDABLE COVERAGE**

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, over the past days we have heard a great deal of rhetoric as it relates to health care and what the best policy for the United States is. In fact, as we address the Affordable Care Act, which the Democratic Governor of Minnesota referred to as unsustainable and former President Clinton referred to as the craziest thing, we understand that the words “Affordable Care Act” do not, in fact, apply.

The paradigm, Mr. Speaker, needs to be this: It is not whether or not Americans have coverage. In a time when Americans, two-thirds of whom cannot afford $1,000 in a time of financial crisis, as we see premiums and deductibles soar—$1,000, $6,000, $10,000—the paradigm should be: Do they have access to care? Because, in a world where you can’t pay your deductible, a premium or catastrophe creates an unaffordable outcome, and then coverage is a piece of paper that does not grant you access to what is truly important, and that is care. That should be the paradigm in this debate going forward.

**THE FIRST 100 DAYS**

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks 100 days of the Trump administration. So let’s take a look.

What does that 100 days mean? It means hundreds of vacancies still left in important agencies like State and Defense, hundreds of hours wasted on meaningless executive orders, hundreds of miles flown back and forth to Mar-a-Lago to play golf, hundreds of educational and cultural programs on the chopping block, hundreds of acres of public lands under threat, and hundreds of programs that benefit millionaires while causing hundreds and thousands of seniors to worry about losing Meals on Wheels, working families losing their health care, DREAMers losing their protection, women losing Planned Parenthood, and ordinary folks losing money out of their pocket to pay higher tax bills because of the new proposal.

That is not much of a record, if you ask me. But what it also means is there are hundreds and thousands of voices rising up saying: We will resist, and we will persist.

**PRESIDENT TRUMP’S BROKEN PROMISES**

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call our President’s attention to the working families both in New York’s capital region and across our great country who are those who are the broken promises during his first 100 days in office.

President Trump promised during the campaign that our working families would never be forgotten again. He has forgotten to keep that promise. This President promised to get lobbyists and special interests out of our government. Then he filled his Cabinet with former lobbyists, Wall Street and oil company executives, and other billionaires.

Now reports are coming out that numerous members of his administration were exempted from his widely publicized 5-year lobbying ban; therefore, it is no surprise that his policies, again and again, put corporate interests ahead of America’s middle class and working families.

President Trump promised to punish companies that outsourced American jobs. Instead, he has continued to award lucrative government contracts to these outsourcing companies, rewarding them for bad behavior and doing nothing to hold other bad actors accountable.

As a candidate, Donald Trump called NAFTA the worst trade deal ever approved in our country. He promised to hold China accountable for its bad behavior on trade. Mexico and Canada called his bluff this week on NAFTA. Instead of accountability, President Trump has offered China sweetheart trade benefits in order to keep promises they had already made in dealing with North Korea.

We know the difference between alternative facts and real results. We all do.

**RURAL AMERICA**

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for rural America. I represent the central coast of California, one of
the most beautiful and bountiful districts in our Nation. With its many and diverse crops, it is the salad bowl of the world. Now, I know it is on the coast of California, but if you drive 1 or 2 miles east, you will be in rural America.

I understand that a majority of 24 million rural Americans voted for Donald Trump. It has been 100 days now, and all they have received is broken promises with an intended laceration of the Department of Agriculture budget by 21 percent and a lack of respect and a limited approach that the men and women do in rural America.

We ask the President to stop his lip service and start giving public service to rural America with investments in infrastructure, research and development, and, yes, immigration reform. It is time to stop the rhetoric and start recognizing that people who come here who work in agriculture contribute not just to our economy but to our country.

Mr. President, all we ask is that you do what people in rural America do every single day. They get up, they work hard, they are stewards of the land, they provide security for our food and for our families, and they serve not just their communities, they serve our country.

BLACK APRIL AND THE FALL OF SAIGON

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, April 30, marks 42 years since the fall of Saigon, commemorated as Black April in Vietnamese-American communities across the United States. Along with Congresswoman LOFGREN, Congressman CORREA, and other colleagues, I introduced a resolution in remembrance of this event, recognizing the service of U.S. Armed Forces and South Vietnamese forces, and honoring the contributions and sacrifices of Vietnamese Americans.

This community, started by refugees, has prospered and thrived, giving so much back to this country. They continue to fight tirelessly for the basic human rights of people in Vietnam. I will continue to be a voice for Vietnamese Americans in Congress and for the rights of the people of Vietnam.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, so many say TQIP. My late mother passed away in 1991, but she said TQIP one time, and the lady responded, S-H-I-T, and mother looked shocked. She said: “Sorry, honey, it’s Thursday.” But this is not Thursday, it is Friday, and I really hoped we would be voting on a bill that wouldn’t totally repeal ObamaCare, but it would give people a great deal of relief. I know with all the talk from the other side of the aisle about how great our health care numbers are, we know that promise after promise was broken in the passage of the ACA, or ObamaCare. People lost their insurance, they lost the medications that they were eligible to have under their prior insurance, they lost their doctor, and they lost their treatment facility. That does take a toll on people’s lives.

There was bragging about the people that now had insurance that didn’t have it before. But we know it was clear, most of that was people that got stuck on Medicaid. It wasn’t real insurance. As we look at the evolution of health care in America, we see that insurance has changed to where it is no longer insurance.

Right now in America, people who are actually medical doctors are some of the best and brightest that America has ever produced. But as an old history major and someone who continues to read and learn from history every week, I know that there have been strides made in health care and in medicine in the last 100 years that are unparalleled in the entire history of mankind.

