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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:
WASHINGTON, DC, June 7, 2017.
I hereby appoint the Honorable Mike JOHNSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

TURKISH CRACKDOWN ON PEACEFUL PROTESTERS
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, a group of peaceful protesters gathered at a public park outside the Turkish Ambassador’s residence in northwest Washington, D.C. They came from a variety of backgrounds—Armenian, Kurdish, Yazidi, and more—but they shared a common concern about developments in Turkey, including the crackdown on political opposition and free speech in that country and Turkey’s continued denial of the Armenian genocide.

About a mile away, Turkey’s President, Tayyip Erdogan was received warmly by President Trump at the White House, with no mention of Turkey’s human rights abuses and growing authoritarianism. The protesters felt, and rightly so, that they had to exercise their First Amendment rights and raise their voices in dissent, the very dissent which has been violently squelched by Erdogan in his own country.

What happened next was a chaotic and violent confrontation that left 11 people injured, 2 of whom required hospitalization. Tensions were already high, with pro-Turkish counter-protesters outside the residence scuffling with protesters. When Erdogan and his entourage arrived, the situation quickly spiraled out of control. As he exited his car, observing the protests, Erdogan can be seen on video speaking briefly to his security detail, and soon thereafter, several of these men, some of them armed with handguns, rushed past D.C. police officers to violently confront protesters, causing several injuries.

The images that you see to my right are indelible and bloody. A Kurdish woman was put in a choke hold and told by the dark-suited man who attacked her that he was going to kill her. Protesters, men and women alike, were knocked to the ground and assaulted with kicks to the face and torso. This was not a scuffle. It was a full-fledged assault by professional thugs on a peaceful protest. Such scenes have become common in Turkey, where state-sponsored violence and repression have become the chief instrument to cement Erdogan’s power.

Selahattin Demirtas was, until recently, the leader of the Kurdish HDP party and someone I had the honor to meet 2 years ago, and now he sits in prison as prosecutors seek to sentence him to 143 years of confinement.

Turkey has become the world’s leading jailer of journalists, most recently adding French photojournalist Mathias Depardon, held in solitary confinement and without charge, to the ranks of 81 journalists currently imprisoned.

Mr. Speaker, Erdogan cannot export the violent repression he visits on his own citizens to our streets. The violence of May 16 can’t go unanswered or forgotten.

Yesterday the House unanimously passed H. Res. 354, condemning the attacks and calling on the administration to pursue justice and hold those who carried out these attacks responsible, whether they be Turkish or not.

This is a good start, but it cannot be the end. The D.C. police department is carrying out an investigation into the attacks, and ultimately they will require cooperation from Turkish authorities in identifying those responsible. Nothing that Turkey has done so far indicates that that cooperation will be forthcoming, and indeed, rather than show even the slightest contrition after their security forces assaulted Americans, authorities in Ankara instead summoned the U.S. Ambassador to lodge a complaint against the United States and police officers who sought to keep the peace. The message from Turkey is as clear as day: We can do as we please whether at home to our own citizens or on your own American soil.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to affirm that we will not allow Turkey to beat innocent protesters on the streets of our Nation’s capital. We will continue to pursue justice and to make clear that America will always stand up for the right of peaceful and free expression.
THE NEED FOR FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the importance of the U.S. International Affairs Budget for America’s economic prosperity. Recently, more than 220 leaders from America’s business community, from Fortune 500 companies to local chambers of commerce, wrote to Secretary of State Tillerson about the strategic investments in development and diplomacy that advance America’s interests overseas and support jobs at home.

I am particularly proud that the CEOs of Land O’Lakes and Cargill—two Minnesota-based companies—helped lead this critical effort. Minnesota businesses understand they need the support of America’s diplomats and development professionals at the State Department and USAID in the international marketplace to succeed.

For less than 1 percent of the Federal budget, our diplomats and development workers help create good governance and stability in developing countries around the world. These efforts enable their economies to grow, creating new markets for American goods in a highly competitive global marketplace.

With 95 percent of the world’s consumers living outside of our borders, some of our fastest growing economies are in developing countries. Currently, 41 million American jobs depend on international trade, including 800,000 in the great State of Minnesota. We simply can’t afford to disengage from the world. We also know that individuals who experience economic growth and trade with one another prefer peace over conflict.

If the United States is to remain an economic powerhouse that continues to create well-paying jobs here at home, we must invest in our diplomatic and development professionals at the State Department and USAID in the international marketplace to succeed. If we don’t, our economic competitors and, God forbid, our enemies certainly will.

I am proud today to honor the achievements of two Minnesota districts. Scott Glew of Elk River and Emmanuel Oppong of St. Cloud have received Bush Fellowships.

During his service in the Army National Guard, Scott was deeply affected by the human suffering he witnessed. That is why, in his current job as an educator, Scott is determined to teach his students about global conflicts. He has advocated for making social studies a main component of our students’ curriculum. With his fellowship, Scott plans to expand and improve upon our education curriculum.

Mr. Oppong is originally from Ghana and knows firsthand that mental health is not a priority for many cultures. That is why he works as a counselor for immigrants and refugees dealing with culture shock and trauma. With his fellowship, Emmanuel plans to learn how to raise awareness of mental health issues and implement education plans to improve the health and well-being of our communities.

I am deeply impressed with these individuals and their commitment to the common good, and I wish them well as they pursue their goals.

AN INCREDIBLE GOLD STAR

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Ally Highaa, a student at Sartell High School. Recently, Ally completed a project that has helped elementary students at St. Francis Xavier Elementary School by pairing them with high school and college students for weekly tutoring sessions. The project has been incredibly successful.

Due to the success of her project, Ally received a Gold Award from the Girl Scouts. This is the highest award the Girl Scouts has to offer. It is no coincidence that Ally has become such a civic-minded young woman, as she is a fourth-generation Girl Scout. In fact, Ally’s mother received the Gold Award in 1985.

Congratulations, Ally. We are proud of you and we are looking forward to your bright future and continued success.

HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

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

Mr. GUTRIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, we waste a lot of time in the House Judiciary Committee passing bills we have already passed year after year that go nowhere. But now evidence is growing that our elections were interfered with by a foreign adversary, evidence that the President and Attorney General have been less than truthful about their subordinates, his family; but from the House Judiciary Committee, we have heard exactly nothing, not a peep, not a hearing or a subpoena, nada, zip, nothing. Just crickets.

When I joined the Judiciary Committee recognizing something about how the committee has jurisdiction over the enforcement of laws, the courts, the conduct of the executive branch, especially when it comes to law enforcement agencies like the FBI, Justice Department entities that may or may not be criminal.

And guess what. I was right. You need look no further than the committee’s website, where it proudly proclaims: “The mighty agenda has frequently placed it in a central role in American politics, most notably during its consideration of impeachment charges against Presidents of the United States in both 1974 and 1999.”

So with all due respect to the Intelligence Committee, the Oversight Committee, and our colleagues in the Senate, it is the Judiciary Committee in the House where impeachment begins. We are like the grand jury of the House of Representatives when it comes to impeachment.

Robert Mueller, the former FBI Director investigating the President, will not be able to indict him while he is President no matter what he uncovers. Most legal scholars argue a sitting President cannot be indicted in criminal court.

So it is the Judiciary Committee that will bring charges if there is evidence of “Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors,” as provided in Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution.

But here we are with evidence that the Attorney General lied to a committee of Congress about his contacts with senior Russian officials and lied on his security clearance application about contacts with Russian officials who are suspected of involvement in covert espionage activities, with evidence that hacking and other activities, in fact, took place directed by Russia. And nothing from the Judiciary Committee.

The Attorney General publicly recused himself from any matters at the Justice Department related to the investigation of Russia contacts, but the Attorney General played a role in the firing of FBI Director James Comey. And we know now, because the President said so, that the firing of Comey, the FBI Director that was investigating him, was done because the...
President said he was “under great pressure” from the Russia investigation. And still nothing from the Judiciary Committee.

Now, let’s go back to those two dates when the Judiciary Committee says we played a role in American politics. In 1974, we had a criminal conspiracy that involved tampering with elections that went all the way to the Oval Office. It involved firing senior Justice Department officials who were part of the investigation. They asked the American community to dis- credit those investigations in 1974. And there were secretly recorded conversa- tions.

Sound familiar? President Nixon soon resigned because he knew what was coming.

In 1998, the issue of whether the President of the United States had lied to a grand jury about an extramarital sexual encounter with a consenting adult woman. That is what that was about. House Judiciary Chairman Henry Hyde of the great State of Illinois, who, as it turned out, knew a thing or two about extra- marital sexual encounters with con- senting adults, passed four Articles of Impeachment along an almost exclu- sively party-line vote. An impeach- ment trial was held in the Senate, which became an epic embarrassment to the Republican Party and to this body. But now, given all of the evi- dence of sectoral tampering, the ap- parent efforts to cover it up, the ac- tions of the President and the Attorney General to deflect and derail investiga- tions, that, to me and to others, ap- pears to be attempts at or actual ob- struction of justice.

From the committee of jurisdiction that is supposed to be in charge and taking action, what do we have? Not a peep, not a hearing, not a subpoena, nada, zip, nothing. Just crickets.

Mr. Speaker, that has got to change, and I suspect it will, because it has to. The Constitution says it has to.

Judiciary Committee, it is time to act and fulfill your constitutional re- sponsibilities.

PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Trump on his decision to withdraw from the Paris climate accord.

For emphasis, the Paris climate accor- d is not now and never has been a treaty. It is an agreement that binds the United States of America because it was never ratified by Congress.

More specifically, the Paris climate accord, a treaty, was never ratified by the Senate pursuant to Article II, section 2 of the United States Constitution.

Rather, in yet another example of disdains for America’s constitutional Republic, the Obama administration refused to seek Senate approval of the treaty.

By declining to move forward on a poorly negotiated bad deal, President Trump kept his promise to the American people at first.

Lest there be any doubt, the Paris climate accord intentionally hurt America to the benefit of competitor nations. In a global redistribution of the wealth scheme, the Paris climate accord called for America to give away tens of billions of dollars to other countries. That is tens of billions of additional taxpayer dollars on top of America’s existing foreign aid give- aways. That is money America does not have, has to borrow to get, and cannot afford to pay back. That is nuts.

America must stop borrowing money to send overseas to help other coun- tries take jobs from Americans. Is that really so hard for the left to under- stand?

The Paris climate accord undermined America’s economy by putting Amer- ican employees at a competitive dis- advantage. By way of but one example, a comprehensive new study prepared by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development estimates that the Paris climate accord could cost the American economy $3 trillion in gross domestic product and 6.5 mil- lion industrial sector jobs over the next two decades.

As President Trump is right, America must lead by putting America’s na- tional interests first. The Paris climate accord failed to do that.

By way of example, under the Paris climate accord, China and India, two of the biggest and worst polluters on Earth, have no new air pollution con- trol obligations until 2030, at the ear- liest.

Contrast the abysmal environmental record of China and India with that of America called let’s be clear, without a Paris climate accord, America’s carbon dioxide emissions have been and are being reduced. For example, between the years 2000 and 2014, the United States reduced its carbon dioxide emis- sions by more than 18 percent.

Further, over the past 50 years, America has been the world’s environ- mental leader. No country on Earth has done more to reduce pollution by properly disposing of hazardous waste. That 50-year record is compelling evidence that America’s focus on being good environmental stewards will continue, with or without the Paris climate accord. That is world leadership.

I know of nothing that says we are going to stop being the world’s envi- ronmental leader. That 50-year record is also compelling evidence that America can and will lead on our own with- out hamstringing ourselves with a burdensome, one-sided Paris cli- mate accord that reduces America’s wealth while costing struggling Amer- ican families their jobs.

In summary, I am proud that Presi- dent Trump puts America first. Amer- ica should not and must not yield even a smidgen of our national sovereignty to the dictates of other, lesser nations. Despite liberal climate-scare and so- cialist Democrat hysteria to the con- trary, America has been and is, by al- most every standard, the greatest Na- tion in world history.

With an America First attitude, America will continue its 75-year streak as the greatest Nation in the history of the world, second to none.

EXTEND HAITIAN TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 6- month extension for Haitian temporary protected status recipients living in the United States, and for whom I be- lieve our country should offer perma- nent residency. Temporary protected status, also known as TPS, offers forms of relief from removal under changing living conditions.

In 2010, Haiti was struck by the worst earthquake in the past 200 years, kill- ing more than 160,000 people and displacing close to 1.5 million.

The United States played an intri- cate role in bringing some of the Hai- tians to the United States, providing them with a safe haven, because that is what we do.

Booker Washington captured well the importance of assisting people in need when he said: “The highest test of the civilization of any race is in its will- ingness to extend a helping hand to the less fortunate.” With this in mind, America should move the temporary protected status to permanent resi- dency.

Return of the Haitian natives would only continue to set back the progress Haiti has made. The country of Haiti continues to feel the ramifications of the 2010 earthquake. Tens of thousands of people sleep in the streets or under plastic sheets in makeshift camps. The conditions that Haitians endure in the country has led to the spread of dis- ease, which has become a major con- cern. The cholera epidemic has affected nearly 200,000 Haitians, killing over 9,000. Cholera is primarily found in countries with inadequate access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene. In short, the quality of living in Haiti has created a need for a better life.

The economic disparity, extreme poverty, and underdevelopment of Haiti continues to loom. Though it is an island nation with rich culture, Haiti remains the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. Among the 9 million people who reside in Haiti, over half of them live on less than a dollar a day. While in the United States, people continue to contribute to our economy,
our diversity, and to our ever-evolving culture. This embodies the epistle of a mutualistic relationship.

The people of Haiti and the United States have had a long and complex relationship dating back to pre-slavery days. Our cultures and our respective histories, beliefs, and destinies are deeply intertwined.

I greatly urge my colleagues to support the permanent extension of Haitians being protected from mass deportation. For 7 years, these Haitians have greatly benefitted the American communities of which they have been a part. To pull them away from these communities at such a pivotal point in both the United States' and Haiti's history would equate to nothing short of gross negligence. Let us not neglect the principle of which our Nation was founded upon and continue to assume the role of our predecessors. Help those who are less fortunate.

### VENEZUELA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 months alone, reports indicate that nearly 3,000 Venezuelans have been jailed and 69 have been killed by the regime. Peaceful protests have led Venezuelan strongman Nicolas Maduro to issue a decree to convene a constituent National Assembly, what he calls a constituent, in order to rewrite Venezuela's constitution.

But as we all know, Mr. Speaker, Maduro is nothing more. This is just another attempt to undermine and discredit the current democratically elected legislature in the National Assembly. Another attempt of a power grab which seeks to consolidate more power around the executive and possibly rewrite the constitution to favor only one individual: Nicolas Maduro. Another attempt to pull a fast one over some in the international community who may make the mistake and call this weak and dangerous gesture progress.

But we know the truth. This is not progress. In fact, this is a major setback to democracy. Maduro is once again trying to delay the inevitable: free, fair, transparent, and democratic elections in Venezuela under the supervision of credible international observers.

Making matters worse, Goldman Sachs is also adding to the Venezuelan people’s misery. Last week, the investment bank bought $2.8 billion in Venezuelan bonds not only providing the Maduro regime a lifeline in the short term but saddling the Venezuelan people with crippling debt repayments in the long term.

When, not if, a democratically elected president comes to the Venezuelan people, they will be stuck with the bill and face the responsibility to pay for this debt.

With so many Venezuelans lacking basic goods, including food, many have taken to calling these bonds hunger bonds, as the regime lines its own pockets and the Venezuelan people continue to suffer.

This is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker. Venezuela's pervasive corruption means any infusion of cash like Goldman Sachs will not benefit the people of Venezuela who desperately need it. Instead, Maduro and his thugs fill their coffers and use the cash to abuse the Venezuelan people and use it to stay in power.

Venezuela's state-owned oil company, PDVSA, was already sanctioned in the year 2011, for helping Iran avoid its own sanctions. Venezuela's Tarek El Aissami, second in command to Maduro, was sanctioned by our U.S. Treasury Department early this year under the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act. Can you imagine? The regime's longstanding ties to drug trafficking and other illicit activities are only now being exposed, and U.S. businesses should be avoiding deals with Maduro like the plague.

But the private sector is not the only one aiding the Maduro regime. Sadly, the U.S. government is also helping prop up the regime. How? By allowing purchases of Venezuelan oil. This keeps Maduro afloat. In 2016, Venezuela remained the third largest foreign crude oil supplier to the United States behind Canada and Saudi Arabia. In 2016, oil exports from Venezuela were valued at $10.5 billion. During the first 3 months of 2017, value of oil exports from Venezuela to the United States was already worth $3.5 billion. Financial transactions like these made to Maduro or any other despotic regime should be prevented.