There was a book called “The Five Thousand Year Leap.” I don’t want to do it an injustice, but basically it points out that when settlers came to North America, not the immigrants that came perhaps from Russia who then later were referred to as Native Americans, but immigrants coming from Europe, the English, and even from Norway, during those years, they came in boats that were not powered other than by sail or by arm strength. Mankind had not made a lot of progress over the thousands of years of man’s existence it is only in the last 100 years that physicians actually were able to have a better chance of healing than harming.

There were entries in journals and letters from people who served under him and were stationed at Valley Forge: Why, even though they weren’t fighting? Because Washington knew if he let the men go home, there was a good chance they wouldn’t come back. If they didn’t come back, then the Revolution was going to be over, and all of those who had participated would be killed by the British forces. So he stayed with the troops. He often allowed the officers to take leave and go home at night or on a weekend, perhaps, but he stayed with the troops.

After the war was won, he went back to Mount Vernon. He thought he was done. He had served his country and done what no one else had ever done in history. Although Cincinnatus did an incredibly selfless thing, it still wasn’t to the level of selflessness of George Washington. When he thought he was done in 1787, here came leaders begging him to come back and lead the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia because, as they eventually made clear to Washington, if he did not come back and reside, all would be lost. All those who fought during the Revolution would have fought for nothing: It would all go away, and the British would be back in charge. There would be chaos.

So he agrees to come back. Then an incredible thing happened at the Constitutional Convention. After they...
could not reach any agreement on much of anything, as Ben Franklin pointed out, Randolph made a motion that they recess until after a celebration of the country's birth, its anniversary in early July.

When they finally do go to church together, worship together, celebrate God's love and his gift in this country, and then come back and try what had been so unsuccessful for the 5 weeks or so to that point.

The vet continued. They went to church at the Reformed Calvinistic Church, a Christian church, and they worshiped God together. They asked for his leadership. The Right Reverend William Rogers, pastor of the Reformed Calvinistic Church in Philadelphia, did a powerful job of leading the worship of God in this Christian church. It was a nondenominational service. We still have a record of the prayer to the God by Reverend Rogers at that celebration.

People noted after they came back that there was a different spirit. Yes, there was disagreement, but it wasn't as rancorous as it had been before that. It even came to the great compromise that allowed one body to have equal numbers of representatives from each State, no matter what size, and another body would have equal power and its representatives would be chosen according to the number of people who lived in that State. That was one of the great compromises.

We end up with a Constitution. George Washington thinks he is done, but after the election is ratified, they begged him to allow them to elect him unanimously to be our first President. He doesn't want to do it. He eventually agrees, gives in. They elect him unanimously. They have a contested vote for Vice President, but John Adams wins. After 4 years, he was ready to go home. They begged him again to allow them to reelect him unanimously. He eventually gave in and served 4 more years as President.

Some disappointed after Washington during those 4 years because he would not allow the United States to get involved in the French Revolution. That irritated some people, but Washington believed that America was so weak in that time, that if we got involved in a foreign war, albeit a civil war, we would end up losing what had been gained to that point. So he didn't let the United States get involved in that point.

When he was begged to stay and let them elect him to a third 4-year term, it would not have been unanimous. He said, basically, that it would look too much like a monarchy if someone served 8 years. He refused and could not be deterred. He went back to Mount Vernon.

There at Mount Vernon, as he loved to do, he was going around assessing what improvements needed to be made there on his property. It was cold. It began to rain. He was marking trees as to which ones would be cut and which ones would be allowed to remain.

It got dark. He came to the house, not realizing that visitors had come. Since the Washingtons were always so hospitable, even if they didn't know people were coming, Martha would provide food for them.

George Washington came in. He was wet, he was cold, and Martha implored him to go change clothes, as did the guests, but he wouldn't have of it because he was so polite, always more concerned about others. So he removed his wet clothes, and ended up developing some kind of cold or infection, and it turned into a very serious infection.

A doctor was called, and he couldn't understand, why it Washington wasn't doing better. They were draining blood from Washington. It should have healed him. It should have made him all well. If we are getting the bad blood out of him, we don't know why he is not getting better. We know now what helps and what doesn't help.

Imagine that: you drain a man's blood, he gets weaker. They didn't understand what they were doing. That was 218 years ago.

Washington got weaker. They were able to ask for the doctor, who was one of George Washington's best friends in the world. Dr. Craik. Dr. Craik loved George Washington. Washington loved him like a brother. Craik wanted to do all he could to get him well. This man who loved Washington and cared so deeply was one of the better doctors of the 18th century. He bled him again. He drained more blood from Washington's body, thinking that would help. But as we now know, that was not helping. It was hurting. It was doing great damage.

That is what they thought just 218 years ago. In that intervening 218 years, the advancements in medicine understanding, why it Washington wasn't doing better, were not as not as helpful as we thought, may have been harmful, but never again to the extent as occurred where the doctors actually were responsible for killing their friend, our American hero.

I don't think we will get to that point again.

It is worth noting historically the developments of health care so that we can adequately see what has happened the way we were got passed. We have done damage to health care in America under ObamaCare.

I know people talk about all the people that have health insurance now that didn't before. So many lost their insurance. Yet, because of the problems that ObamaCare basically outlawed catastrophic insurance policies, which are those that have a high deductible with a low premium and ensure against basically something catastrophic, disease, injury, with the deductibles dramatically increased.
didn’t get the care they need. They were waiting for months. Then I will have people tell me they got treated very well. They are in the Lufkin Clinic named for Charlie Wilson.

Overall, I think our veterans would still be better off if all of them were given more importance. If you want to go to your local VA clinic, if you have one close, fine. You just go to whichever is closest and it gives you the best health care. That provides competition and it keeps our word to the veterans that they will have the health care they need.

Veterans should not be penalized because they served our country and put themselves in harm’s way. My 4 years on Active Duty in the U.S. Army did not entitle me to life health care, so I don’t have that personal experience of dealing with the VA health care. I was not disabled. I still feel guilty because during my 4 years, 1978 to 1982, we were never in combat.

We were put on alert in 1979 that some of us, at least, might be going to Iran, and we should have. I still feel that if the Americans going to the Middle East today had been sent back then and had done the job of the radical Islamists that President Carter had been welcomed in. Ayatollah Khomeini, President Carter welcomed him as a man of peace, and he has done anything but provide peace.

But we owe our veterans so much. George Washington knew that, and that is why in that picture just down the hall, that huge painting that John Trumbull and painted, Washington, with his arm outstretched, piece of paper in there. On that piece of paper was his resignation. He had also sent a copy to all 13 Governors. Amazingly, the last part of his resignation was a prayer for the Nation. In that prayer for the Nation, he concluded that he prayed God would ensure that we would never forget those who had served in the field; talking about our veterans who had fought for this country because Washington knew if we were going to remain a free nation, then we would have to honor those, take care of those who suffered as a result of giving us, protecting our freedom. That is why also, if we ever fail to honor those who have honored us by serving us in the military, we won’t last past the next major conflict. It is important we do that, and Washington knew that.

So, since Washington’s death was certainly propelled by blood being drained, we know draining somebody of their life-giving blood is not normally a good idea, but in the last 100 years, just thinking about you have a better chance of getting well than you do of getting sick, look at the progress that was made in medicine in 100 years and look at the developments in medicine since then and about.

Yes, we know the big pharmaceutical companies signed on to endorsing ObamaCare, as did the American Hosp.

ital Association and the American Medical Association and AARP. For every organization that signed on endorsing ObamaCare, if you read the ObamaCare bill, as I did, you could normally find where they got their payoff. You could normally find something that was given to them to buy their support. AARP has made more money than they would have ever dreamed before ObamaCare through the health insurance policies that they endorse. So, there is a lot of self-service for AARP to endorse a bill that did massive medical damage to retired people, a bill that cut $716 billion out of Medicare.

When people realize AARP endorsed a bill that did so much gutting of Medicare, how could they do that if they really care about retired people? Well, how they could do it is that they were going to be rewarded by selling or endorsing insurance that wouldn’t have the 2 percent tax on it that most insurance would have. They got some other benefits out of it. I haven’t seen how much profit they have made for a nonprofit organization, but I believe it was in 2008 that they made over $400 million. It basically profit for a nonprofit, from their insurance sales. There is no telling how much that has increased. I would love to see the number since ObamaCare came about. But they got a big payday because they endorsed ObamaCare.

The pharmaceutical industry knew they were going to make tens of billions of dollars more than they ever had after ObamaCare. They were bought off to endorse it. But for some of us who could see clearly down the road where it was heading, as I have told some in the pharmaceutical industry: By endorsing ObamaCare, if it is not changed, you will have signed the death warrant for your own industry because eventually it will lead to failure to recoup research and development.

Not initially, but by then the people who had endorsed ObamaCare from the pharmaceutical industry will no doubt have gotten their golden parachutes and could own an island somewhere. Who knows? But they will be plenty wealthy. They would have overseen the steps that would lead to the demise of the greatest developments in health care in thousands of years, really just in the last 50 or 60, extraordinary developments.

Something has to be done. That is why a majority of Americans did not support ObamaCare in 2009 and 2010. It is why a majority of Americans wanted change. They had to have change. Like the old joke about the guy up in the tree who went up to get the gorilla out. After tangling for so long, he yells at the guy: Just shoot up in the tree. He said: Yeah, but I might hit you. And they said: Yeah, but one of us has got to have some relief.

People suffering from health care under ObamaCare have been crying for relief: Just do something. We have got to have relief. I have heard that from so many in east Texas. Look, something has got to be done. We can’t keep going like this. We can’t afford the premiums, and it is not going to get us the health care because I can’t pay the deductibles. Something has to be done. I was hoping we would have a full repeal. The bill 2 years ago didn’t fully repeal ObamaCare. Of course, when we have done in the bill we have now, but the reason I agreed to sign on was so many people were saying: We don’t like ObamaCare, but we have got to have some relief. We have got to have relief. We finally got concessions that would ensure that people’s premiums would come down in 2 years—too late for the year, but would come down in 2 years, and then we would continue to make progress in the area of premiums. We are talking an end to health care. Instead of paying tens of thousands of dollars to health insurance companies, they would have a big hunk of that money going to their own health savings account. That would be paying to lead us—and still can—to a place where patients control their own health care again, where they can go talk to a doctor and not have an insurance manager intervene and say: Uh-oh, you can’t go see that person. Nope, you can’t go see that person. Nope, we haven’t given approval to this or that.

It is a doctor and a patient relationship the way progress has been made in the last 100 years that has given us, to a point, the best health care in the history of mankind.

Now, in the 1970s, when I was in the Soviet Union as an exchange student for a summer, I saw socialized medicine, the real socialized medicine, the same kind of socialized medicine that President Obama and so many others called—they put this loveable sounding name—single payer. Now, it is socialized medicine the government controls it all. You don’t have any choices. It is in the hands of the government. They see all; they know all.

Once the government has that power, then they have the right—and an obligation even—to tell you what you have to do physically, what you can eat, who you can see, where you can go, when you can go. People who want total government control over people’s lives, the rest of their but everybody else’s—they understood, they had the vision that if we can get government control of health care, then we will be able to control all these minions all across America.

This is a lot of people in this body who I disagree with, but I know they want to do what is right for America. But it is not right for America and for Americans to have the United States Government dictating every aspect of our lives.