We have a moral obligation to respect the suffering needs of the Venezuelan people and help alleviate this suffering.

### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the foundation of healthy living and healthy communities: our food, which comes from our farms.

This month is both National Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Month and National Dairy Month. Although we should bring attention to the importance of eating these nutrient-rich foods, dairy and fresh vegetables play a much larger role, as we know, in the health of our communities and our country, and they do so not just by providing us food.

In California, we know that dairy products and fresh fruits and vegetables are an integral part of our healthy community and a strong economy. Our farmers also provide economic development in other sectors as businesses are created and expand, investments are made, and innovations arise to support the needs of these farmers and farm communities.

But the economic contributions of California agriculture—American agriculture—do not end at our borders. In California, we produce half of the Nation's fruits and vegetables, and we are the top milk producing State in the Nation. The men and women who own and work on these farms provide both nutritious food for our families and create thousands of jobs across the country.

We know we must make sure that our farmers have the tools to do so, but our farmers need a reliable source of water, a legal and stable workforce, and access to export markets, in other words, fair trade agreements.

We must also ensure that American agriculture is sustainable. We must continue to ensure that it is sustainable for our well-being and the well-being of future generations to come because the bottom line does not come from a grocery store. Food comes from our farms and the land that they farm.

Our food supply is a national security issue, but it never really gets looked at in that light. So by investing in critical new programs and infrastructure projects—by ensuring that our farmers have the water, the workforce, and the access to foreign markets—we are not only investing in our farms, but we are investing in the long-term health and security of our Nation.

What is more, people don’t realize it, but less than 3 percent of our Nation’s population is directly involved in the
production of food and fiber. This is part of the amazing development of American agriculture. So equally crucial for the sustainability of American agriculture are our export markets and our trade agreements. That means improving NAFTA, continuing to engage with our allies, and not turning our back on Asia.

In fiscal year 2016, the United States exported $129 billion worth of agricultural products. We not only feed our Nation every night, but we grow more than enough to export abroad. We must maintain good relations with our top trade partners and continue to lower trade barriers to existing and new foreign markets.

So let's not just focus on healthy eating during National Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Month and National Dairy Month; let's take the opportunity to discuss how we will work together to ensure that our farmers, ranchers, and dairymen and -women can continue to continue to not only to America’s dinner tables, but to our communities and to our economy. The health and security of our Nation depends on it.

CONGRATULATING ANANYA VINAY

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, let me also give a shout-out to Ananya Vinay, the 2017 National Spelling Bee champion, from Fresno, California. We are all proud of her accomplishments. Obviously, this young lady has a great future ahead of her.

Congratulations, once again, on becoming the 2017 National Spelling Bee champion.

HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF ROY HERTEL

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of my friend Roy Hertel, who passed away Thursday, May 25, at the age of 68.

Roy was a true public servant and community leader in Montgomery County, Illinois. Throughout his life and career, he held many roles in the region and had an immeasurable impact on countless lives, including mine.

As a teacher, circuit clerk, county board chairman, and administrator for the county’s Department of Health and Human Services in the State of Illinois, Roy’s career was defined by his dedication to bettering the lives of those not only in Montgomery County, but also throughout central Illinois.

His involvement in the region went far beyond his career. Roy was an active member of the Disciples of Christ in Hillsboro; a 45-year member of the Lions Club, where he had held all offices, the district lieutenant governor and district governor in 1991 and 1992; a member of the Mt. Moriah Masonic Lodge Number 51 A.F. & A.M. in Hillsboro; president of the Circuit Clerk’s Association; a member of the Hillsboro Moose Lodge Number 1377; part of the Hillsboro Sports Association; and served as chairman, until his death, of the Montgomery County Board.

Roy also served as a coach for both youth baseball and soccer leagues, and was a dedicated fan and supporter of every sports team he played on and every child played on in Hillsboro, Illinois. He was especially fond of the Hillsboro Junior High Dragons that his son started on, clear up until his son played for the Gateway Grizzlies.

My wife Nanci and the rest of Roy’s family and friends, as central Illinois has lost a leader whose presence will be tremendously missed.

REFORM OUR BROKEN MILITARY JUSTICE SYSTEM

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 7 years, I have spoken out against the broken military justice system that allows commanders to decide how sexual assaults and other criminal offenses are prosecuted under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Our servicemembers are stuck in a world where their fates rest within the chain of command, where bias is king and justice often a jester.

Today, I stand here sick at heart that, once again, a rape conviction has been overturned because of the broken military justice system. In this instance, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces threw out Airman Rodney Boyce’s rape and assault conviction because of the involvement of Lieutenant General Craig Franklin, who referred the case to court-martial.

This all came about because, in 2013, General Franklin was admonished by his superiors for tossing out the aggravated sexual assault conviction of a fellow F-16 pilot, a unanimous decision by a jury of his peers. Certainly, a general should not have the power to overturn the findings of a court of law simply because he thinks his buddy could not possibly have committed the sexual assault.

But because Franklin was appropriately admonished for this abuse of power, the U.S. Court of Appeals found that his subsequent decision to move forward with an entirely separate Boyce case constituted unlawful command influence.

This is made more ridiculous by two facts: first, the military judge during the actual trial found no evidence of unlawful command influence; second, the appeals court that threw out the Boyce case also did not find evidence of unlawful command influence, just the “appearance” of it.

So, apparently, unlawful command influence is like pornography: there is no definition, but judges know it when they see it.

Colleagues, it is past time to reform this unjust system that ignores jury decisions on the whim of a convening authority. The military must remove the power to decide whether or not to prosecute sexual assault cases from the chain of command and give the authority to independent military prosecutors.

I have met with countless survivors who have suffered in unique and horrifying ways. There is a hauntingly clear pattern to nearly all of their experiences: the perpetrator was let off the hook and the victim/fellow service-member was revictimized by an unjust system, all at the hands of the chain of command that is supposed to be there to protect and defend them.

The sense of betrayal by their command is marrow deep and life altering. Many describe the feelings of this betrayal more akin to a violation at the hands of a family member rather than a boss or coworker.

All that we need to do is to allow trained and experienced lawyers in the military to make a legal judgment about a crime. This in no way impacts the commander’s authority. It simply gives servicemembers what we civilians take for granted—having a trained and impartial system to decide whether to move forward with serious charges of sexual assault.

Our servicemembers deserve and need a system that they can trust to be fair and impartial. Letting a convicted rapist walk free because of a mere appearance of unlawful command influence—forget the fact that he was, in fact, convicted of the assault—shows just how deep the problem runs.

As this case shows, the perception and the reality is that commanders with a built-in conflict of interest and with little or no legal training are deciding whether to move forward to trial. They make this decision not solely based on legal reasoning, but a myriad of other factors—like how well they fly a jet or how well they are liked by others—that should not be injected into the decisionmaking.

Our servicemembers deserve and need a system that they can trust to be fair and impartial. We have the power and duty to fundamentally reform the system to ensure that they are treated with a level of fairness that befits their sacrifice and service.

Mr. Speaker, the words of one military servicemember still haunt me and ring in my ears, when she said to me:

I joined the military to fight the enemy. I never thought that he would be right next to me.

HONORING THE AMERICAN FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an often overlooked and sometimes undervalued American hero: the American farmer.

The American farmer has been working the land since before the founding
of this country. Early settlers quickly discovered that America is endowed with abundant natural resources, rich soil, and temperate conditions that provide a solid foundation for a vibrant agrarian economy.

Fast-forward a few hundred years, and today the United States is the number one exporter of agricultural products in the world. In fact, farming accounts for over $163 billion each year. This production not only helps make our GDP the highest in the world, but it also helps feed billions worldwide, often in the most hard-to-reach places where food insecurity and malnutrition are chronic problems.

According to the most recent data from the USDA, family farms account for 99 percent of all farms in the U.S. and 89 percent of America’s agricultural production. Ninety percent of the farms in the U.S. are considered small, and these small farms account for the vast majority of American farmers. This includes supporting the U.S. production in Indiana supports over 245,000 jobs, and corn, soybeans, hogs, poultry, and dairy have a combined $10 billion in economic impact statewide. Simply put, agriculture is a big deal in Indiana, and the Hoosier farmer does all of the heavy lifting.

Safe, affordable food is important to our national security, and a reliable, sustainable food source is crucial to safeguarding public health while preserving economic independence. That is why we should support our Nation’s agricultural producers in every way that we can.

This includes supporting the U.S. crop insurance program, which provides an important safety net to farmers who face risks with which we must learn to live. The program is designed to support the American farmer while wasting less and producing more. It is a framework, a roadmap to get the pollution reductions started, to ensure a safe, sustainable, and economically prosperous future. It supports our economic model built for the long haul, one that protects lives and livelihoods, while wasting less and producing more. These are irrefutable costs to leaving the Paris Agreement.

By removing us from the agreement, the President isn’t canceling it. He is simply ensuring that we are the ones who will be left behind as the world moves forward without us. We will be left behind with the cost of polluted air, unsafe drinking water, rising health care costs, increased health care costs, and shrinking, uncompetitive fossil fuel industries that imperil their workers and drag the economy down.

It will cost us standing as a world leader in innovation as other countries step forward to fill the void that we have created and realize the benefits of clean-energy jobs, reliable public transit, and stable supply chains for businesses.

They understand that climate change affects us all, no matter when or whether we are in the middle of a major city or on the top of the great Rocky Mountains.

The 194 nations that remain in the Paris Agreement will continue to act, not because the U.S. once told them to do so, but because it is the right thing to do and it is in their best interest from economic gain and public health to national security and stewardship.

I encourage everyone to go visit the mountains. Go spend a week with the deeply moved men and women of the National Park Service who have dedicated their lives to understanding and protecting America’s precious natural
places. Then come back here, and I guarantee that you will understand why we need to act.

INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

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

Mr. Himes. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we are told that this week is Infrastructure Week. After four contentious months of a new President, and all that has been contained in those 4 months, I actually saw a glimmer of hope and possibility around the idea that we might finally come together to do something for our constituents in an area that they tell us is absolutely essential.

I worry, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to let this opportunity be lost in the political roll that is already consuming this idea of a week that we devote to infrastructure.

So I want to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and say, let’s not let this idea go. It is too important. The improvement of our roadways and our bridges, our airports, and our railways is absolutely essential to the quality of life of every single constituent at every single Member of this House.

As I talk to the business leaders in my district, the fact that they have a challenge in moving their people and their goods, that sometimes getting to work and these propositions, are the things that hold them back.

I know that the Republicans and the Democrats disagree on an awful lot, but we have to be able to agree on the fundamental notion that if we don’t have a functioning transportation infrastructure, if our airplanes and ships and rails and cars don’t move well, this country cannot be great, and our economy will be damaged.

These last 4 months have been pretty rough. We got—kicked off with a repeal of the Affordable Care Act; and I understand that my Republican friends had been promising that for years, but it was a brutal experience. It failed on the floor. The American public hates the bill that so many of my Republican friends were cajoled into voting for, much to their political peril.

There was an alternative start to this Presidency. There was this fantasy alternative start that has the President, his inauguration, saying to the American people: I know that this campaign was tough and the rhetoric was as ugly as it ever has been in an American campaign, but we are going to come together now, in January of 2017, to reestablish the Nation, literally, and our nation, literally means we are going to work together to rebuild the infrastructure of this country.

Sadly, that is an alternate reality that did not happen, and so we are consumed in Twitter feuds and partisanship and some of the most difficult to pass legislation that ultimately is not likely to become law, but which will continue to split the parties in this Chamber.

It is not too late, though. Mr. Speaker, I think we can still turn this around.

I have the privilege of chairing the New Democrat Coalition, 61 Democratic Members who, as challenged as they feel by the President’s positions and behavior, are hoping for that moment when we can work with Republicans, when we can get something done with this President that will be meaningful to our constituents. And I know they, as many other Democrats, will be there for that conversation.

To my conservative, even to my Freedom Caucus friends, there is nothing more conservative than the idea that you keep your house in order; that you invest so that your children can have the kind of prosperity that we were able to experience.

And to the President, I would say: Sir, you seem to be a builder. You seem to have recognized the need for this kind of program when you promised a $1 trillion infrastructure investment. And, sir, I would say, if you look at some of our highways that were built in the 1950s, at the entrance ramp to those highways you will see a sign that says the Dwight D. Eisenhower Interstate Highway System. Sir, there is no reason why those signs couldn’t have your name on them.

So, Mr. Speaker, this problem is so urgent, it is so potentially bipartisan in its solution, that I want to close with the observation that we need to lift this out of the partisan maze and observe, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday we celebrated the Greatest Generation because, 73 years ago yesterday, they stormed the beaches of Normandy. That is part of why we call them the Greatest Generation. But the other reason is that is part of why we call them the Greatest Generation. They built our country.

And now that generation looks at us and they have a question, and that question is: What will you do with that legacy that we built for you?

Mr. Speaker, let’s answer that question in a way that will make them proud.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.
jobs. I am grateful for President Trump's vision to create jobs for Americans.

President Trump has been clear: his first priority is jobs. Sadly, job-destroying regulations from the Paris Agreement would prevent American jobs while having negative long-term achievement for American families.

Additionally, the Paris Agreement constitutes a treaty, a treaty that should have been submitted for approval to the Senate. Instead, the former administration unconstitutionally adopted the treaty by executive order.

The best way to achieve a cleaner environment is through limited government and free market economic growth, creating jobs—not Big Government mandates with higher taxes, destroying jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our sympathy to the citizens of London on the murderous terrorist attacks Saturday, as we cherish our shared heritage of D-Day to liberate Europe for freedom.

MERICARE

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, a major western New York health insurance provider announced today that they are seeking an almost 50 percent increase in health insurance premiums next year. They cite rising medical and drug costs as reasons for seeking this increase.

Medicare is the most successful and popular healthcare system in America. With low administrative costs and high-quality outcomes, Americans ages 65 to 68 should be able to buy in, at their own expense, to Medicare. Under this plan, Medicare could add 10 million more Americans, using the leverage of 67 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this is real leverage to drive down healthcare costs and drive up the quality of that coverage. With real patient protections and full and affordable coverage for preexisting diseases like cancer and diabetes, Medicare should be an option for Americans 50 to 65 years old.

RECOGNIZING EMILY AND MICHAEL BROADBRIDGE

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about some incredible young people back home in Michigan. Meet Emily and Michael Broadbridge. Emily is a sixth grader and Michael is a first grader in Macomb County.

This is no ordinary lemonade stand. Instead of simply making money for themselves, Emily and Michael are donating all the money they earn to the Homeless Education Project, which provides school supplies and clothes for homeless students in Macomb County.

Emily held her first lemonade stand on National Lemonade Day in 2011—yes, there is one—when she was just 5. Her parents thought it would be a good lesson for her, but it became so much more when she decided on her own to donate her proceeds to charity. Since then, Emily and her brother, Michael, have raised over $13,000 for the Homeless Education Project. They expect to raise $7,000 this year.

Emily and Michael have selflessly put others' needs before their own. I am proud to recognize them and their example today as role models for our community.

“WRONG” CHOICE ACT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this week the House considers the “Wrong” CHOICE Act, so I have one question for this body: Has this House completely forgotten how much pain the housing crisis that triggered the Great Recession has caused the American people? Elephant million people lost their homes; 8 million Americans lost their jobs; people lost their life savings—and that was not some sort of an accident. It was the effect of bad policy that allowed financial institutions to prey upon unwitting customers and take everything that they have worked for. That is what precipitated this crisis. It wasn’t a storm. It was bad policy.

And so what do we have? A bill that will take us right back to where we were, to the conditions that caused the financial crisis in the first place, and take the cop off the beat, essentially eliminating the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to protect people. We cannot do this. Let’s reject this bill.

SUPPORTING THE FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act, replacing the harmful Dodd-Frank Act, with reforms that help all Americans.

The CHOICE Act keeps the promise to my constituents to remove Obama-era regulations, increase choice for consumers in my community, and impose the toughest penalties in history for financial fraud.

Strong communities like the ones I represent in north Texas are based on the strength of their local businesses. Under Dodd-Frank, America loses an average of one community bank every day. The Financial CHOICE Act will help businesses on Main Street reform business on Wall Street and fuel economic growth throughout the country. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 10.

REMEMBERING JACK O’NEILL

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Jack O’Neill, a Santa Cruz resident, a cultural icon, and a surfing legend. Jack passed away last week at 94 years young. There has been a great amount of love for this man and a great amount of appreciation for what this man did.

After serving in the U.S. Navy, he moved to Santa Cruz, where he loved surfing in its cold waters, so much so that he was quoted as saying: “When you get screwed up, just jump in the ocean and everything is all right.”

Jack was a trailblazer not just in the ocean, but in life. As a father of seven and grandfather of six, he understood how important it was to preserve our ocean for our children.