I long for the days when my liberal friends used to yell: We don’t want the government in our bedroom.
Because since then, they have been saying: Yeah, let’s get the government in our bedroom, in our bathroom, in our kitchen, in our living room, in our garage. We want government control of everything.

As I have said before, the only thing it appears that George Orwell got wrong was the date. It wasn’t 1984. But we still have a chance to get off this miserable road we are on. That is why the huge bulk of geographic America rose up on election day in November and said: We have got to have some relief. Whether we like Donald Trump or not, we have got to have some relief, we have got to have some change.

That is why the huge geographical United States voted for Donald Trump. The fringes of the United States, the coast and a few major cities said: No, we like the government telling us what to do, how to live, what we can have.

But across America geographically, that was not what people wanted.

Thus, I really hoped that by compromising again, as the Freedom Caucus, that we could have a vote by today on a bill that would start us down the road of getting rid of ObamaCare, getting us back on a road toward freedom. We knew it was going to be tough.

If you don’t think it would be tough, look at the Soviet Union after the fall of the wall and the Soviet Government. There were so many Russians who said: What are we going to do? We have to do it. We can’t do it. We don’t want that kind of freedom.

Well, they are finding out that perhaps they do.

One of the things that we had gotten as a compromise to try to help Americans in the agreement that has developed to this point was the elimination of the taxes that would have been kept in place under the proposed bill that was first filed by our leadership.

Another thing that would be in there is a provision that if you are going to now be part of Medicaid, as we have had millions now having the government pick up the insurance through Medicaid, then we are going to put a similar work requirement, as was put on by Congress in the 1990s by the Republican House and Senate.

And though President Clinton didn’t want to agree to that, once he saw they had the votes to override another veto, he agreed to sign it because rather than have a veto overridden—and now it is one of the things he brags about: Oh, yeah, while I was President, I reformed welfare, so you had to work.

As a result of that reform in the 1990s—it was not a callous move. It was a caring move by Republicans in the House and Senate who understood that it is not a punishment to have a job. It gives you a feeling of self-worth.

We are not going to get back to the days where as many people have jobs as need, then, if you are able to work, you are going to have to do something.

As a result of that work requirement in the 1990s, income for single mothers, when adjusted for inflation, for the first time since we began in the 1960s under the so-called Great Society, for the first time, that income increased for single moms when adjusted for inflation.

The Federal Government, since the Great Society legislation, had begun to lure young women into holes, into rats, from which they could not extricate themselves. After 30 years of the Federal Government luring people into holes they then could not get out of, they were required to get out of the hole, they did, and their lives improved.

Now, I know the mainstream media has been there to defend every bit of government control as it took over health insurance companies; that they are monopolies. That people like me that probably were more intelligent on national testing than they were. But, nonetheless, used all kinds of excoriating terms, make fun. Like the time I mentioned that a minimum somebody was working and that they were in line to get groceries and the person in front of them had crab legs that were expensive, and this person said: Gosh, I am wishing I could have afforded crab legs.

But it turned out, when they pulled the card, which let them know taxpayers were paying for those crab legs, he realized the reason that he can’t afford crab legs is because he is paying for his and this other person’s food.

Well, the press went nuts over that. It has been some years back. It wasn’t long after that, after the media here in Washington belittled me, the media in New York belittled me, never brought it out, but we got a picture. They said nobody can have money from food stamp programs, CHIP, any of that. You can’t do that. We have got pictures of crabs for sale and the sign saying “we take food stamps.”

Anyway, it is very clear that, when you see the signs that say “we take food stamps” for the crabs, that the media that belittled me back in those days, they had their fun, but they were just wrong, and they were lying to cover for more and bigger intrusive government.

I want to also thank my friend Tom MacArthur. I am not crazy about the amendment that he provided, but Tom is making a real effort: let’s reason together. Let’s come together on a bill. We compromise, and we get to a point where we can help our respective constituents. We can help America.

I felt like, with all of the compromises, we were going to bring down premiums more quickly. We were repealing at least some of ObamaCare, and we got to a point where we could help our respective constituents. We can help America.

So that has to go. The House did that. I look forward to the Senate doing that.

Our revised version that was introduced since we would vote on today still does not fully repeal ObamaCare, but by the negotiations that have occurred in the Tuesday Group, Freedom Caucus, Republican Study Committee, committee of jurisdiction, we have made a great deal of progress, and I thought we were going to be out of there by the end of the day. I appreciate very much Speaker Ryan agreeing to do it. But he and Kevin McCarthy allowed a bill to come to the floor. Our whip, Steve Scalise, found: Gee, this is a lot easier doing a whip on this thing than we thought.

That last bill did a great thing, and I appreciate very much Speaker Ryan agreeing to do it. But he and Kevin McCarthy allowed a bill to come to the floor. Our whip, Steve Scalise, found: Gee, this is a lot easier doing a whip on this thing than we thought.

They can take actions that, in some other industry, would cause the Department of Justice to come after them and sue them, take very strong actions, and could even result in criminal actions if someone is acting against some antitrust laws.

Health insurance companies have been allowed to monopolize. They can take actions that, in some other industry, would cause the Department of Justice to come after them and sue them, take very strong actions, and could even result in criminal actions if someone is acting against some antitrust laws.

Well, you can go in and tell somebody: We want, in our agreement, that if you take any of these other upstart insurance companies’ insurance, you are going to lose your current network; and we are the big dog, so you will be out of luck.

Well, this body did a great thing, and I appreciate very much Speaker Ryan agreeing to do it. But he and Kevin McCarthy allowed a bill to come to the floor. Our whip, Steve Scalise, found: Gee, this is a lot easier doing a whip on this thing than we thought.