He was instrumental in designating Santa Cruz as a world surfing reserve, one of only four locations in the world that preserve surf spots and their surrounding environment.

He created the O’Neill Sea Odyssey, an educational program on a 65-foot-long catamaran that teaches our children how to be stewards of the ocean.

Jack not only bestowed upon us the wetsuit and year-round surfing, he left a legacy for our children to understand that being in and around the ocean really can make everything all right. For that, I thank and I honor Jack O’Neill.

THE BATTLE OF MIDWAY

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Chaplain mentioned, in prayer a few minutes ago, the U.S. Navy, forever changing the course of history. Victory in this battle allowed the United States and its allies to go on offense for the duration of the war. This was a real turning point in World War II.

The Japanese came to the battle from June 4 to June 7, 1942, with the largest armada they had ever assembled and the intention to finally defeat
Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, when President Trump withdrew from the Paris climate accord last week, I was in Germany meeting with some of that country’s top officials, legislators, and business leaders. In our conversations, many of my German counterparts rightly emphasized that climate change is a major world threat, with potential to cause widespread and long-lasting damage if not acted upon.

So the news of President Trump’s unilateral decision drew sharp criticism from our long-time allies as we were considering withdrawal as America ceding international leadership and turning its back on the world.

Indeed, withdrawing from the Paris climate accord reduces our ability to help shape a solution to the climate change crisis and retreats from our responsibility to serve as a global leader. It also ignores the role we, here in the United States, play in contributing to climate change.

I stand in strong support of American businesses and State and local leaders across our country who see beyond the shortsighted approach of this decision and will remain committed to furthering the goals of the Paris accord.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

At the same time, we are facing a crisis in the manufacturing sector and in the rebuilding of our industrial base.

Incentives matter, Mr. Speaker, and this bill gives banks a huge incentive to load up on risk. We know what risk looks like. Eleven million people lost their homes, the median family lost all their savings, and actually lets the big banks populates the White House. They run the Treasury. Now they want to deregulate Wall Street again with a so-called CHOICE Act.

With our mere three carriers to their 6 and 1/2 billion, with our naval officers’ un-canny ability to adapt and think on their feet led to our success and kept our country safe from the Axis powers.

I urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous bill and, instead, pass H.R. 790, the Return to Prudent Banking Act, which would reinstate a 21st-century Glass-Steagall Act.

DEFEATING THE ISIS ENEMY

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, under the cover of the Paris accord to pass legislation declaring our country safe from the Axis powers.

Incentives matter, Mr. Speaker, and this bill gives banks a huge incentive to load up on risk. We know what risk looks like. Eleven million people lost their homes, the median family lost all their savings, and actually lets the big banks populates the White House. They run the Treasury. Now they want to deregulate Wall Street again with a so-called CHOICE Act.

With our mere three carriers to their 6 and 1/2 billion, with our naval officers’ un-canny ability to adapt and think on their feet led to our success and kept our country safe from the Axis powers.

I urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous bill and, instead, pass H.R. 790, the Return to Prudent Banking Act, which would reinstate a 21st-century Glass-Steagall Act.
Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand shoulder to shoulder with our friends and allies in Great Britain, who have suffered three horrific terror attacks in a period of less than 3 months.

These attacks at the hands of Islamic State in Iraq and Syria are barbaric, evil, and must be condemned by the entire world. These cowards have used vehicles, knives, and bombs to rein terror down on London and Manchester, even targeting innocent young girls at a concert hall.

Radical Islamic extremism is a vile ideology that must be stampeded out at every corner of the world. This is a time for unity of purpose and strong leadership.

The United States, our NATO allies, and our allies in the Middle East must chart a unified course towards complete destruction of ISIS. As we begin to succeed in the fight, their resolve to attack us will only grow stronger, but we cannot be deterred.

Mr. Speaker, freedom and liberty must win over hatred and extremism. We must defeat this enemy, and this administration in its efforts to do so.

Mr. Speaker, freedom and liberty must win over hatred and extremism. We must defeat this enemy, and this administration in its efforts to do so.

To the students of the U.S. Virgin Islands, I pledge to continue in today's learning environment, but amidst the challenges we face, you stand strong. We appreciate all of your work.

As a representative in Congress for the Virgin Islands, I pledge to continue to support legislation and initiatives that make our children, teachers, and administrators a priority.

To the students of the U.S. Virgin Islands, I have a message for you: During these summer months, please take this time to continue to learn, participate in the Governor's reading challenge, find a new hobby, work, and please explore the natural wonder of our home, the Virgin Islands of the United States. Be safe, and best wishes to you all as you continue a productive educational journey. Have a safe and fun-filled summer.

Mr. Speaker, it is often difficult when Members represent different aspects or parties to really speak to what is right.

I just came from Europe, meeting with Europeans from a number of countries. I was passing through London in the backdrop of the heinous and tragic London Bridge incident. Many of us saw the courageous mayor of London speak to the people, along with national leadership.

So I must indicate my disappointment in the comments of the Commander in Chief of this Nation to bash time and time again Mayor Khan, a Muslim, who has stood against terrorism. Then, of course, the precipitous actions of firing Director Comey and the rumors of either firing or asking for the resignation of Attorney General Sessions gives me great pause for legislation like the Financial CHOICE Act that would take away the independent authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and make the head of that an appointee of the President, so the person who protects consumers will be able to be fired by this President.

With the words against the London mayor, the firing of Comey, and the threatening of Attorney General Sessions, I wonder whether or not we can tolerate any other authority given to this White House to be able to fire people who are to protect the rights of the American people, and to be able to stand for comments that undermine our allies and the friendships that we have established over the decades working to secure the American people. Let us think about it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:


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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 7, 2017, at 9:17 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1094.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REAPPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s reappointment pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 412, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development:

Mr. BEN Ray LUJAN, New Mexico

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 374 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 374 Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security, now printed on the resolution, shall be considered adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. A motion to recommit the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 374, which provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act, and makes in order one amendment.

H.R. 2213 is a commonsense bipartisan bill, introduced by Ms. MCSALLY from Arizona, that will help ensure we have sufficient Border Patrol agents to secure our border. At this point in
time, where we are facing tremendous challenges overseas, where we are facing tremendous national security challenges, our Customs and Border Protection is understaffed and unable to meet the congressionally mandated staffing levels for Customs officers and Border Patrol agents.

With these ever-increasing threats to our national security, it is vital that we ensure CBP can quickly hire capable and trustworthy individuals to secure our border. Currently, prospective officers and Border Patrol agents are required to undergo a background check that includes passing a polygraph test. This process has been very long and has drastically delayed the CBP’s ability to hire officers and Border Patrol agents.

H.R. 2213 simply provides a limited, voluntary exemption to the pre-employment polygraph requirement for State and local law enforcement officers that are in good standing and who have gone through a State and local law enforcement polygraph test, for Federal law enforcement officers who are in good standing, and members of the armed services or veterans who have received or who are eligible to receive an honorable discharge and have held a security clearance and undergone a thorough background check in the past 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this exemption is very narrow and only applies to men and women that we already trust to protect and defend us at home or abroad, and women who have already been through relevant security background checks. The CBP would not be required to use this waiver authority; and, if there is anything in any applicant’s history that warrants further investigation, the CBP Commissioner is fully authorized and encouraged to use a polygraph test to resolve any outstanding questions.

Mr. Speaker, for years, the CBP has struggled to attract and retain potential employees. There is no more urgent need that we have right now than securing our border and making sure we have the resources there to be able to do that job.

"1230"

H.R. 2213 is a commonsense approach that will help address this issue and ensure the CBP has the men and women it needs to ensure our borders and our Nation secure. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 2213, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), my friend, for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

H.R. 2213 would broaden the criteria for waiving the polygraph requirement for Border Patrol agents and applicants at U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

Under the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act, the Commissioner of the CBP would be permitted to waive polygraph requirements for certain State and law enforcement personnel who have passed a polygraph examination, Federal law enforcement agents who have passed a stringent background investigation, and veterans who have served in the military who have held a security clearance and passed a background check.

Mr. Speaker, we understand the importance of ensuring that our Federal officers and agents are operating at full capacity, but there are other big-ticket items that we are ignoring in this institution. So I ask: Where is the Republican agenda?

With control of both Chambers of Congress and the White House, my colleagues across the aisle have made it through nearly half of their first year in power without a single major legislative achievement. It appears that President Donald John Trump is more interested in slashing old policies than proposing new ones.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump and congressional Republicans have yet to put forward the promised $1 trillion infrastructure package. Voters are still waiting in vain for slashing tax cuts promised to them during the campaign.

The American people have yet to see a single jobs bill, let alone the super-secret plan to defeat ISIS. And looming over this long to-do list is the investigations into Russia’s blatant attempts to interfere in our election, an issue that many of my Republican colleagues seem more than happy to ignore.

Instead, President Donald John Trump and my friends across the aisle have spent their time rolling back protections for workers, consumers, teachers, students, and the environment.

Instead of tackling a bipartisan spending deal, addressing budget cuts under sequestration, and avoiding debt default, Congress insists on dismantling the Affordable Care Act and replacing it with a plan that will raise deductibles, lessen coverage, and leave 23 million more people uninsured.

Mr. Speaker, there are still plenty of people without jobs in this country. We have plenty of families worried that they will be tossed off of their health insurance plan, and we have plenty of folks who are pleading with Congress to pass compassionate immigration reform.

Yet President Donald John Trump is tweeting about his travel ban and attacking London Mayor Sadiq Khan hours after a terrorist attack hit London which, sadly, killed seven people and injured more than 40.

Mr. Speaker, after being the antigovernment party—and I find it hypocritical that people in the administration are declaring that we are obstructionists. They gave, during that period of the previous President, obstruction absolutely new meaning.

After being the antigovernment party for so many years, it appears that the congressional Republicans have forgotten how to govern.

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

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

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

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

As someone who has spent their entire career and adult life in law enforcement, I know full well the importance of being able to hire quality men and women to provide for the security of our communities and our Nation at large.

H.R. 2213 simply provides the Border Patrol and U.S. Customs a tool in their
In 2015, the CBP Integrity Advisory Panel found that—and this is a quote—"arrests for corruption of CBP personnel far exceed, on a per capita basis, such arrests at other Federal law enforcement agencies."

In 2016, the same panel observed that "corrupt CBP law enforcement personnel pose a national security threat." And it recommended that the current polygraph test be expanded, not reduced.

Now, this bill allows for an exemption for local law enforcement and former members of the Armed Forces from the polygraph requirement. For example, if a polygraph has been taken in the prior 10 years, I think it is a mistake to think that that will protect us.

In fact, the Inspector General at DHS, John Roth, advises against this. This bill does not lower standards. It merely takes a commonsense approach to hiring by giving CBP the option not to duplicate a polygraph exam already completed by a highly qualified applicant's previous enforcement agency.

I represent the Port of Jacksonville, which moved 82 tons of cargo last year and is one of only 16 ports of call authorized to move military cargo through our national security operations.

It is absolutely vital that U.S. Customs and Border Protection be able to hire enough qualified officers to maintain the flow of commerce.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE). Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Rules Committee colleague for yielding. I am proud to support this rule and the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, last November, the American people sent a strong message: they want a secure southern border. Having a strong system of border security is critical to our national defense and the safety and the security of the American people. President Trump has asked us to get more boots on the ground protecting our border, and this bill is an important step in that process.

U.S. Border Patrol agencies are the ones serving on the front lines when it comes to border security. These hard-working men and women serve day and night at the border, at airports, and at sea and land ports in an effort to keep us safe. We should be grateful for their service and their sacrifice.

Unfortunately, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or CBP, is woefully understaffed. In fact, the numbers show that we are short 1,000 officers and 1,800 Border Patrol agents. This shortage is making it harder to secure the border and help keep bad actors out of our country.

That is where this bill comes in. It would amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to provide necessary discretionary waiver authority to the CBP Commissioner in an effort to reduce the staffing shortage. The bill specifically would provide the Commissioner with the authority to waive the polygraph examinations in three circumstances.

The polygraph exam would be waived for current State and local law enforcement officers who have already passed a polygraph examination, Federal law enforcement officers who have already passed a stringent background investigation, and veterans with at least 3 consecutive years in the military who have already passed a background check. These are three very tailored and specific circumstances, and these are exactly the
kind of men and women we want and need when it comes to border security positions.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the waiver authority granted under this bill is not mandatory. It will ultimately be the decision of the CBP Commissioner to decide on a strict case-by-case basis whether to issue a waiver. The Commissioner can order a polygraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.

The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner can still order a polygraph for any applicant they deem necessary.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that passed out of the Homeland Security Committee on a voice vote, and I urge bipartisan support here in the full House.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting a stronger and more robust border security system.

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

Mr. Speaker, we continue to be deeply concerned by revelations that Russia hacked last year's elections. In fact, just this week we learned that Russian military intelligence engaged in a monthlong cyber attack against our voting infrastructure, specifically targeting a voting software supplier and local election officials.

This most recent revelation comes on the back of earlier determinations by the intelligence community that Russia hacked the DNC and distributed fake news in order to sway the election in Donald Trump's favor. This has been made even more troublesome by the fact that Donald John Trump recently admitted that he fired FBI Director Comey over the Bureau's investigation into links between the Trump campaign and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the integrity of our electoral system is at stake. It is time the Republican-controlled Congress does its job and acts to defend our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan bill, H.R. 356, which would create a nonpartisan commission to investigate Russian interference into our 2016 election.

This marks the eighth time we have tried to bring this bill to the House floor. On the previous seven occasions, the Republican majority, regrettably, refused to allow the House to even debate this important legislation. But today, they will have yet another opportunity to redeem themselves. I hope they will finally put country ahead of party.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, we stand here today with a to-do list a mile long. As a result, we have much time to cross items off that list. There are only 30 working days before our 5-week August recess. That is not much time, but those of us on this side of the aisle stand ready to work in a bipartisan manner with our Republican colleagues in order to make sensible reforms to our Tax Code, our infrastructure and healthcare system, in short, to work hard for the American people, because that is what we were sent here to do.

It is far past time for my friends across the aisle to come to the table ready to work on behalf of the American people in a bipartisan manner. We on this side of the aisle continue to stand ready to do so, and I urge a "no" vote on the motion.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues from Florida for his participation in this debate today.

I think it is important for the record to be clear and to be accurate, Mr. Speaker. This House of Representatives, in the time that we have been in session, has been the most productive House during the first 100 days of a Presidency in 30 years.

I am sure that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may not want to agree to that. They may not want to acknowledge that because Speaker Pelosi held the record previously when she was Speaker, but I am very proud of that, that we have done a tremendous amount for the American people in the time that we have been in session.

We have overturned 14 Obama regulations in this Congress alone, which has had a tremendous impact on our constituents. We have already taken steps that will save them $3.7 billion in regulatory costs, 4.2 million hours in paperwork.

Mr. Speaker, when I think about the communities across my home State of Wyoming, this relief could not have come soon enough. We are in a position today to take on this important mission.

We have had threats growing around the world. We are living in a dangerous world. We are living in a world in which America's ability to defend and protect itself is under threat in a way that it has not been certainly since the end of the Cold War, and maybe even since World War II.

Defending and protecting this Nation, Mr. Speaker, will require, both, that we provide the resources our military needs to defend us so that we can, Mr. Speaker, get out from underneath the policies of the last eight years, but it also will require that we secure our border.

This bill today on the floor will provide the relief necessary for the CBP to do what is necessary to keep us safe. We have no greater responsibility than providing for our security.

I would remind the gentleman from Florida that this bill passed out of the Homeland Security Committee on a voice vote, on a bipartisan basis, with members from both sides of the aisle. It is crucially important that we take this step to provide the relief—and not mandatory relief, but the relief—that the CBP can use if it needs.
Mr. Speaker, as we discuss the range of accomplishments that we have had that I am very proud of in this Congress and the accomplishments still to come, I think that we have to also recognize that nothing is more important than the security of the Nation. This bill gets part of that right, making sure that the CBP can do its job. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of both the rule and H.R. 2213.

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

AN AMENDMENT DEBATE RESOLUTION OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS.

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

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 356) to establish the National Commission on Foreign Interference in the 2016 Election. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the substitute shall be laid aside. The previous question on the bill shall be considered as ordered. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the floor leader and the minority floor leader. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against the substitute shall be laid aside. The previous question on the bill shall be considered as ordered. The Speaker may, pursuant to clause 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 375 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 375
Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create a national opportunity for consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating hidden tape to access capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes. The vote on the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). The resolution is the same resolution that was offered from the Gentleman from Colorado and was not accepted. Therefore, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create a national opportunity for consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating hidden tape to access capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes. The vote on the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). The resolution is the same resolution that was offered from the Gentleman from Colorado and was not accepted. Therefore, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create a national opportunity for consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating hidden tape to access capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes. The vote on the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived.

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H.R. 10, Financial Choice Act of 2017.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 375 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 375
Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create a national opportunity for consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating hidden tape to access capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes. The vote on the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). The resolution is the same resolution that was offered from the Gentleman from Colorado and was not accepted. Therefore, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create a national opportunity for consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating hidden tape to access capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes. The vote on the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived.

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H.R. 10, Financial Choice Act of 2017.
structured process for debate and makes in order six amendments to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to return hope and opportunity to Main Street America through the Financial CHOICE Act legislation that puts the American economy at the very heart of our economy, ensuring that our financial system facilitates job creation, economic growth, and fairness.

Nearly 10 years ago, the American economy crumbled. The Great Recession of the late 2000s revealed that our financial system was fragile, and many Americans got the short end of the stick.

In 2010, Democrats passed H.R. 4173, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. They promised the bill would lift the American economy. They promised an end to Wall Street bailouts. They promised to protect consumers. Seven years later, we know that these promises never came true.

Due to Dodd-Frank’s excessive regulatory burden, big banks are getting bigger while small banks and credit unions are disappearing. There have only been six new bank charters since Dodd-Frank. This 10-year decline is really 170 on average per year before the bill. In fact, 43 percent of banks with assets under $100 million have disappeared.

Large banks survive because they can afford armies of lawyers to understand Dodd-Frank regulations. In 2010, Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein even suggested his bank would be among the biggest beneficiaries of Dodd-Frank. But for community banks with community budgets, the effects of the law have been devastating.

Dodd-Frank also failed to address the too-big-to-fail problem. Under the Dodd-Frank law, big banks are growing larger, and taxpayers are still responsible for bailing them out. Furthermore, Dodd-Frank has made access to banking and credit more difficult for average Americans. Since the passage of the bill, bank fees have increased and millions more Americans are now considered unbanked or underbanked.

Declining liquidity has limited access to credit for small businesses and the regulatory restrictions on mortgage hedges have pushed homeownership out of reach for the middle class. Seventy-two percent of community banks say that the Dodd-Frank regulations restrict their ability to offer mortgage loans.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the price we must pay to be a hopeful and prosperous nation. That is why I am here supporting the Financial CHOICE Act. It repeals Dodd-Frank, replacing the harmful law with reasonable regulations that ensure consumer protection, job growth, economic growth, and strong community banks.

The Financial CHOICE Act ends the costly over-regulation of small banks. It implements historically tough penalties on financial fraud and insider trading. It ends taxpayer-funded bailouts and creates new bankruptcy laws designed for failing banks. It is time that Congress put Main Street ahead of Wall Street.

The Financial CHOICE Act also reins in the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, a government agency that has increased predatory regulations of the financial industry but that has shown no accountability. The judicial branch has actually declared its structure unconstitutional.

The CFPB is causing problems for consumers. It has a database for complaints from consumers, but it publishes consumer complaints before even checking if they are true. The CFPB also weighs in on financial regulations where Congress should instead be making these decisions, and the CFPB wasted over $200 million on lavish renovations of their office space in downtown Washington, D.C.

This legislation we are considering today will restructure the CFPB, restoring congressional oversight duties that were shifted under the regular legislative appropriations process. We will also be refocusing the CFPB on enforcing consumer protection laws, rather than making up their own laws that only hurt the average American.

Perhaps most important to Coloradans, the Financial CHOICE Act creates economic growth and jobs by making credit easier to access for Main Street America. Thanks to the TAI-LOR Act, introduced by my friend and colleague from Colorado (Mr. Tipton), regulators will be able to craft custom regulations to reflect the specific business model of local banks.

This bill also creates jobs and economic growth by requiring more transparent policymaking at the Federal Reserve. We rein in stifling regulations on small, community banks, allowing them to compete against their larger counterparts. We increase consumer choice by allowing Americans to access a bank and a credit card.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today to transform our Nation’s financial system. We have the opportunity to level the playing field between big and small banks. We have the opportunity to safe guard against predatory practices.

We are here to restore hope and opportunity through the Financial CHOICE Act.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, I brought the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to the floor of the House as chairman of the House Rules Committee. This law was a statement from Congress on behalf of the American people that unchecked corporate greed will never again bring the United States of America to financial collapse.

My colleague began his speech this morning by saying that this law had not worked, but I am not aware of major bank failures or bank failures of too-big-to-fail, and I would say, indeed, this law has worked.

Since it has been enacted, our economy has had over 80 consecutive months of private sector job growth. That is pretty good. In fact, it is a record-setting streak. More than 16 million jobs have been created, and business lending has been increased by 75 percent. I am not getting all the complaints that I used to get that they could not borrow money from banks, particularly the small businesses.

Along the way, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau established under this law has helped 29 million people in all of our 50 States to receive nearly $12 billion in relief from companies that engaged in irresponsible or predatory practices.

One group that sent us a letter begging us not to do away with Dodd-Frank was the Veterans of Foreign Wars who said that far too often their members were the victims of predatory lenders—shysters, people not telling them the truth—and that is exactly what the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was established to do.

You can’t argue about whether or not it has succeeded. If 29 million people in 50 States have received back $12 billion in relief of bad practices, but this legislation completely will do away with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the only thing we have left to protect Main Street and the small investors.

These gains weren’t a coincidence. Mr. Speaker. They were the result of the Dodd-Frank law. Gutting Wall Street reform will be a historic give-away to special interests.

The Wall Street firms who plunged our country to the brink in 2008, would be free once again to take advantage of consumers and force middle class families to go it alone, without the protections this bill has provided them.

The CHOICE Act is the wrong choice for consumers and families. Instead of standing with financial lobbyists, I urge the majority to uphold the trust of the people we all represent.

Five years ago, Democrats and Republicans came together to almost unanimously pass my bill to end insider trading in Congress. The STOCK Act passed the House Chamber by a vote of 417-2, one of the most bipartisan bills of that entire session of Congress.

It wasn’t easy. I led a 6-year fight to get it signed into law after learning that Members of Congress and their staffs were abusing their positions by misusing the privileged information that they gleaned and that was not available to everybody else in America.

They gleaned this information while
Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule because it is time to, once and for all, end the harmful regulations caused by this disastrous and misguided law.

Mr. Speaker, let me take just a few moments to talk to you about the harmful effects Dodd-Frank has had on my home State of Texas. As of just a few months ago, in Texas alone, 358 State or federally chartered banks, credit unions, or thrifts have either closed or merged since 2010, when Dodd-Frank became law.

According to our Texas State Banking Commission, the last bank or credit union chartered in Texas was in 2009, in a State with one of the healthiest economies in the country. Mass consolidations and closures have left many Texans few options, something the previous administration promised.

While Dodd-Frank aimed at fixing our banking system, its overreach and over-size-fits-all regulations have only hurt one person: the consumer. Increased bank fees, less access to consumer credit products, 1,000-page rules, and billions of dollars in regulatory costs has resulted in a financial system over the last 7 years.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, I will leave you with this: If you support crushing regulations that have hurt our community banks and credit unions, if you support taxpayer bailouts, if you support an agency that is accountable to none, and if you support less accountability for both Washington and Wall Street, would you please vote against this bill and the underlying bill?

But if you support financial opportunity for all, taxpayer bailout for none, less regulations on small community financial institutions, and more accountability and transparency, then support this bill to support consumers, and support Main Street America.

In God we trust. Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, those wondering why Republican lips are sealed so very tight when it comes to President Trump jeopardizing our national security, threatening our democracy, and engaging in one crazy action after another need look no further than this bill.

You see, this is a bill to handcuff the cop on Wall Street. So many of our Republican colleagues are so eager to shield Wall Street from action and eventually to bestow one tax break after another on Wall Street, that they are willing to pay almost any price in silence concerning Mr. Trump's outrages.

As a person who voted against all of the big bank bailouts, I am most concerned that this bill will produce only more. When the banks were bailed out, American families paid the price, as did the American taxpayer. They paid the price for the recklessness that led to that unnecessary financial crisis.

A more immediate concern is what happens to the cop on the beat, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, a new law enforcement agency that the AARP described as one designed to hold Wall Street accountable. That is exactly what the CFPB has done. Whether it is payday lenders or deceitful language in the fine print of financial agreements, reverse mortgages, contracts denying consumers their rightful remedies for wrong-doing, or many other issues, this agency has been there to protect the consumers.

Among those most threatened that have benefited from this law enforcement agency are our military families, who face unique financial challenges, from illegal foreclosures, to cheating them on student loans, to payday lenders who overcharge their families. This law enforcement agency has been there for them. Today, it would be substantially weakened by this legislation.

One of the leading examples of the success of this law enforcement agency is Wells Fargo: fined $100 million, $85 million in claw-backs from executives, a CEO resigned. None of that happened to the other banks, but Wells Fargo was caught. It was caught because there was a law enforcement agency on the beat doing something about it.

There are those who fought this legislation from the start, and they won't give up on trying to undermine it.

You need only look at what happened this year in enforcement actions to see what this agency is doing: a company failed to provide redress for illegal collection tactics, deceived consumers about credit scores, misstated the charges associated with pawn loans, denied consumers access to their own money, and kept borrowers in the dark about options to avoid foreclosure. One bit of wrongdoing after another. Why not have a cop on the beat working for us? Some people want to have the unlimited right to exploit consumers.

This agency is the one thing standing in the way to protect them. I say: stop this Republican interference with law enforcement and send a message at the same time to President Donald J. Trump that our laws apply to him too, and ought to be enforced against him when he is engaged in wrongdoing.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most deceptive things that Congress does is regulate one part of an industry for the problems created by another part.

The community banking sector is trying to do with the collapse in 2008. It was Wall Street, the people in New York, the big banks. Yet the Dodd-Frank regulation kind of let them scoot by and...
Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the chair of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, the economic downturn caused Michiganers and citizens around the country to lose their jobs, families to lose their savings, and way too many to lose their homes. Since that time, our friends on the other side of the aisle have attempted to convince the American people that Dodd-Frank was "the answer" to the financial crisis, despite the law failing to actually address the root cause of the downturn. In reality, Dodd-Frank has made it more difficult for hardworking taxpayers to secure a future for themselves and their children by denying them the economic recovery that they deserve.

Let's be honest: Dodd-Frank was an agenda waiting for a crisis. So many issues related to stability were crammed into this flawed law that, now, big banks have gotten even bigger and small banks have disappeared at an alarming rate. Even worse, Dodd-Frank enshrined "too big to fail" and, frankly, put in place "too small to save."

Enough is enough. In order to increase economic opportunity, we must enact commonsense regulatory reform and restore accountability to Wall Street and to Washington. The House Financial Services Committee achieves this goal through a carefully crafted Financial CHOICE Act, which we are debating here today.

The Financial CHOICE Act eliminates Dodd-Frank’s one-size-fits-all regulatory structure that has strangled community financial institutions with overly burdensome regulations that were meant for the largest banks in America. By enacting the CHOICE Act, credit unions and small businesses can utilize their resources to help individual customers and small businesses achieve financial independence.

If we want small businesses to continue to be the engine of economic growth, we must remove the regulatory red tape that is preventing these community lenders from supporting small business job creators.

Additionally, the Financial CHOICE Act holds Wall Street accountable by imposing the toughest penalties in history. To protect consumers from financial fraud is a key goal for all of us.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.
Lastly, this commonsense legislation protects taxpayers by eliminating too big to fail, something that my colleague had just talked about, and requires failing institutions to liquidate through a streamlined bankruptcy process with taxpayer-funded bailouts. The process that she was talking about, this orderly liquidation authority, the government runs the bank for 5 years, and that is unacceptable.

So I hope you will join me in supporting this rule and supporting the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the “Wrong” CHOICE Act. This bill will have a devastating impact on the ability of regulators to protect everyday Americans from the same types of predatory practices.

If you support consumers, you must oppose the “Wrong” CHOICE Act. If you want to make sure that consumers have a fighting chance against those big banks and their illegal practices, then you must oppose the “Wrong” CHOICE Act, because this act guts the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

In nearly 6 years, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has returned nearly $12 billion to 29 million Americans hurt by illegal financial practices, reduced $7.7 billion in consumer debts while winning $3.7 billion in compensation for consumers, and it has benefited nearly 50 million households in the form of new protections shielding consumers from surprise costs in terms on their mortgages and their credit cards.

Now, at a time when we have a student loan crisis in this country, $1.4 trillion in student debt, we have to make sure that we are protecting families, students, and young people around the country.

My home State of Washington was proud to work with the CFPB on those new regulations that would actually protect working people, make sure that they have off-ramps if they get into predatory loans and make sure that we regulate that industry.

The benefits of Dodd-Frank are not limited just to consumers, by the way. Big and small banks have benefited: lending grew to record highs, and 2016 data from the FDIC shows that those banks are doing pretty well.

The financial crisis, which destroyed trillions of dollars in wealth and wreaked havoc on the financial lives of millions of families, was not a random event.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JAYAPAL. The Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission itself said that widespread failures in financial regulation and rampant predatory lending practices were key drivers of the crisis. This bill ignores those lessons and takes us so far backwards, Mr. Speaker.

Real people are struggling to recover from that 2008 crisis, still, and instead of rolling back protections for consumers, we should be investing in jobs for everyday Americans. We should be making sure that the guy on Main Street or the woman on Main Street has a chance to bank and against all those predatory practices.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support consumers and working Americans and to oppose the “Wrong” CHOICE Act.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I note for the record that the best way for a student to repay student loans is to have a strong economy and not the anemic recovery that we had from the last recession.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before you today to speak on the rule and in support of H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act, which represents years of hard work by our chairman, JEB HENSARLING, and the entire Financial Services Committee.

For nearly 8 years, Dodd-Frank has targeted Main Street pocketbooks and stripped families of real opportunities for financial success and independence. For instance, the CFPB has spent years removing choices and making access to financial products more difficult to obtain. Under these regulations, it is now harder for families to quality for a mortgage, to obtain an auto loan, and to access other forms of credit that they have depended on every day of their lives. Meanwhile, the CFPB fails to monitor and prevent actual and real instances of consumer fraud like we saw with the opening of millions of unauthorized accounts at Wells Fargo.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of chairing the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee on Financial Services, and today—today—we released a report titled, “Was the Cop on the Beat?” This is regarding the CFPB’s wholly inadequate role in investigating the Wells Fargo fraudulent account scandal.

We have received numerous records from both Wells Fargo and the OCC and others that indicate that the CFPB was asleep at the wheel when it came to investigating Wells Fargo. Unfortunately, the CFPB has produced no such documents, even under subpoena, that contradict this assertion and support the testimony of Director Cordray in the hearing of this committee earlier in the year. This report highlights the need for reforms to the CFPB that are contained in the CHOICE Act.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, we need to bring accountability and transparency to a Bureau that has been thwarting congressional oversight and due process.

Additionally, the CHOICE Act will increase lending in our communities, open up our economy, end taxpayer-funded bailouts, and hold Wall Street and Washington accountable. Americans today deserve the “Right” CHOICE Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers?

Mr. BUCK. I do.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the chair of the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, when former President Obama signed the Dodd-Frank financial control law into law about 7 years ago, supporters promised that it would repair the economy; they promised that it would end too big to fail; they promised it would enhance financial stability and protect consumers. But none of those promises have been kept.

Nearly 9 years after the financial crisis, Americans are still stuck in the slowest, weakest economic recovery in 70 years. The percentage of Americans who are actually in the workforce is at its lowest level since the late 1970s, and we still have not fully reached the potential of our economic recovery. This is precisely because of the Dodd-Frank law. The Dodd-Frank law has clogged the plumbing of our economy with an avalanche of red tape.

Far from ending too big to fail, Dodd-Frank has guaranteed that too-big-to-fail banks will get a taxpayer bailout whenever they go into distress. As big banks have gotten bigger as a result of Dodd-Frank, the small banks, the community banks, the credit unions—the credit providers for the entrepreneurs, the small businesses, the job creators in this country—are fewer. That is a huge problem for the dynamism of the economy, and that is one of the reasons why we haven’t seen economic recovery the way that we should.

Dodd-Frank has made it more difficult for small businesses and startups to obtain capital to grow, invest, and hire. Before Dodd-Frank, small business lending was more than 150 percent of large bank lending. Today, due to Dodd-Frank, small bank lending is about 80 percent below that of large bank lending. This is why new business formation is at a generational low, because small businesses and startups and entrepreneurs have much more success obtaining capital from community banks than Wall Street banks.
Financial services and products have been impaired. Since Dodd-Frank, the number of banks offering free checking has shrunk from 75 percent to 37 percent, the ranks of the unbanked have gone up, and one in five community banks in my home State of Kentucky have disappeared as a result of Dodd-Frank.