That last bill did a great thing, and I appreciate very much Speaker Ryan agreeing to do it. But he and Kevin McCarthy allowed a bill to come to the floor. Our whip, Steve Scalise, found: Gee, this is a lot easier doing a whip on this thing than we thought.

Well, this body did a great thing, and I appreciate very much Speaker Ryan agreeing to do it. But he and Kevin McCarthy allowed a bill to come to the floor. Our whip, Steve Scalise, found: Gee, this is a lot easier doing a whip on this thing than we thought.
Now, today was as close as we have gotten to repealing and getting into law a big repeal of a big part of ObamaCare, but it didn't happen today. It needs to happen, and it needs to happen very soon.

But what did happen in the White House, the President has stood undeterred. Again, today, he signed another executive order. This one didn't do as the prior administration and usurped power that was not his, that only Congress has. He is working well within the law and gets good advice on this stuff.

I have got to say, even when I have talked to the President over the last few weeks, more than once, he wants to make sure that he is following the Constitution, and he is careful to say that. I like that. Let's check to see and make sure we are following the Constitution and we are not missing something here. I love having a President that is concerned about that. For all of the wonderful things they talked about when they took him, he is concerned about it. He does not want to exceed his authority.

Unfortunately, we have judges in the Ninth Circuit, particularly, that exceed their authority on a regular basis. Mr. Speaker, I am hoping in the very near future, we will break up the Ninth Circuit. It would be okay with me if we restricted the Ninth Circuit, who doesn't have one care about precedence, about the Constitution. They just have their agenda. If we are not going to get rid of them altogether, then let's at least restrict their jurisdiction to controversies that arise within their building and then divide up the rest.

We need a new circuit. Let President Trump appoint all of the new 12th Circuit that will be created. I am very pleased that our Judiciary Committee is wanting to do something major regarding the Ninth Circuit being out of control.

And I do think an important step will be, when we eliminate the jurisdiction of a district court over immigration and naturalization matters, we have authority to create courts—all but one. The Supreme Court is the only one and naturalization matters, we have authority to create courts—all but one. The Supreme Court is the only one. All the others are under the Constitution. The Supreme Court is the only one. All the others are under the Constitution. All the rest of them, we brought them into the world and we can take them out. We need to do that if we are going to save this constitutional Republic.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to finish by mentioning the National Day of Prayer recognition that is coming up on Thursday. Anne Graham Lotz took over the gavel from Shirley Dobson, and her husband, Shirley. Shirley has done an extraordinary job over the last 25 years.

The National Day of Prayer has continued the tradition for many years now. We do have an observance at the Capitol for a couple of decades. It has been at the Cannon Caucus Room. It seats more than the rooms here at the Capitol do. We had hoped to have it in the rotunda. It is nondenominational. There are others than Christians. There are Jewish leaders that will participate and always have.

This coming Thursday is that day. Thousands of cities around the country will observe the National Day of Prayer that President Trump will do, as all the Presidents for many decades have done, and sign recognizing that as the Day of Prayer. Congress has passed it recognizing that. Though Senator Schumer wouldn't let us have it in the rotunda, it will be in Statuary Hall, and it will be a day of prayer, thanksgiving, and fasting for some.

Our National Day of Prayer is really a day of celebration. I think it is something that has characterized this Nation from our very beginning. We had an order like none other from any commander I am ever familiar with. In my 4 years in the Army, we never had a commander issue an order like this. And certainly if one had been issued toward Obama administration's generals and admirals, the administration would have, no doubt, fired them immediately.

Washington issued an order for all its commanders that they had to allow our military members fighting for the United States to worship on Sunday. They to set up chaplains in each unit if there was someone who could fulfill that role, and, if not, they would be allowed to go to another unit's worship of the Lord on Sunday. Now, that was back in our founding.

That is when we were fighting for existence. And for all those who have turned a blind eye to the real history of America—which is really hard to do with all of the evidence that is so overwhelming. But if one would just go down to the State Department down the road here, within the glass case there at the State Department, they have a copy of the original Treaty of Paris, 1783.

It surprised me. As much as I have studied history, I did not know how it started until I saw that. And I was actually with our pastor from Green Acres Baptist Church there in Tyler. He and his wife, Cindy, were with me and my wife, Kathy. I have actually not been on a tour of the State Department since. A lot of it is pretty boring, but this is intriguing.

This is the front of the Treaty of Paris, 1783. This was the document that required England, Great Britain, to recognize, in writing, that the United States of America was an independent country, that we did not have to do what we were dictated to by Great Britain, and that we were free and independent. There was still concern there in 1783.

It is also worth noting, as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the planner of 9/11—thank God he is still in Guantánamo—he said, in his pleading, he gave the reference to the verse in the Koran that says that anyone who attempts to attach someone else to God, to Allah, should be killed. It is a capital offense. It is a death-penalty offense. It didn't really happen until somebody else agrees it is true. And our enemy, at that time, agreed it was true, and we began our Nation. And this National Day of Prayer is a day of rejoicing, a day of thanksgiving to the most holy and undivided trinity. "In the name of the most holy and undivided trinity." They said right there. It started our country, independently.

We recognize there is a most holy and undivided trinity. We say the Declaration of Independence started us, we didn't really happen until somebody else agrees it is true. And our enemy, at that time, agreed it was true, and we began our Nation. And this National Day of Prayer is a day of rejoicing, a day of thanksgiving to the most holy and undivided trinity. And it has been awesome if it could have been in the rotunda, but, under the rules of the Senate, if any Senator puts a hold on the bill, then it doesn't go forward for unanimous consent.

Hopefully, Senator Schumer is still there next year when it comes time. Hopefully, he won't put a hold on it if Anne Graham Lotz still has a vision of having the National Day of Prayer
celebration there in the Nation’s rotunda.

But instead, next Thursday, it will be after 5 so it doesn’t interfere with the normal workings. I had no problem with having the Holocaust recognition at 11 a.m. in the morning. Not only did I not have a problem with it, I was proud that we did it during the day like that. It should be noted. People should understand that unless you stand up for freedom, stand up for the teachings of Jesus, stand up for things that are actually in the Bible, you are not going to have the kind of freedom that allows people to be part of the greatest country in the world because that greatest country in world history will end up sliding down to the dustbin of history.

So it will be a great day. Mr. Speaker, I hope to see you there.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition.


The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I, to the committee on House Administration.

THE NEXT 100 DAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of big ideas and promises from the President, but we haven’t seen much tangible action from the Republicans over the last 100 days. We know we need to continue to improve health care in this country, yet Republicans have failed to come up with a reasonable solution.

As someone who has spent over 36 years working in the insurance industry, I stand willing and ready to work with my colleagues to improve health care for my constituents and the American people, especially in the Fifth Congressional District.

What we really need is for my colleagues to focus on energy and creating jobs. That is so important here in America.

What we don’t need is to continue with more of the antics from the President who is more focused on selling scores from the campaign trail than finding real solutions for the American people.

It really is a sad day in America when Congress can’t come together to make real progress for the American people. Real progress. We need to put aside the bickering and roll up our sleeves in order to get the work done for the people in America.

That is something we should all be able to do within the next 100 days. There has been so much concern about what is happening with the present administration over the next 100 days. So since that is prevalent and the American people have heard about it, now the concentration is on what Congress and the President are going to do for the next 100 days for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to join me in doing what is right—right for their constituents, right for the American people.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I to the committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a Joint Resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 99. Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 1, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Ron Estes

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employees</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1 (equivalent) Foreign currency</th>
<th>Transportation Foreign currency</th>
<th>Other purposes Foreign currency</th>
<th>Total Foreign currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Silverberg</td>
<td>2/21</td>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>7,348</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,890.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>7,348</td>
<td></td>
<td>421.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>963</td>
<td>7,348</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,311.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

Mr. DANIEL SILVERBERG, Apr. 17, 2017.
### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Per diem constitutes lodging and meals. If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

### HOUSE COMMITTEES

HON. RANDY HULTGREN ............................................... 2 /18 2 /19 Czech Republic ... 357.73 .................... .................... .................... .................... .................. .. 357.73

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Per diem constitutes lodging and meals. If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

### HOUSE COMMITTEES

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX, Chairman, Apr. 5, 2017.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Per diem constitutes lodging and meals. If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

### HOUSE COMMITTEES

HON. GREGG HARPER, Chairman, Apr. 6, 2017.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Per diem constitutes lodging and meals. If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

### HOUSE COMMITTEES

HON. ROB BISHOP, Chairman, Apr. 4, 2017.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Per diem constitutes lodging and meals. If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

### HOUSE COMMITTEES

HON. LANAM SMITH, Chairman, Apr. 21, 2017.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Per diem constitutes lodging and meals. If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

### HOUSE COMMITTEES

HON. NEVIN BRADY, Chairman, Apr. 6, 2017.
EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

1188. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting two notifications of a federal vacancy and nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1189. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s FY 2016 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1190. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s FY 2016 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.
Under clause 2 of rule XIII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DeFazio (for himself, Mr. Wal- den, Mr. Blumenauer, and Ms. Bonamici):

H.R. 2225. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for a rain spell preparedness fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. Smith of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Long, Mr. Bakk, and Mr. Byrne):

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to apply budget neutrality on a State-specific basis in the calculation of the Medicare hospital wage index for non-rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Stivers (for himself and Mr. Walz):

H.R. 2225. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. Ratcliffe (for himself, Mr. Amodei, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hultgren, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Luetkemeyer, Mr. Marchant, Mr. Messer, Mr. Pearce, Mr. Pittenger, Mr. Poliquin, Mr. Royce of California, Mr. Rothfus, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Stivers, Mr. Tipton, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Williams, Mr. Davidson, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. McHenry, Mr. Posey, Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee, Mr. Hice, Mr. Blankenhorn, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Trott, and Mr. Blum):

H.R. 2225. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution’s portfolio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. Hurd (for himself, Mr. Col- nolly, Mr. Kelly of California, Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Delgado of California, Mr. Grimm, Mr. Kinzler, Mrs. Comstock, Mr. Yoder, Mr. colleagues (for himself, Mr. Foxx, Mr. Royce of California, Mr. Reeves of Texas, Mr. Fleischmann, Mr.mpeg, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Crank, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Yarmuth, Mr. Foster, Mr. Engel, Mr. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Falon, Mrs. Comstock, Mr. Rush, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Clarke of New York, Mr. McGov- ren, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mr. Hastings, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Cofman, Mr. Cook, Mr. Zeldin, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Diz- balart, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Schakowsky, Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee, Mr. Donovan, Mr. Lence, Mr. Hultton of Florida, Mr. Flake of Arizona, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Roskam, Mr. Katzko, Mr. Cotsello of Pennsylvania, Mr. DeSaulas, Mr. Thompson of Penn- sylvania, Mr. Mac- Arthur, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Schieffert, Mr. Hill, Mr. Farenthold, Mr. Ratterman, Mr. Rechert, Mr. Royce of California, and Mr. Fitzpatrick):