Consumer protection? Hardly. Taking away financial services and products, eliminating competition and choice from the marketplace, eliminating small business, taking away access to credit, that is not protecting consumers. That is hurting consumers. Dodd-Frank is the worst bill for consumers that we could possibly have.

We need the Financial CHOICE Act, which will preserve access to financial services and products and give consumers access to mortgages and access to financial products like credit cards and overdraft protection and home equity loans. All of these services and products are going away because of Dodd-Frank and the busybodies in Washington.

We need to protect consumers. There is nothing wrong with effective regulation, but this is regulation gone awry. It is unacceptable, it is not transparent, it is hurting the American consumers, and it is certainly not adding to financial stability when big banks and Wall Street are getting bigger and our community banks are going away.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY), the chief deputy whip of the Republican Conference.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses and families in the backbone of all rural communities like the ones I represent in western North Carolina. The fact is that Dodd-Frank has had a crushing impact both on the ability of families and small businesses to access loans and the financial products that they need and deserve.

Half of what community banks did prior to Dodd-Frank was lending to small businesses. Now it is down to 20 percent of what they do. That is as a result of massive regulations that have come about as a result of Dodd-Frank.

For families, the availability of services that they used to commonly think is acceptable, like free checking and mortgage lending, are significantly diminished or altogether gone for them. Since Dodd-Frank became law, nearly three-quarters of community banks have either left or greatly reduced their mortgage businesses. This is problematic for families. The impact of these changes has hit rural communities like the ones I represent in western North Carolina the hardest.

But it doesn’t end there. The law’s mandates have driven up the cost of borrowing, making it harder and more expensive for families to access credit or save for important life events like paying for your child’s college education.

Mr. Speaker, the Financial CHOICE Act changes much of this. It begins to undo the damage caused by Dodd-Frank. Washington mandates, very expensive regulations, by cutting off access to financial products that the American people need and desire.

Additionally, the Financial CHOICE Act actually addresses the plight of small businesses by cleaning up these messy regulations that are unclear, that have made the marketplace less safe and secure for lending and small businesses, and encouraging the use of innovative new forms of capital formation that help businesses grow and prosper.

That means jobs. This bill is directed at growing the American economy, getting us back on our feet, and helping prosperity not just to urban or rural areas, but to both, to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill and get on with the business of legislating.

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

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, the Financial CHOICE Act. The acronym CHOICE stands for Creating Hope and Opportunity for Investors, Consumers, and Entrepreneurs. This legislation could be very well entitled the “Make America Grow Again Act.”

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, understate the importance of economic growth and what that means to this country: jobs, better jobs; wages, higher wages; and revenues, more revenues coming into the Federal Treasury as a result of healthy economic growth that will allow us to pay for the critical programs that people in this country depend on, whether seniors, veterans, infrastructure.

You pay for your government with a healthy growing economy. That is not what we have today, or what we will grow again, especially as we think of these individuals.

Opponents of this legislation are defending a stagnant status quo. They are defending a status quo that has given us the slowest economy since the Great Depression, a status quo responsible for the loss of 1,400 community banks, a status quo that has a community bank or credit union closing every single day, a status quo that has resulted in the noncreation of 650,000 jobs, a status quo that has cut real wages and productivity, a status quo that has taken away choices from individuals.

This legislation will end too big to fail and will end too small to succeed. Regardless of who you are or where you come from, you should have access to affordable reliable financial services. This bill is taking away choices from individuals.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time. The points have been made, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

With each passing day, we learn more about the tangled web of interest and links to Russia and the Trump administration. Just last week we learned that President Trump’s son-in-law, Jared Kushner, attempted to establish a back channel of communications with Russian officials, and the Trump transition team before they were even inaugurated.

Tomorrow, former FBI Director James Comey will likely testify that President Trump attempted to influence the FBI’s investigation into possible collusion between his campaign and the Russian Government.

Who knows what further ties to Russia we will uncover from his testimony. Without President Trump’s tax returns, we simply have no way of knowing if he himself has financial ties to Russia, as news reports have suggested. The American people deserve to know whether or not our President has any business dealings with Russia or other foreign governments, and it is imperative that we prevent the White House from becoming another arm of the Trump organization.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative Esenko’s bill, H.R. 305, which would require Presidents and major party nominees for the Presidency to release their tax returns.

If the President has nothing to hide, including financial interests or business dealings with Russia, then he should freely release his tax returns to reassure the American people.

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

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

There being no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the majority why we enacted the Wall Street Reform in the first place.
Our country was plunged into the worst recession since the Great Depression after big Wall Street firms played Russian roulette with our future for years. During the 2008 financial crash, more than 8 million Americans lost their jobs, $33 trillion in wealth vanished overnight, and 11 million homes were lost.

After years of excesses and dodging regulation, the financial firms were finally brought under control by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The perverse notion of too big to fail was finally ended, and the financial playing field was tilted back toward consumers.

We restored the results of the law in the form of record-setting private sector job growth, millions of new jobs, and historic rates of business lending. It is beyond me why anyone in the world would want to repeal this law and threaten this progress. Instead of doing the bidding of the financial lobbyists who don’t really care for the law, we should be acting to uphold the trust of the people who sent us here.

Then, by passing the End Congressional Stock Market Abuse Act to bring an end to the egregious use of exclusive stock deals for Members of Congress, no initial public offerings by Members of Congress.

The American people must be able to trust what we are doing here and trust that it is right for them without concern that we are using our position to enrich ourselves.

My bill would enhance the STOCK Act, which passed the Chamber virtually unanimously—two “no” votes in 2012, with provisions that I think we could all agree on: no exclusive stock deals for Members of Congress, no initial public offerings, regardless of where they are offered.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we should be focusing on today, not dismantling a law that made financial security to millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, to oppose the underlying legislation, the “Wrong” CHOICE Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is not for the big banks. It is not for the bureaucrats and their swanky downtown office at CFPB. This legislation was crafted for the American people, the men and women who work hard every day to earn a living. These individuals want choice in the financial products they can buy. They want healthy community banks. They want lower taxes instead of Wall Street bailouts.

The Financial CHOICE Act was written over the past several years with these people in mind. We will restore hope and opportunity for them.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING and the Financial Services Committee for their hard work on this bill. I thank Chairman SESSIONS for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote “yes” on the resolution, and then to vote “yes” on the underlying bill.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the Previous Question so that the House can vote on my bipartisan legislation, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act.

I first introduced the Presidential Tax Transparency Act exactly one year ago today, along with my Senate counterpart Ron Wyden. This bill would codify the longstanding tradition of presidential disclosure of tax returns. The bill is simple, it is bipartisan, and it has the support of the American people. A recent poll found that 90 percent of Americans believe the President should disclose his tax returns. Earlier today, a petition was delivered to Congress with over 4 million signatures calling on the House to take up this bill.

Since I introduced the Presidential Tax Transparency Act in recent weeks, the President Trump has amassed serious ethical lapses, troubling connections to Russian officials, and countless potential conflicts of interest, all while hiding his full financial information from the public.

Mr. Trump is the first president in decades to refuse to disclose his tax returns as a candidate and as President. We know from his candidate financial disclosure and from his tax returns that the President has 56 financial positions in companies around the world, and owes at least $300 million in debts to various banks. But there’s no way for us to verify these claims without his tax return information.

Disclosure of the President’s tax returns would provide answers to many of the troubling questions surrounding this Administration’s connections to Russia, including connections to the Russian government, major companies, and the Russian oligarchs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Rule and the underlying legislation. I thank the American people for being patient with us in obtaining the truth of what they are entitled to.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 375 OFFERED BY

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House of the state of the consideration of the bill (H.R. 305) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by President and vice president.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote “yes” on the resolution, and then to vote “yes” on the underlying bill.
question vote in their own manual: “Al-
though it is generally not possible to amend
the rule because the majority Member con-
trolling the time will not yield for the pur-
pose of offering an amendment, the same re-
sult may be achieved by voting down the pre-
vious question on the rule. . . . When the
motion for the previous question is defeated,
continues to the Member who led the opposi-
tion to ordering the pre-
vious question. That Member, because he
then controls the time, may offer an amend-
ment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of
amendment.”
In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of
Representatives, the subsection titled “Amend-
ing Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule
[a special rule reported from the Committee
on Rules] opens the resolution to amend-
ment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, sec-
tion 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon re-
jection of the motion for the previous ques-
tion on a resolution reported from the Com-
mittee on Rules, control shifts to the Mem-
ber leading the opposition to the previous
question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for de-
bate thereon.”
Clearly, the vote on the previous question
on a rule does have substantive policy impli-
cations. It is one of the only available tools
for those who oppose the Republican major-
ity’s agenda and allows those with alterna-
tive views the opportunity to offer an alter-
native plan.
Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back
the balance of my time, and I move the
previous question on the resolu-
tion. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The ques-
tion is on ordering the previous
question. The vote was taken by electronic
device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189,
not voting 1, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas 228</th>
<th>Yoder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaah</td>
<td>Amodei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
<td>Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barletha</td>
<td>Barr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td>Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bost</td>
<td>Brady (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brat</td>
<td>Bridenstine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (AL)</td>
<td>Brooks (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck</td>
<td>Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>Carter (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (TX)</td>
<td>Chabot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
<td>Cheney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofman</td>
<td>Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins (GA)</td>
<td>Collins (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comer</td>
<td>Comstock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaway</td>
<td>Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costello (PA)</td>
<td>Crandall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>CURBETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>Davis, Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denham</td>
<td>Dent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSantis</td>
<td>DesJarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz-Balart</td>
<td>Donovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy</td>
<td>Duncan (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Emmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estes (KS)</td>
<td>Farenthold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faso</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>Fischmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flores</td>
<td>Fortenberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank (AZ)</td>
<td>Frerichs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaetz</td>
<td>Gallagher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant
to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-
cedings on this question will be post-
poned.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The un-
finished business is the vote on the un-
derstanding the previous question on the resolu-
tion (H. Res. 374) providing for con-
sideration of the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph
waiver authority, and for other pur-
poses, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.
The Clerk read the title of the resolu-
tion.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The ques-
tion is on ordering the previous
question.
Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back
the balance of my time, and I move the
previous question on the resolu-
tion. The first electronic vote will be con-
ducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining
electronic votes will be conducted as 5-
minute votes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant
to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings
will resume on questions postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:
Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 374;
Adopting House Resolution 374, if or-
dered;
Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 375; and
Adopting House Resolution 375, if or-
dered.
The first electronic vote will be con-
ducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining
electronic votes will be conducted as 5-
minute votes.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—a yeses 231, noes 185, not voting 14, as follows:

AYES—231

Noes—185

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House. The form of the resolution is as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately release his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States’ system of checks and balances, Congress has responsibility to hold the executive branch of government to a fair and equal standard of transparency ensuring the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax Policy Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline of reasonable information including whether the President paid taxes, ownership interests, charitable donations made, and whether tax deductions have been explored;

Whereas, disclosure of the President’s tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President’s financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether they share any partnerships, equity interests, joint ventures or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President recently fired the Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, under whose leadership the FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign was colluding with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, President Trump reportedly stated to Russian officials during a White House meeting that he fired Director Comey to ease pressure on the ongoing investigation of Russia’s influence in the 2016 election;

Whereas, Senate Russia investigators have requested information from the Treasury Department’s criminal investigation division, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, which handles cases of money laundering for information related to President Trump, his top officials and campaign aides. FinCEN has been investigating allegations of foreign money-laundering through purchases of U.S. real estate;

Whereas, the President’s tax returns would show us whether he has foreign bank accounts and how much profit he receives from his ownership in myriad partnerships;

Whereas, Donald Trump Jr. said The Trump Organization saw money “pouring in from Russia” and that “Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets”;

Whereas, Congress gave itself the authority to review an individual’s tax returns to investigate and reveal possible conflicts of interest of executive branch officials involved dating back to the Teapot Dome scandal;

Whereas, it has been reported that federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian influence in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, according to the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses;
businesses, and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution for the express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any “present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state”;

Whereas, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President’s tax returns under section 6103 of the Tax Code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, Director Comey has testified that tax returns are a common tool in investigations because they can show income and motives;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives shall:

One, immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives;

Two, support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under Rule 19, a motion offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Massachusetts will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT OF 2017

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on order-
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Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rolloc No. 290.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidable detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloc No. 289 and “nay” on rolloc No. 290.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes:

1. H. Res. 374, Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2213. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on this motion.

2. Motion to order the Previous Question on the Rule. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on this motion.

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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall No. 290.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a personal explanation.

WHEREAS General George C. Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953 for developing the strategy known as the Marshall Plan; during World War II; awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 1948, one of only five Army five-star generals in the history of the United States; and Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense; and the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 33

Whereas George C. Marshall served as Army Chief of Staff during World War II; Special Ambassador to China, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense; and George C. Marshall was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 1946 for his military strategy and vital role during World War II; Whereas George C. Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953 for developing the European economic recovery strategy known as the Marshall Plan;
Whereas the George C. Marshall Foundation was established in 1953 and is devoted to preserving the legacy of General George C. Marshall through educational scholarship programs and activities; and

Whereas the George C. Marshall Foundation opened the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in 1964 in Lexington, Virginia, on the post of the Virginia Military Institute, which is the alma mater of General George C. Marshall; and

Whereas the George C. Marshall Museum educates the public about the military and diplomatic contributions of General George C. Marshall through exhibits and artifacts; and

Whereas the George C. Marshall Research Library maintains the most comprehensive collection of records documenting the life and leadership of General George C. Marshall: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress designates the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BRAT. 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. Con. Res. 33.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 33, a resolution that designates the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

General Marshall was one of America’s most distinguished soldiers, a dedicated statesman, and a genuine peacemaker. General Marshall served as Army Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, and Secretaries of both the Departments of State and Defense. He was promoted to General in 1944— one of only nine individuals in our Nation’s history to rise to the rank of a five-star officer—and was also awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 1946.

In addition, General Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953 for developing the European economic recovery strategy known as the Marshall Plan, which was essential to bringing peace to the postwar European continent.

To honor the legacy of such an accomplished man, the George C. Marshall Foundation created, on June 7, 2017, to pay tribute to General Marshall’s contributions to our Nation and the world during some of the most perilous and tumultuous times of the 20th century. The Marshall Foundation preserves this legacy through educational facilities and scholarship programs.

The George C. Marshall Foundation opened the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, on the post of the Virginia Military Institute, the alma mater of General Marshall. The library provides scholars with a documented record of the life of General Marshall and his public service, and tells the inspiring story with visitors through exhibitions, artifacts, and educational programs.

General Marshall’s contributions to our Nation and our world cannot be overstated, and I hope to see this resolution adopted to designate the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

Both institutions work tirelessly to highlight and share General Marshall’s work and service, and this is a fitting tribute to a man who spent a lifetime faithfully and courageously serving his country at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 33, designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library. I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), for sponsoring the resolution and note that the entire Virginia delegation has signed on as original cosponsors.

General George C. Marshall is a national hero, a distinguished public servant, and treasured piece of Virginia’s history. Located in Lexington, Virginia, the George C. Marshall Museum and Library are located on the campus of the Virginia Military Institute, his alma mater.

General Marshall served our country as the Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, Secretary of State, president of the Red Cross, Secretary of Defense, and is one of only five Army five-star generals in the United States.

After World War II, General Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953, for his role in developing the European Recovery Program better known as the Marshall Plan. This week we are commemorating the 70th anniversary of the Marshall Plan speech given on June 5, 1947, at Harvard University. The Marshall Plan contributed to European integration and growth in the aftermath of World War II.

As the holder of the George C. Marshall papers and with a mission to collect, preserve, and share information regarding the life and career of General Marshall, it is apt to make this institution the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

Mr. Speaker, considering the important place in our Nation’s history that General Marshall holds, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of H. Con. Res. 33. This resolution would designate the George C. Marshall Museum and the George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

I would like to thank Chairwoman FOXX, Ranking Member SCOTT, and Mr. BRAT for their work in bringing this legislation to the floor today.

It is only fitting that we consider this resolution on the week of the 70th anniversary of General George Marshall’s speech at Harvard University where he proposed a comprehensive foreign assistance program—later coined as the Marshall Plan—to help rebuild the war-torn and devastated economies in Western Europe after World War II.

General George Catlett Marshall dedicated his life to public service—serving honorably in the United States Army, as Army Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, Secretary of Defense. He was one of only five-star generals ever to serve in our military.

From his allied plan to storm the beaches of Normandy to the Marshall Plan, his leadership changed the world. The history of the United States and the global community would be a different place if not for the contributions of General Marshall.

At the recommendation of former President Harry Truman, the Marshall Foundation was established in 1953. On May 23, 1964, the Marshall Museum and Library was dedicated on the post of the Virginia Military Institute—General Marshall’s alma mater.

For over 50 years, the Marshall Foundation has devoted its mission to educating the public about the important contributions of General Marshall.