H.R. 2236. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to submit a statue or bust of Elie Wiesel for placement in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. Royce of California: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 1665. A bill to ensure that the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency considers severe local impact in making a recommendation to the President for a major disaster declaration with an amendment (Rept. 115-99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. Shuster: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1678. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act concerning the provision of compensation for recovery disaster or emergency assistance payments, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. Foxx: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1180. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector, with an amendment (Rept. 115-101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary dis- charged from further consideration. H.R. 1644 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DeFazio (for himself, Mr. Wal- den, Mr. Blumenauer, and Ms. Bonamici):

H.R. 2225. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for a rain spell preparedness fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. Smith of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Long, Mr. Bakk, and Mr. Byrne):

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to apply budget neutrality on a State-specific basis in the calculation of the Medicare hospital wage index for non-rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Stivers (for himself and Mr. Walz):

H.R. 2225. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. Ratcliffe (for himself, Mr. Amodei, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hultgren, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Luetkemeyer, Mr. Marchant, Mr. Messer, Mr. Pearce, Mr. Pittenger, Mr. Poliquin, Mr. Royce of California, Mr. Rothfus, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Stivers, Mr. Tipton, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Williams, Mr. Davidson, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. McHenry, Mr. Posey, Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee, Mr. Hice, Mr. Blankenhorn, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Trott, and Mr. Blum):

H.R. 2225. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution’s portfolio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. Hurd (for himself, Mr. Con- nolly, Mr. Kelly of California, Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Delgado of California, Mr. Grimm, Mr. Kinzler, Mrs. Comstock, Mr. Yoder, Mr. colleagues (for himself, Mr. Foxx, Mr. Royce of California, Mr. Reeves of Texas, Mr. Fleischmann, Mr.mpeg, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Crank, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Yarmuth, Mr. Foster, Mr. Engel, Mr. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Falon, Mrs. Comstock, Mr. Rush, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Clarke of New York, Mr. McGov- ren, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mr. Hastings, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Cofman, Mr. Cook, Mr. Zeldin, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Diz- balart, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Schakowsky, Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee, Mr. Donovan, Mr. Lence, Mr. Hultton of Florida, Mr. Flake of Arizona, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Roskam, Mr. Katzko, Mr. Cotsello of Pennsylvania, Mr. DeSaulas, Mr. Thompson of Penn- sylvania, Mr. Mac- Arthur, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Schieffert, Mr. Hill, Mr. Farenthold, Mr. Ratterman, Mr. Rechert, Mr. Royce of California, and Mr. Fitzpatrick):

H.R. 2236. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to submit a statue or bust of Elie Wiesel for placement in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DeLear (for herself, Ms. Moulton, Mr. Peters, and Mrs. Mur- phy of Florida):

H.R. 2231. A bill to establish a joint commission on North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. Ros-Lehtinen (for herself, Ms. Demings, Mr. Collins of Georgia, Mr. Pascrell, and Mr. Reichert):

H.R. 2246. A bill to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforce- ment officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Cummings (for himself and Mr. Farenthold):

H.R. 2226. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistle- blowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subse- quently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. Cohen (for himself, Ms. Ros- Lehtinen, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Mezrich, Mr. Deutch, Ms. Brown of Pennsylvania, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Granger, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Yarmuth, Mr. Foster, Mr. Engel, Mr. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Rush, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Clarke of New York, Mr. McGov- ren, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mr. Hastings, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Cofman, Mr. Cook, Mr. Zeldin, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Diz- balart, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Schakowsky, Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee, Mr. Donovan, Mr. Lence, Mr. Hultton of Florida, Mr. Flake of Arizona, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Roskam, Mr. Katzko, Mr. Cotsello of Pennsylvania, Mr. DeSaulas, Mr. Thompson of Penn- sylvania, Mr. Mac- Arthur, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Schieffert, Mr. Hill, Mr. Farenthold, Mr. Ratterman, Mr. Rechert, Mr. Royce of California, and Mr. Fitzpatrick):

H.R. 2239. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Libr- ary to obtain a statue or bust of Elie Wiesel for placement in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DelBene (for herself, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Peters, and Mrs. Mur- phy of Florida):
H.R. 2233: A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve the H-1B visa program, to repeal the diversity visa lottery program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. POCAN, Ms. DETRUESS, Ms. LEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. REED, Ms. JACKSON of Georgia, Ms. TAYLOR, Mr. McQUEEN, and Mr. RAUSCHENBERGER):

H.R. 2234. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring Student Employees in Recognition of Agriculture (RISER) Award Program recognizing excellence exhibited by students in prekindergarten through higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2235. A bill to improve air travel for passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LANGSTON):

H.R. 2236. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide certain alternative eligibility requirements applicable to foster care youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By MR. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2237. A bill to provide for phased-in payment of Social Security Disability Insurance payments during the waiting period for individuals with a terminal illness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEMINGS:

H.R. 2238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. BEATY):

H.R. 2239. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a State Medicaid option to provide coverage of community-based inpatient substance use disorder treatment for nonelderly adults, to remove such services from the Medicaid exclusion from medical assistance of items and services provided in an institution for mental diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Ms. MURPHY):

H.R. 2240. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a test of the Arrow 3 missile defense system with the Government of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. LUCINDA (for himself and Mr. MEGHAN):

H.R. 2241. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat qualified alternative minimum tax payments as an excludable qualified transportation fringe benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. CARTwright, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SQUEELE, Ms. SCHWARSKY, Mr. WINTER, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 2242. A bill to prohibit drilling in the outer Continental Shelf, to prohibit coal leases on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. WILKES):

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the eligibility of certain former members of the Armed Forces who are medically retired and who are entitled to hospital insurance benefits under Medicare part A by reason of previous entitlement to social security disability insurance benefits to enroll in the TRICARE program regardless of whether such members decline enrollment under Medicare part B, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Ms. DIGGETTI):