The museum has five extensive exhibits and houses General Marshall’s 1953 Nobel Peace Prize. The research library collects, preserves, and shares the largest collection of documents pertaining to General Marshall’s life.

Just last year, the Marshall Foundation reached a huge milestone with the completion of the Papers of George Catlett Marshall. This project began in 1977 with a goal to create a published record of over 5,000 documents spanning over 5,666 pages.
Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 374, I call up the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration. The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 374, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read. The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2213

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. HIRING FLEXIBILITY. Section 3 of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–376, 6 U.S.C. 221) is amended by striking subsection (a)(1) in the following subsections:

“(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may waive the application of subsection (a)(1) in the following circumstances:

(1) In the case of a current, full-time law enforcement officer employed by a State or local law enforcement agency, if such officer—

(A) has served as a law enforcement officer for not fewer than three years with no break in service;

(B) is authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of, or the incarceration of any person for, any violation of law, and has statutory powers for arrest or apprehension;

(C) is not currently under investigation, has not been found to have engaged in criminal activity or serious misconduct, has not resigned from or been dismissed from a law enforcement officer position under investigation or in lieu of termination, and has not been dismissed from a law enforcement officer position; and

(D) has, within the past ten years, successfully completed a polygraph examination as a condition of employment with such officer’s current law enforcement agency.

(2) In the case of a current, full-time law enforcement officer employed by a Federal law enforcement agency, if such officer—

(A) has served as a law enforcement officer for not fewer than three years with no break in service;

(B) has authority to make arrests, conduct investigations, conduct searches, make seizures, carry firearms, and serve orders, warrants, and other processes;

(C) is not currently under investigation, has not been found to have engaged in criminal activity or serious misconduct, has not resigned from a law enforcement officer position under investigation or in lieu of termination, and has not been dismissed from a law enforcement officer position; and

(D) holds a current Tier 4 background investigation or current Tier 5 background investigation.

(3) In the case of an individual who is a member of the Armed Forces for not fewer than three years;

(A) holds, or has held within the past five years, a Secret, Top Secret, or Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information clearance;

(B) has, or has held within the past five years, a current Tier 4 background investigation or current Tier 5 background investigation;

(C) received, or is eligible to receive, an honorable discharge from service in the Armed Forces and has not engaged in criminal activity or committed a serious military or civil offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice; and

(D) was not granted any waivers to obtain the clearance referred to subparagraph (B).

(3) TERMINATION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The authority to issue a waiver under subsection (b) shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

SEC. 3. SUPPLEMENTAL COMMISSIONER AUTHORITY AND DEFINITIONS. (a) SUPPLEMENTAL COMMISSIONER AUTHORITY.—Section 4 of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–376) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 4. SUPPLEMENTAL COMMISSIONER AUTHORITY.

“(a) NON-EXEMPTION.—An individual who receives a waiver under subsection (b) of section 3 is not exempt from other hiring requirements relating to suitability for employment and eligibility to hold a national security designated position, as determined by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(b) BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS.—Any individual who receives a waiver under subsection (b) of section 3 who holds a current Tier 4 background investigation shall be subject to a Tier 5 background investigation.

“(c) ADMINISTRATION OF POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection is authorized to administer a polygraph examination to an applicant or employee who is eligible for or receives a waiver under subsection (b) of section 3 if information is discovered prior to the completion of a background investigation that results in a determination that a polygraph examination is necessary to make a final determination regarding suitability for employment or continued employment, as the case may be.”.

(b) REPORT.—The Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 shall be amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 5. REPORTING.

“Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section and every year for the next four years thereafter, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall provide the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate information on the number, disaggregated with respect to each category of waivers described in subsection (c) of section 3, of waivers requested, granted, and denied, and the reasons for any such denial, and the final outcome of the application for employment made with respect to each such waiver.”.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—The Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

“In this Act:

“(1) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ‘law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given to

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
such term in sections 8331(20) and 8401(17) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) VETERAN.—The term ‘veteran’ has the meaning given such term in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code.

(3) SERIOUS MILITARY OR CIVIL OFFENSE.—The term ‘serious military or civil offense’ means an offense for which:

(A) a punitive discharge is, or would be, authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the Manual for Court-Martial, as pursuant to Army Regulation 635-200 chapter 24-12.

(B) a punitive discharge is authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the Navy and Marine Corps Manual, as pursuant to NAVPERS 15566/0, chapter 24.

(2) The terms ‘Tier 4’ and ‘Tier 5’ with respect to background investigations have the meaning given such terms under the 2012 Federal Investigative Standards.’.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Vela) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul).

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2213 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDING ON AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Permission to postpone proceeding on amendment to H.R. 2213, Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017, is granted.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2213 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and in support of the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, the failed immigration policies of the previous administration have kept our borders open, weakened our national security, and put millions of American lives at risk from an increasing number of grave and growing threats. These threats come from drug cartels, gang members, human traffickers, and international terrorists who seek to do our country harm.

Fortunately, we now have a partner in the White House who understands that we cannot rely on the oceans or other natural boundaries alone to separate us from those looking to infiltrate our homeland.

This morning, I was once again pleased to welcome Secretary Kelly before the Committee on Homeland Security and listen to him articulate the importance of border security to the Trump administration.

We know we need a 21st century border to meet 21st century threats. Sadly, over the past few days, news reports have renewed the news that reminds us of the dangerous consequences of Washington’s inability to achieve that goal.

As a former Federal prosecutor and the chief of counterterrorism and national security in the U.S. Attorney’s Office in Texas, I have seen how people take advantage of our Nation’s open borders. Over time, those who are determined to come here illegally become more sophisticated. They know we are taking huge measures that we take to stop them. It is obvious that we need a new approach.

When it comes to strengthening our borders, additional funds and new technology will be necessary. However, our strongest assets are the courageous men and women who serve as Border Patrol agents and Customs and Border Protection officers. These patriots put their lives on the line every single day to protect us while also safeguarding our economic relationships that boost American jobs and grow American businesses.

However, we are already struggling to hire and retain men and women who have held security clearances and misconduct, and have previously passed a law enforcement polygraph exam.

It also provides the CBP Commissioner with the authority to hire members and veterans of the armed services who have held security clearances and who have already completed a robust background check.

To put it simply, this bill will make it easier for some of America’s finest law enforcement officers and soldiers help protect our borders.

As drugs continue to creep into our neighborhoods and wreak havoc on our communities and terrorists advance their plans to attack our country and disrupt our way of life, we must make sure we have an adequate force to protect our borders.

This needs to be a priority. This bill would provide CBP with the flexibility to hire State and local law enforcement officers who have already served for 3 years without a break in service, are not under investigation or have been found guilty of misconduct, and have previously passed a law enforcement polygraph exam.

Under this bill, the CBP Commissioner may, on a case-by-case basis, delegate to the CBP Commissioner to the hiring process. All other vetting requirements in the 12-step hiring process for these applicants will still apply.

CBP has struggled with recruiting the officers and agents to fill its frontline ranks at our Nation’s air, land, and seaports. Currently, there are 1,400 unfilled positions within the CBP workforce at our Nation’s ports of entry. Delays and short staffing at our ports of entry costs the United States economy up to $5.8 billion each year.

Under this bill, the CBP Commissioner may, on a case-by-case basis, exempt certain veterans and State and local law enforcement officers who meet specific standards, such as holding a security clearance and previously passing a polygraph, from having to take the CBP polygraph as a part of the hiring process.

CBP continues to struggle with recruiting and retaining agents, and CBP, to its credit, has developed a robust vetting process that is in place to ensure the qualifications of those who are hired.

d the National Capitol Police and Transportation Security Administration share my position on this bill. As a Representative from a district along our Southern border, she fully understands more than any Member the seriousness of this issue.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

I have forcefully rejected the President’s mass deportation efforts from the beginning, and I will continue to do so.

Many of us have appropriately criticized our President’s misguided and thoughtless attributing the criminal actions of a few undocumented individuals to the entire undocumented population. Equally here, it would be hypocritical to attribute the criminal actions of a few harmfyl drugs off our streets.

Mr. Vela. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Chairwoman McSally. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.
At the current hiring rate, approximately 113 applicants go through the process in order to hire a single officer or agent. That means CBP needs to have hundreds of thousands of people apply just to meet their current needs. We need more manpower to properly secure our borders. As CBP agents at our Nation’s airports who arrive from overseas, and facilitate cross-border commerce that powers our economy.

There are several underlying issues that are responsible for these current staffing woes, it takes more than 292 days for these 12 distinct steps, on average, to hire a new officer or agent. And even with the newer expedited system that is supposed to condense these steps into just six days, it still takes an average of 180 days to complete the process. Very few people can wait somewhere between 6 months to a year for a job. We are losing very experienced and already vetted applicants.

Several years ago, the committee began working directly with the previous administration to find solutions to these staffing problems and the hiring process. The bill under consideration today represents the fruits of that bipartisan work and, as a result, was passed out of the Homeland Security Committee unanimously last month.

My bill allows the Commissioner of CBP to waive the polygraph requirement for certain categories of job applicants. These exemptions are purely discretionary, not mandatory. If there is something in an applicant’s history or background that causes CBP concern, they can still use the polygraph exam to resolve those questions.

These small changes will provide CBP with immediate relief so they are able to quickly, yet judiciously, hire officers and agents from a pool of qualified applicants who already maintain the public’s trust and put their lives on the line for our security and our safety on a daily basis.

I want to make my position very clear. Every CBP officer or Border Patrol agent should be thoroughly vetted to ensure there are no integrity issues in their background and they are not at risk for corruption. That is how the current system operates, and nothing in this bill would change that. That is why Congress required polygraph examinations and stringent background checks for agents in the past.

I fully support the use of polygraph examinations to weed out people who may have trouble with funding security clearances, and CBP has been losing officers to hire those who have already been vetted and proven by their service in uniform that they are suitable to become agents and officers.

The National Treasury Employees Union, which represents the officers who are stationed at the ports of entry; the Non Commissioned Officers Association, who represent many of our veteran front line agents; the Border Trade Alliance; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and the Department of Homeland Security all support this bill. Indeed, this is a rare bill that has united both management and labor.

I include these letters of support in the Record.

The National Treasury Employees Union, June 5, 2017.

Dear Representative: On behalf of the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Officer Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Treasury Employees Union, the Border Security who represent many of our veteran front line officers, and the Department of Homeland Security; the Border Trade Alliance; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and the Department of Homeland Security all support this bill. Indeed, this is a rare bill that has united both management and labor.

I include these letters of support in the Record.

The National Treasury Employees Union, June 5, 2017.

Dear Representative: On behalf of the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Officer Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Treasury Employees Union, the Border Security who represent many of our veteran front line officers, and the Department of Homeland Security; the Border Trade Alliance; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and the Department of Homeland Security all support this bill. Indeed, this is a rare bill that has united both management and labor.

I include these letters of support in the Record.

The National Treasury Employees Union, June 5, 2017.

Dear Representative: On behalf of the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Officer Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Treasury Employees Union, the Border Security who represent many of our veteran front line officers, and the Department of Homeland Security; the Border Trade Alliance; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and the Department of Homeland Security all support this bill. Indeed, this is a rare bill that has united both management and labor.

I include these letters of support in the Record.

The National Treasury Employees Union, June 5, 2017.

Dear Representative: On behalf of the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Officer Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Treasury Employees Union, the Border Security who represent many of our veteran front line officers, and the Department of Homeland Security; the Border Trade Alliance; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and the Department of Homeland Security all support this bill. Indeed, this is a rare bill that has united both management and labor.

I include these letters of support in the Record.

The National Treasury Employees Union, June 5, 2017.

Dear Representative: On behalf of the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Officer Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Treasury Employees Union, the Border Security who represent many of our veteran front line officers, and the Department of Homeland Security; the Border Trade Alliance; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and the Department of Homeland Security all support this bill. Indeed, this is a rare bill that has united both management and labor.

I include these letters of support in the Record.

The National Treasury Employees Union, June 5, 2017.

Dear Representative: On behalf of the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Officer Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Treasury Employees Union, the Border Security who represent many of our veteran front line officers, and the Department of Homeland Security; the Border Trade Alliance; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and the Department of Homeland Security all support this bill. Indeed, this is a rare bill that has united both management and labor.

I include these letters of support in the Record.

The National Treasury Employees Union, June 5, 2017.
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NON COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION.

Hon. Ron Johnson,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and
Governmental Affairs, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Johnson:
On behalf of the Non-Commissioned Officers Association (NCOA), a Veteran Service Organization of over 55,000 members, I am writing to offer support for the “Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017,” which was ordered reported as S. 595 by the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on May 17, 2017, and reported as H.R. 2213 by the House Homeland Security Committee on May 16, 2017. NCOA supports the goal of increasing border security through easing polygraph requirements for Veterans who have already taken a polygraph and are interested in serving in the border security mission.

NCOA has been working with CBP to help fulfill its hiring and recruiting mission. CBP is faced with numerous challenges—many of which can be assisted by looking to our nation’s transitioning Veterans. NCOA had an extensive and national transition program for our NCOS for decades and believe that our Veterans are qualified, trained, and committed to the mission of protecting our nation.

NCOA supports amendments to the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Pub. L. No. 111-350) that would make integrity in the workplace by requiring that all CBP applicants for law enforcement positions receive a polygraph examination before being offered employment. The amendments proposed by S. 595 and H.R. 2213 would enable CBP to develop a risk-based approach to extend polygraph waiver eligibility to an applicant who falls within one of three categories and satisfies specific criteria including but not limited to:

1. A Current State or Local Law Enforcement Officer with a successfully completed polygraph examination with the applicant’s law enforcement agency, at least three consecutive years employed as a fully authorized law enforcement officer, and no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct;
2. A Current Federal Law Enforcement Officer with a successfully completed polygraph examination, at least three years employed as a fully authorized federal law enforcement officer, a current/in-scope Tier 4 Background Investigation or a Tier 5 Single Scope Background Investigation, and no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct;
3. A Transitioning Military Member Service Member, Veteran, or Member of the Reserves or National Guard who has at least four years of service in the military, no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct, and who left the military (within the past five years) a Secret, Top Secret, or Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information clearance and was not granted any waivers to obtain that clearance.

NCOA believes the flexibility to waive the polygraph for the Veteran categories outlined in the amendment makes sense and would potentially expedite their onboarding to a position in border patrol. Currently, the onboarding process simply takes too long and CBP loses great candidates, and Veterans are left to seek employment elsewhere.

We also strongly disagree with objections to this small alteration to the polygraph policy. Caring about Veterans and others who have already committed their lives to protecting the nation and its citizens and to say otherwise is pure fallacy and dirty politics.

Thank you for your attention and for your efforts to help secure our borders and enable transitioning Veterans to find meaningful employment.

Respectfully,
Jon Ostrowski,
BMCS (ret.) U.S. Coast Guard, Executive Director, NCOA.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE.

Hon. Paul D. Ryan,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker and Representatives:
I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 2213, the “Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act,” and to urge the House to pass it.

The pace of hiring at the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) agency of the Department of Homeland Security has been problematic for several years. This legislation would expand the applicant front line officers pool to fill vacant officer positions at CBP by allowing the Commissioner to waive the polygraph requirements in certain cases. The CBP is one of the few Federal agencies that requires all its front-line officers to pass a polygraph test that two of three applicants will fail. This rate of failure is considerably higher than other Federal law enforcement agencies and the Fraternal Order of Police strongly recommends that how these tests are administered be reviewed to determine why this is the case.

The bill will give the CBP greater flexibility by allowing the polygraph test to be waived for certain veterans and law enforcement officers. This will enable the CBP to meeting the condition of their hiring process.

On behalf of the more than 530,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we are pleased to support this legislation and look forward to its passage in the House. If I can or of any further assistance on this or any other issue, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Senior Advisor Jim Pasco in my Washington, D.C. office.

Sincerely,
Chuck Canterbury,
National President.

BORDER TRADE ALLIANCE.

Hon. Martha McSally,
Washington, DC.

Dear Representative McSally:
The Border Trade Alliance (BTA) supports your legislation, H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017, which contains important reforms to the polygraph examination process employed in the recruitment process for Customs and Border Protection officers.

For over 30 years, the BTA has sought to support public policies that encourage robust cross-border trade while ensuring our ports of entry have the resources necessary to process traffic efficiently. Adequate port staffing is critical to realizing those goals.

We share your belief that CBP’s ability to recruit new officers into its ranks is hamstrung by a polygraph screening that is overly burdensome and not properly aligned with the needs of today’s CBP.

CBP’s failure to meet Congress’ calls for hiring 2,000 new officers must be addressed swiftly, or our borders will continue to be characterized by long delays and congestion.