H.R. 2244. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a pilot project under which no more than 3 sponsors agree to evaluate the psychological and social distress experienced by patients participating in a clinical trial, conducted by the respective sponsor, of a drug or biological product that is intended to treat a serious or life-threatening disease or condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. JEAN, Ms. MONGEON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. McNERNEY, and Mr. GUTENBERG):

H.R. 2245. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to conduct a study to determine the relationship between school start times and adolescent health, well-being, and performance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 2246. A bill to amend the mandatory flood insurance coverage requirement for commercial properties located in flooded hazard areas and to provide for greater transfer of risk under the National Flood Insurance Program to private capital and reinsurance markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MILLIE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 2247. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for equal treatment of individual marriage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr.分鐘ELO:

H.R. 2248. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from revising the approved oil and gas leasing program for fiscal years 2017 through 2022; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JAY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. COYNE):

H.R. 2249. A bill to authorize a State or a portion of a State to conduct a demonstration project designed to test best methods of protecting the safety of families and individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Financial Services, Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CURSELO of Florida, Mrs. WALORSKI of Michigan, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2250. A bill to establish consistent requirements for the electronic content and format of data used in the administration of certain human services programs under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SHERE-POTTER, Ms. MENQ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MILLER of Alabama, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. TORRES, Mr. VILA, Ms. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. FLASKEET, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. HIME):

H.R. 2251. A bill to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Programs Enhancement Act of 2001 and title 36, United States Code, to require the provision of chiropractic care and services to veterans at all Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers and to expand access to such care for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 2252. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to place a ten-year moratorium on oil and gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities on the Outer Continental Shelf in the Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Straits of Florida planning areas and in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, for the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a business credit relating to the use of clean-fuel and fuel efficient vehicles by businesses within areas designated as nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. MAXIN N WATERS of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BERA, Mr. DEEMAN, Mr. DICKEY of Maine, Mr. MCLINTOCK, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARR, Mr. CEDARBERG, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. CORBETTA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ESHOO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PANETTA,
By Mr. Peters, Ms. Roybal-allard, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Schiff, Ms. Speier, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Takanu, Mr. Vargas, and Mrs. Mimi Walters of California:

H. Res. 254. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2630 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the "Janet Capello Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. Troy: H. Res. 255. A bill to clarify that nonprofit organizations may accept donated mortgage appraisals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. Upton (for himself, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Hultgren, and Ms. Bonamici): H. Res. 257. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. Westrup: H. Res. 257. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to consolidate certain eligibility tiers under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. Lowenthal (for himself, Ms. Lowery, Mr. Peters, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Takanu, Mr. Connolly, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Kurott, and Mr. Mcgovern): H. Res. 259. A resolution recognizing the 22nd anniversary of the Fall of Saigon on April 30, 1975, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. Titus (for herself, Ms. Lee, Mr. Takanu, and Mr. Huffman): H. Res. 294. A resolution recognizing and honoring the essential role of classified school education support employees through the Recognizing Inspirational School Employees Award; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. Cardenas (for himself, Mr. Tipton, Ms. Adams, Ms. Bonamici, Ms. Bordallo, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. Cicilline, Ms. Clarke of New York, Ms. Clarke of California, Mr. Collins of New York, Mr. Costa, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Hultgren, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. Loebrock, Mrs. Lowey, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Ms. McCollum, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Quigley, Ms. Sanchez, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Ms. Sinema, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Takanu, Mr. Titus, Mrs. Torres, Mr. Veasey, and Ms. Matsui): H. Res. 296. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of April 30, 2017, through May 6, 2017, as "National Small Business Week" to honor the vital role of small business and the passion of entrepreneurs in the United States; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. Cook (for himself and Mr. Lowenthal): H. Res. 298. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam should provide former members of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam who served alongside the United States Armed Forces in defense of their nation during the Vietnam War, with appropriate levels of support and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. Holding, for himself, Mr. Connolly, and Mr. Mica: H. Res. 297. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 2017 as "National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month" to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. Pearce (for himself, Mr. Swalwell of California, and Mr. Crawford): H. Res. 298. A resolution recognizing the security challenges of convening government officials in one specific place and directing the House of Representatives to adopt appropriate steps so that the House of Representatives can meet in a virtual setting; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to committees on Rules, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DeFazio: H. Res. 2223. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. Smith of Nebraska: H. Res. 2224. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, Clause 1, in the case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. Titus: H. Res. 2225. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. Judy Chu of California: H. Res. 2225. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. Rosa-Lehtinen: H. Res. 2226. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois: H. Res. 2237. 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 as stated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. Demings: H. Res. 2238. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which states that the Congress shall have the power to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. TROTTS:

H.R. 2255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 2256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, "The Congress shall have the power—

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 2257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. FALLONE:

H.R. 2258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 2292.
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H. Res. 30: Mr. Veasey, Ms. MCSally, and Mr. Mitchell.
H. Res. 31: Mr. Hick.
H. Res. 129: Mr. Collins of New York and Mr. Perlmutter.
H. Res. 164: Mr. Jeffries.
H. Res. 188: Mr. Bilirakis.
H. Res. 206: Ms. Judy Chu of California.
H. Res. 213: Mrs. Bratton.
H. Res. 218: Ms. Judy Chu of California.
H. Res. 259: Mr. Diaz-Balart and Mr. Donovan.
H. Res. 270: Mr. Panetta.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. HARPER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in H.R. 2192 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII.

42. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Jonesboro, AR, relative to Resolution R-EN-016-2017, urging all United States Senators to reintroduce the Marketplace Fairness Act into the United States Senate during its 2017 session; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Ms. ESHOO on H.R. 306: Mr. Bera, Mr. Clay, Mr. O’Halloran, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Schrader, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Loeb, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Cuellar.