Your bill wisely seeks to streamline the recruitment process by waiving the existing polygraph examination requirement if the applicant is a State or local law enforcement officer in good standing if they have already completed a polygraph examination as a condition of their employment or, in the case of federal law enforcement officials, have already completed a Tier 4 or 5 background investigation.

In the case of members of the military or veterans, your bill allows the polygraph exam to be waived for individuals who have received high level security clearances.

Finally, your legislation contains an added level of security by permitting CBP to administer a polygraph exam in those cases where a background investigation indicates a polygraph examination is necessary to make a final determination regarding an applicant’s suitability for employment or an employee’s continued employment.

The reforms contained in your legislation are important as we seek new ways to attract talented, qualified individuals into CBP’s service with as few redundant, bureaucratic hurdles as possible, while still strengthening border security and ensuring the highest degree of confidence in new recruits.

The Border Trade Alliance is proud to support your legislation and we commend you for working in a bipartisan manner. This legislation is a positive development for national security, veterans’ employment, and facilitating trade and travel as it addresses the important as we seek new ways to attract talented, qualified individuals into CBP’s service with as few redundant, bureaucratic hurdles as possible, while still strengthening border security and ensuring the highest degree of confidence in new recruits.

Sincerely,
Russell L. Jones,
Chairman.

Bretton Clarke,
President.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Hon. Michael McCaul,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. Benning Thompson,
Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman McCaul and Ranking Member Thompson:
The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports H.R. 2213, the “Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.” This legislation is a positive development for national security, veterans’ employment, and facilitating trade and travel as it addresses important economic fronts. A recent study found that every batch of 33 CBP officers hired could result in an economic effect of $24 million and employment gains of 1,053 jobs in the U.S.

This legislation would increase the ranks of CBP officers. This will enable CBP to its highest degree of confidence in new recruits.

The Border Trade Alliance is proud to support your legislation and we commend you for working in a bipartisan manner. This legislation is a positive development for national security, veterans’ employment, and facilitating trade and travel as it addresses the important as we seek new ways to attract talented, qualified individuals into CBP’s service with as few redundant, bureaucratic hurdles as possible, while still

Sincerely,
Neil L. Bradley.
I would like to thank Chairman McCAUL and Ranking Member Thompson, and especially my ranking member, Mr. Vela, for his support and work with us on this important bill.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about standing up for Border Patrol cops. Border Patrol is woefully underfunded. This bill addresses this serious issue. In order to stand strong against jihadist terror and cartel organized crime, we would like to see more funds directed toward Border Patrol.

I would like to thank Chairman McCAUL and Ranking Member Thompson, and especially my ranking member, Mr. Vela, for his support and work with us on this important bill.
must have an adequate number of boots on the ground.  

Mr. Speaker, I served my community for many, many years as a street cop. I know exactly what it is to work patrol under dangerous, exhausting conditions. My Border Patrol brothers and sisters of the thin blue line are stretched too thin.

Hear my words: These are high caliber law enforcement professionals, but they are well below the staffing levels mandated by Congress.

This bill is not about lowering standards, as some critics claim. To the contrary, this bill allows for a common sense approach to hire experienced, highly qualified patriots to fill the ranks of our front lines. This bill allows reasonable degrees of discretion that streamline the vetting and hiring process at Customs and Border Patrol. I would like to thank Chairwoman McSALLY for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the law enforcement community and vote in favor of this important legislation.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I had the benefit, of course, of hearing my colleague, Congresswoman LOPFREH, and I appreciate my colleagues on the other side because, agreed, we all want there to be the highest level of national security protections at the border, but we want to make sure that we are maximizing those opportunities and recognize that there has been an issue of being able to address the shortage of officers. But to address a workforce shortage by minimizing the very requirements that not only preserve our national security and protect the men and women at our border, I would agree, is not the way that we should be proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I rise in opposition to the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act. As a Member from a border State that heavily trades with Mexico, I certainly understand the value of having sufficient customs officials manning our ports of entry and agents protecting our border; but eliminating the critical polygraph requirements for certain CBP applicants would undermine our Nation’s safety, given this agency’s historic connection to our free trade and commerce through our ports of entry. Yet the previous administration’s policy left our Border Patrol and Customs operations hamstrung and significantly understaffed.

As someone from a border State, I have seen and experienced those vulnerabilities firsthand.

To say that our Border Patrol and Customs operations are woefully understaffed is woefully understated. We are almost 3,000 officers and agents short of the minimum that is mandated by Congress. One reason for this understaffing is the unreasonable and protracted hiring processes.

In 2015, it took more than 460 days, on average, and 11 separate steps to hire a new officer or agent. This is absolutely absurd, even by government standards, and it must be fixed. That is why today I cosponsor H.R. 2213. This legislation provides a more commonsense and expeditious process for hiring border personnel.

We also need enough Customs officers to foster efficient trade for a robust economy. A recent study found that every batch of 33 CBP officers hired could lead to an increase in GDP of $60 million and an employment gain of over 1,000 jobs. For too long, the Federal Government has abdicated its chief responsibility of securing our borders and protecting our citizens. We must put the safety and security of the American people first and give our Border Patrol and the CBP the staff they need to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2213, and I applaud Chairman McCAUL, Ranking Member VELA, and Representative MCsALLY for their leadership on this critical issue.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

This legislation aims to address a staffing issue that has plagued the United States Customs and Border Patrol for many years.

H.R. 2213 would add the option to waive the polygraph test for a select few individuals who have already successfully taken and passed a similar polygraph test in the past. These individuals are veterans, members of our Armed Forces, or law enforcement officers with clean records and years of honorable service.

A veteran with secret clearance and an honorable discharge, 3 years of service, and a tier 5 background check is someone I would hold in high regard and exempt from an unnecessary polygraph.

I would not be in favor of this bill if it was exempting a polygraph test to the general public. This is a special group—our veterans and our law enforcement.

This legislation would not change the United States Customs and Border Patrol requirements for background checks or interviews. Customs and Border Patrol would still have their candidates undergo the regular battery of tests and checks. Customs and Border Patrol would still ask a candidate who waived the polygraph under these proposed changes to take an examination.

This bill will not lower the standards for entry. Rather, the flexibility it provides would prevent potential bottlenecks in the hiring pipelines and eliminate redundancy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to appease the concerns of several of my colleagues and say that this is not about building up a deportation force. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reaffirm that this legislation exclusively applies to Customs and Border Patrol, and it will not change the hiring procedures for Immigration and Customs Enforcement. This bill is about ensuring the agency hires only the best and the most honorable candidates. This bill is about providing employment and advancement opportunities for our servicemembers and law enforcement and creating job opportunities for those living in our border communities and border States.

Mr. Speaker, I also live in a border community, and I support this bill.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), the chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this polygraph waiver provision that is proposed here is a darn good idea that is a long time overdue from happening. The reality is the hiring process of the Border Patrol, and, in fact, I would argue it is almost everything under my jurisdiction in Homeland Security, is as slow as molasses in the wintertime. It just doesn’t move.
Meanwhile, we have got skilled law enforcement people applying, skilled former veterans with high clearances who are applying for these jobs and being stymied by the lack of polygraph operators available to do it.

This is a right choice of setting a priority for those people who have served, proving their worth, and are asking to be part of the defense of our national borders. I support this wholeheartedly. I support Chairwoman McSALLY’s concept here. It is great. It starts doing the right way of doing things is the right way, we ought to be doing it. Nobody is going to keep from checking on people. You can still make them take a polygraph if you run across something you don’t like. But it is a good idea whose time has come. Let’s be modern Americans and have new ideas and make those new ideas work.

I commend everyone here in support of this. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I think, for a change, government is making a good start at new ideas.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I will not mince words. Anyone who votes for this bill is voting to support and implement Donald Trump’s views on immigration, his desire to militarize our southern border, and his fantasy of a mass deportation force. You cannot spin it any other way.

If we want to lower the standards for screening and hiring CBP officers, eliminate checks that could help weed out candidates with criminal histories or criminal intentions, and water down the integrity of this important national security source, this bill is for you.

But if you care about border security and the integrity of the officers, you should join me in voting against the bill.

To me and a lot of other people watching this debate, this is about something else. Remember that man descending the golden escalators at Trump Tower announcing his campaign for President by saying Mexicans who ran illegal drugs and rapists into the country? That is what this bill does.

If you are onboard with this, you are also onboard with building a wall; onboard with billions to be spent on deporting moms and dads who have lived here for decades; going after DREAMers as the Trump administration is doing today, deporting DREAMers from the United States of America. Where do you want to draw the line on the Trump deportation agenda? I say draw the line right here, right now, and don’t give another inch. There are many ways to secure the Nation, but watering down the hiring standards of our men and women in uniform should not be one of them. Let’s secure the border. Let’s have them the same test at the border that you have a DEA agent, FBI agent, Secret Service agent. What are we going to do? Not have them take polygraph tests? That is going to be doing this. I doubt it.

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

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative VELA for yielding time to me and also Chairman McCaul and the folks who have been working on this particular bill.

CBP currently has a staffing deficit of 3,000 individuals for the uniform components, that is the U.S. Border Patrol, Office of Field Operations, Air and Marine Operations, which jeopardizes our national and our economic security.

This legislation does not cover ICE, CBP, Border Patrol, and Air and Marine. Nobody else. This has nothing to do with deportation.

Long before President Trump became a candidate for the office, Congress authorized 2,000 additional officers. That was about 4 years ago. Chairman CARTER, MICHAEL McCaul, we authorized 2,000 officers. Up to now, Mr. Speaker, we have not been able to hire those 2,000 officers because of the polygraph waived.

In fact, 65 percent of those individuals who applied for CBP are rejected, which is twice the amount that you have for other Federal officers, FBI, DEA, when they take their polygraph.

I am talking about polygraph exams.

Again, this does not cover ICE. What this bill actually does, it will strengthen CBP’s efforts to secure our border by filling those positions. I represent Laredo, the largest inland port, 14,000 traders a day. They have been delayed because we don’t have enough CBP officers, and we need to get them.

What this bill does, it does not lower the standards. I emphasize, it does not lower the standards. It streamlines the background investigation for a limited number of veterans, military officers, law enforcement. If you are a local law enforcement and you take a polygraph exam, then you can ask for this waiver. Or if you are a servicemember or a veteran with the highest background investigation, you can ask for it. Or if you are current Federal law enforcement with the highest background exam, you can get a waiver. But, again, if somebody finds out those vetted individuals still need to take a polygraph, then you would take it.

Finally, the last thing to conclude is, Members, this is not the first time we have gotten a waiver.

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

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CUELLAR. If you look at the National Defense Authorization polygraph waiver language, CBP has already gotten requests for waivers. In fact, it has already been done. This is not the first time that we are doing this. It is already the law. It doesn’t bring down the standards. It allows us to have more men and women at the border. This is why I ask you to support this legislation.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017, aims to bring some relief to the tremendous staffing shortages at our ports of entry by providing CBP with limited authority to waive its polygraph requirement on a case-by-case basis for certain veterans and State and local law enforcement officers in its hiring process.

H.R. 2213 is endorsed by the NTEU, the union that represents frontline CBP officers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. Speaker. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding this debate, it is important to note this bill is a bipartisan effort, passing unanimously out of my committee. It is supported by Ranking Member Thornorris, Congressman VELA, and we thank you for that, and others. Again, it passed unanimously.

I was pleased to see also a Dear Colleague letter sent by my Democratic counterparts on the Homeland Security Committee urging the passage of this bill. This only further underscores the bipartisan nature of this bill.

It is also supported, Mr. Speaker, by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Border Trade Alliance, the CBP officers’ union, and the Fraternal Order of Police, among others.

The issue is very clear. Not passing this bill will continue to keep American families at risk from dangers of human traffickers, drug smugglers, and international terrorists. Right now, we simply don’t have an adequate number of Border Patrol agents and CBP officers to safeguard our Nation’s border. We need to fix that. That is what this legislation does. It will allow us to bolster our forces with talented law enforcement officials and military personnel who have been previously vetted and have already demonstrated their commitment and patriotism to their fellow Americans.
THOMPSON, and all those who supported this bill. It will help strengthen our borders.

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

Mr. DeFazio. Mr. Speaker, I will be unable to vote on H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act. If I were present, I would vote against the bill.

While this bill purports to fast track the hiring of Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) agents in order to ensure our national security, it would actually water down hiring practices and allow potential vulnerabilities in the country's largest law enforcement agency. H.R. 2213 would allow certain CBP applicants to bypass polygraph testing.

In 2010 Congress passed the Anti-Border Corruption Act, which mandated CBP applicants pass a polygraph test as part of their hiring process. This bill was an essential step after an influx of corruption cases were revealed within the agency—ranging from drug trafficking to accepting bribes. Decreasing hiring standards as proposed by H.R. 2213 would do exactly what the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 fixed.

Instead of finding common-sense ways to expedite the hiring process without compromising the integrity of the agency, H.R. 2213 irresponsibly and in an attempt to keep President Trump's campaign promises of quickly increasing border patrol agents.

I am absolutely committed to regaining control of our country's borders and continually fighting to restrict individuals who would do our citizens harm—both through terrorist attacks or drug smuggling—from entering the United States. This ill-conceived legislation does nothing to ensure increased border security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, after line 1, insert the following:

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the later of the following dates:

(1) The date on which all of the following have been completed:

(A) The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection has conducted an evaluation and pilot program of the Test for Espionage, Sabotage, and Corruption (TES-C).

(B) The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security has certified such evaluation and pilot program.

(C) The Commissioner submits to Congress a report on such evaluation and pilot program.

(2) The date on which the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security completes a risk assessment of the population of individuals who could receive waivers under section 4(a) of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010, as amended by this Act, and submits to Congress certification that providing waivers to such individuals would not endanger national security, undermine workforce integrity, or increase corruption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 374, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this is, in fact, a national security issue. No other Federal law enforcement agency in the country—not the FBI, DEA, ATF, or Secret Service—makes any exceptions to their polygraph exam.

I understand that the CBP has a staffing shortage, but watering down vetting standards is dangerous and could lead to more corruption at the largest law enforcement agency in the country. In fact, 2,170 CBP personnel were arrested for sexual assault, excessive force, conspiring with international drug trafficking organizations, and other offenses between 2005 and 2012.

In response, Congress enacted legislation to require every applicant to undergo a polygraph exam—no exceptions. DHS' own Integrity Advisory Panel recommended that the current polygraph testing be expanded, not reduced, given the higher rates of corruption at CBP than any other Federal law enforcement agency.

This bill takes us backward, and some current and former DHS officials have expressed concerns that the bill could expose the agency to corruption. Facing severe staffing challenges, CBP needs a robust, comprehensive anti-corruption program that is not as controlled as the military.

DHS Inspector General John Roth warned that the proposed legislation "could put CBP at significant risk and that while it may sound reasonable to say you could waive requirements from former military personnel because they have passed a polygraph, Border Patrol agents work in a different environment that is not as controlled as the military."

Former CBP legal counsel of Internal Affairs has stated that "very few members of the military take polygraphs or have comprehensive background checks, and the quality of State or local law enforcement polygraphs varies widely."

My amendment would delay the implementation of the bill until, one, CBP completes its ongoing pilot program of an alternative polygraph test that may help speed up hiring while maintaining vetting standards; and, two, the DHS inspector general determines that the bill would not endanger our national security, undermine workforce integrity, or, in fact, increase corruption.

I recognize that CBP is managing a staffing shortage, but watering down hiring practices is not a solution. The most effective way to prevent corruption is comprehensive background checks, and our Customs and Border Patrol officers are facing a difficult mission in an extremely challenging environment. Polygraph testing is an important tool to ensure those charged with patrolling our border are not corruptible by drug traffickers or other criminal elements.

I am sympathetic to the hiring and staffing challenges facing this agency, but we cannot cut corners or jeopardize the security of our border.

This amendment delays the implementation of this legislation until CBP can compile its comprehensive alternative, more efficient polygraph test.

This amendment also requires DHS to determine these changes in the underlying bill to our polygraph procedures do not endanger our national security. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to ensure we do not create unnecessary risks to the security of our border.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good solution to the dilemma that faces us. We do have a hiring deficit in the Border Patrol, but we cannot give up on the need to fully vet these people.

The independent inspector said that the polygraphs had stopped dozens of applicants who have admitted to participating in human trafficking, defrauding the government, and have links with cartels intent to infiltrate CBP.

There has been, actually, a release from the Freedom of Information Act of people who would be eligible for the exemption who admitted, under the polygraph, to sexual assault, to child pornography, to taking classified information from Afghanistan, to taking classified information from Iraq, a sheriff's employee who engaged in theft, and a police officer who was a smuggler. The Border Patrol cannot afford this.

I think the gentlewoman's amendment actually preserves what we want, and I would highly recommend that we approve it.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.
Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Lujan Grisham amendment.

Let me say, first, that the Secretary of Homeland Security testified before my committee this morning, a decorated four-star general serving in Iraq and Afghanistan that he knows the SOUTHCOM. This man knows the border. Secretary Kelly supports this legislation.

I find it a bit offensive that decorated veterans who have already received clearances somehow would present a threat to the security of the United States, so I reject that argument.

This amendment strikes me as an unnecessary and harmful delay tactic that would prevent CBP from implementing the much-needed flexibility provided for in the underlying bill.

If the delays called for in this amendment were put in place, CBP would have to sit and wait until certain unnecessary obstacles were overcome, some of which had been completed for any of their control. All the while, they would continue to hemorrhage officers and agents, threatening the Nation’s border security and the flow of commerce in and out of the country. This could put our national interest at risk, and it would be, further, detrimental to the flow of legitimate trade and travel.

CBP has missed hiring targets for Border Patrol agents for 4 years and CBP officers for almost 18 months. We need additional officers and agents now, simply to meet the congressionally mandated CBP staffing levels that have been put in place for a year. We cannot wait for more reports and evaluations.

Sadly, this amendment looks to me like an attempt by opponents of the bill to prevent the important provisions of this bill from going into effect in a timely manner, thus preventing the hiring of already trusted and vetted officers who have already served their Nation and the military with honor and distinction.

It is also important to underscore two points here: one, that all applicants will continue to be fully vetted, including a rigorous tier 5 background investigation, which is equivalent to the investigation performed for all servicemen who hold a top secret clearance; and second, the authority granted under this bill is discretionary. If the CBP Commissioner wishes to require a polygraph examination for any applicant for any reason, he can and should do so.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to wait any longer. As the Speaker knows, who is briefed on the threats, as do I, in a classified setting, the threats are real. This Nation is at risk, and we cannot afford to wait.

So, for these reasons, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Let me just close, again, by saying I oppose the amendment. The men and women wearing the uniform on the front lines of our ports and borders need relief now, and any delay tactics should be rejected. Therefore, I urge opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill as amended, and I recognize the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham). The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McCaul. 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, and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Capuano. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House that was previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately release his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the President’s system of checks and balances, Congress has a responsibility to hold the Executive Branch of government to a fair and equal standard of transparency ensuring the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline for tax reform including whether the President paid taxes, ownership interests, charitable donations made, and whether tax deductions have been exploited;

Whereas, disclosure of the President’s tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in 2016, understand the President’s financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President recently fired Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, under whose leadership the FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, President Trump reportedly stated to Russian officials during a White House meeting that he fired Director Comey to ease pressure on the ongoing investigation of Russia’s influence in the 2016 election.

Whereas, the President has refused to divest his own assets or hire his own family into his business, and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution to express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any ‘‘present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state’’;

Whereas, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President’s tax returns under Section 6103 of the tax code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, the Director of the Internal Revenue Service has testified that tax returns are a critical tool in investigations because they can show income and motives;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise; Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the House of Representa-tives shall:

Immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives.

2. Support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Simpson). Does the gentleman from Massachusetts wish to present argument on the parliamentary question whether the resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. Capuano. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the question of order.
Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, the privileges of the House as defined in rule IX, clause 1 are “those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.”

We all know what has been going on for the last couple of months. In light of the testimony that was just released today of former Director Comey and what he is scheduled to say, his written testimony tomorrow, if it is not clear by now that the Congress should continue on, as we speak, we have several committees in this Congress investigating the Russian influence on our election and what its relationship is with the Trump administration.

Clearly and unequivocally, one of the questions that must be answered for the integrity of this investigation and, therefore, the integrity of the House, is whether the President himself had any undue influence in his actions.

Now, with that, I would like to invite my friend, Mr. PASCRELL, to say a few words. He has been the leader on this particular issue for months now.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear each Member individually.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, just yesterday’s events have made those answers even more critical than ever. And as my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) just pointed out, what we need to do is uphold the integrity of this body, the legislative branch of government.

Now, just a brief review, because I think this is a privilege of the House. That is why I believe this House should take this action.

And again, I hope we find nothing. That would be good for America, certainly good for Mr. Trump, good for America. We have plenty of other things to talk about and debate. This shouldn’t be one of them.

And if anybody can look me in the face and say that they believe this investigation is just going to go away, if they believe the investigators are not going to look at the President’s financial records, then I can’t because anybody who has ever been involved in any type of an investigation knows it is inevitable. And since it is inevitable, why should we wait? Why should we wait?

I ran for office, taking an oath to uphold the Constitution and giving my constituents my promise of only one thing: I will do my job as best as I see fit. I won’t shirk my responsibilities.

We have plenty of votes in this House that many of us, including me, would rather not take because they are uncomfortable, because we have to explain them to our constituents, because sometimes they are difficult and confusing. This is not one of them.

There is no reason to believe that they have a right to know that their President has not been subject to undue influence. That is all this does. It draws no conclusion from it, and it allows the majority party to call on the Executive branch, not me, but the majority party; the chair of the Ways and Means Committee.

That is why I offered this resolution. That is why I think this resolution is going to continue to be offered, and, at some point, the House is going to do it. I don’t know why Members of the House want to drag this out and pretend that somehow you are going to be able to avoid it. You are not. It is going to happen.

And, again, I hope we find nothing. And if anybody can look me in the face and say that it is “no,” I have no personal reason to want to have the President do something wrong.

But, at the same time, we, the American people, have a right to know the answers. And if the President has not been subject to undue influence, then we should have answers.

Now, I offer this resolution because it is the privilege of the House—this is the document that was presented on June 21, the day after inauguration, 2009, the Ethics Commitments by the Executive Branch of Personnel.

And this document goes into such things as the revolving door ban on lobbyists or pertaining to the executive branch of government because that is what we are talking about.

Just when you think you have heard it all, you haven’t.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, this administration threw out there in a trial balloon that we are going to start to sell off——

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you know who Walter Shaub is. S-H-A-U-B. Walter Shaub is the Director of the United States Office of Government Ethics. That is pretty important. In fact, in this administration—talk about the privilege of the House—this is the document that was presented on June 21, the day after inauguration, 2009, the Ethics Commitments by the Executive Branch of Personnel.

But this document goes into such things as the revolving door ban on lobbyists or pertaining to the executive branch of government because that is what we are talking about.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, this administration threw out there in a trial balloon that we are going to start to sell off——

Is there a problem? Is there a problem?

Mr. PASCRELL. That is correct. That is exactly what I am doing.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is wandering far from the question of order.

Mr. PASCRELL. I never wander, Mr. Speaker. I may not stick to the subject, but I don’t wander.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in the wilderness.

Mr. PASCRELL. No, I am not. I am not in Idaho.

The fact of the matter is, this is a very specific document that each administration presents when it is sworn. This is the set of rules which govern the executive branch of government.

When I read in documentation that we are getting set to sell off public lands, what am I reminded of?

Talk about the integrity of the House of Representatives. What am I reminded of?

I am reminded of what happened in 1922, 1923, 1924, when they tried to sell...
The Speaker pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House? 

The Speaker pro tempore. The motion at the desk.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 292, I was unavoidably detained to cast my vote in time. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."
Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have had this competitive shoot for a number of years, and I have to admit, this year I had a job fair at home, so I am going to turn it over to my vice chair, MARC VEASEY, who was actually out there. It is a great competition between the Republicans and the Democrats, but we work together on a lot of other issues.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Houston, Representative GREEN, and I also thank the Republicans that participate in the shoot every year. Obviously, we all play to win every time and we take the competition very seriously. Democrats only lost by about 13 shots this year. We actually did pretty good. So we are improving.

I want to remind everybody that we work on issues like conservation, environmental issues, and other things where Democrats and Republicans can come together for the greater cause of the country. I want to remind the gentleman that next year we are going to find those 13 shots.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), who is MARC VEASEY's co-chair on the caucus.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague that those shots were in my bag at one point and on our side.

We are going to win again next year. We always enjoy the friendship, and I look forward to seeing the gentleman again out there and standing up for the rights of sportsmen. I certainly appreciate his friendship and look forward to traveling again with him.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. What a great event. It was a great opportunity for us to get together, get to know each other, and spend some time in the outdoors.

I invite all Members to join the caucus. Come and be a part of this next year. Republicans retain the trophy this year, and I hope we will next year.

ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

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

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adopting amendment No. 1 to the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. DE LAURO) under the name of MICKI GRISHAM on which the year and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—179

Adams, Aguilar, Amadi, Barragán, Bass, Bera, Bishop (GA), Blackburn, Blumenauer, Blunt Rochester, Bonamici, Boyle, Brady (PA), Brown (MD), Brownley (CA), Bustos, Butterfield, Capuano, Carcagno, Carnahan, Cazon (IN), Carstwick, Castor (FL), Castro (TX), Chu, Cicilline, Clarke (MA), Clarke (NY), Cleaver, Cohen, Connolly, Conyers, Cooper, Courtney, Crist, Crowley, Davis (CA), Delaney, De Lauro, DelBene, DelBene, Demings, DeSaulnier, Deutch, Dingell, Doig, Doyle (NY), Edwards, Espal Bart, Bergman (UT), Birakits, Bishop (MI), Bishop (UT), Black, Blackburn, Blumenauer, Brooks (AL), Brooks (IN), Buck, Builders, Burgess, Adams, Aguilar, Amadi, Barragán, Bass, Bera, Bishop (GA), Blackburn, Blumenauer, Blunt Rochester, Bonamici, Boyle, Brady (PA), Brown (MD), Brownley (CA), Bustos, Butterfield, Capuano, Carcagno, Carnahan, Cazon (IN), Carstwick, Castor (FL), Castro (TX), Chu, Cicilline, Clarke (MA), Clarke (NY), Cleaver, Cohen, Connolly, Conyers, Cooper, Courtney, Crist, Crowley, Davis (CA), Delaney, De Lauro, DelBene, DelBene, Demings, DeSaulnier, Deutch, Dingell, Doig, Doyle (NY), Edwards, Espal, Evans, Foster, Gabbard, Gabbard, NAYS—238

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Houston, Representative GREEN, and I also thank the Republicans that participate in the shoot every year. Obviously, we all play to win every time and we take the competition very seriously. Democrats only lost by about 13 shots this year. We actually did pretty good. So we are improving.

I want to remind everybody that we work on issues like conservation, environmental issues, and other things where Democrats and Republicans can come together for the greater cause of the country. I want to remind the gentleman that next year we are going to find those 13 shots.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), who is MARC VEASEY's co-chair on the caucus.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague that those shots were in my bag at one point and on our side.

We are going to win again next year. We always enjoy the friendship, and I look forward to seeing the gentleman again out there and standing up for the rights of sportsmen. I certainly appreciate his friendship and look forward to traveling again with him.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. What a great event. It was a great opportunity for us to get together, get to know each other, and spend some time in the outdoors.

I invite all Members to join the caucus. Come and be a part of this next year. Republicans retain the trophy this year, and I hope we will next year.

ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

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

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adopting amendment No. 1 to the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. DE LAURO) under the name of MICKI GRISHAM on which the year and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—179

Adams, Aguilar, Amadi, Barragán, Bass, Bera, Bishop (GA), Blackburn, Blumenauer, Blunt Rochester, Bonamici, Boyle, Brady (PA), Brown (MD), Brownley (CA), Bustos, Butterfield, Capuano, Carcagno, Carnahan, Cazon (IN), Carstwick, Castor (FL), Castro (TX), Chu, Cicilline, Clarke (MA), Clarke (NY), Cleaver, Cohen, Connolly, Conyers, Cooper, Courtney, Crist, Crowley, Davis (CA), Delaney, De Lauro, DelBene, DelBene, Demings, DeSaulnier, Deutch, Dingell, Doig, Doyle (NY), Edwards, Espal, Evans, Foster, Gabbard, Gabbard, NAYS—238

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Houston, Representative GREEN, and I also thank the Republicans that participate in the shoot every year. Obviously, we all play to win every time and we take the competition very seriously. Democrats only lost by about 13 shots this year. We actually did pretty good. So we are improving.

I want to remind everybody that we work on issues like conservation, environmental issues, and other things where Democrats and Republicans can come together for the greater cause of the country. I want to remind the gentleman that next year we are going to find those 13 shots.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), who is MARC VEASEY's co-chair on the caucus.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague that those shots were in my bag at one point and on our side.

We are going to win again next year. We always enjoy the friendship, and I look forward to seeing the gentleman again out there and standing up for the rights of sportsmen. I certainly appreciate his friendship and look forward to traveling again with him.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. What a great event. It was a great opportunity for us to get together, get to know each other, and spend some time in the outdoors.

I invite all Members to join the caucus. Come and be a part of this next year. Republicans retain the trophy this year, and I hope we will next year.

ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

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

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adopting amendment No. 1 to the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. DE LAURO) under the name of MICKI GRISHAM on which the year and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]
David-Cole Fletcher served the ordeal, still expressing hope and compassion. That dark moment and bright example of courage and compassion has prompted soul-searching in my community. There has been a tremendous outpouring of support and a commitment to help the vulnerable. We all think about whether we would have had that courage. Who knows what might have happened to those two young women if those courageous people had not intervened. Based on what happened, it is highly likely that they would have been physically assaulted, injured, or worse.

We think this is a wake-up call for all of us to protect the vulnerable, to resist intolerance, and to condemn behaviors and language that would incite violence. We all have a stake in resisting intolerance, and to condemn behaviors and language that would incite violence. There has been a tremendous outpouring of support and a commitment. There has been a tremendous outpouring of support and a commitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 137, not voting 11, as follows:

RECORDED VOTE
Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on June 7, 2017 on account of attending my son’s graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “yea” for rollcall vote No. 288, “yea” for rollcall vote No. 289, “yea” for rollcall vote No. 290, “yea” for rollcall vote No. 291, “yea” for rollcall vote No. 292, “yea” for rollcall vote No. 293, and “yea” for rollcall vote No. 294.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 292, No. 293, and No. 294 due to my spouse’s health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on the Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair. I also would have voted “yea” on the Lujan Grisham Amendment. I also would have voted “nay” on Final Passage of H.R. 2213—Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Mr. SCHNEIDER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.” So the bill was passed.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 137, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—282

Not Voting—11

NOT VOTING—11

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have a personal explanation.

Mr. SCHNEIDER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.” So the bill was passed.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 137, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—282

Not Voting—11

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have a personal explanation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 292, No. 293, and No. 294 due to my spouse’s health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on the Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair. I also would have voted “yea” on the Lujan Grisham Amendment. I also would have voted “nay” on Final Passage of H.R. 2213—Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2560
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 2560.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 2560.

There was no objection.
CONGRATULATING LOCAL HERO
THALIA RODRIGUEZ

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a young and valiant member of our south Florida community, Thalia Rodriguez. Just 17 years old, Thalia used her skills that she learned from her high school’s emergency medical responder class to save the life of one of our Miami-Dade police officers.

Major Ricky Carter was off duty, traveling on his motorcycle, when an unexpected crash left him critically injured at the side of the road. Thalia came upon the scene, immediately began to apply first aid to the injured police major. Realizing that his injuries were too severe to wait for the first responders to arrive, Thalia made the split-second decision to fashion a tourniquet out of a belt, thereby buying Major Carter valuable time. Thalia’s brave act that Sunday morning saved Major Ricky Carter’s life.

Thank you to Thalia Rodriguez, a graduating senior at Westland Hialeah Senior High School, for her outstanding heroism.

CELEBRATING LADY BETTY COLES

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and celebrate the 90th birthday of Lady Betty Coles of Trenton, New Jersey. She was wonderfully celebrated this weekend at a party attended by over 100 family members and friends, thanks to her daughter and son-in-law, Tracy and Robert Ross.

Lady Coles has distinguished her family, church, and community with countless years of dedicated service, love, and leadership by example. She has enriched our community as charter member of the Epsilon Upsilon Omega Chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha since 1952, and continues her years of service as a member of Shiloh Baptist Church.

Personally, I am grateful for her friendship, her stewardship, her mentorship, her leadership, and her dedication to not only New Jersey, but our global community.

May God continue to bless Lady Coles on this milestone year, and we are forever grateful to Him, having sent her our way.

BRINGING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY TO ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Financial CHOICE Act. Financial Services Committee Chairman JEB HENSAWLING’s bill aims to bring economic opportunity to all Americans.

After Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats passed the Dodd-Frank Act of 2010, dozens of small community financial institutions in my district were forced to close or merge with big banks. In fact, my State of Georgia has lost more than 40 of these institutions over the period of time. This was due to the unbelievable complexity and compliance costs of the regulations imposed on them.

With the Financial CHOICE Act, community banks will finally be able to get some relief from these regulations. As a business owner myself, I know how important access to capital can be for a new business. We know that 70 percent of all new job creation is created by the growth of small businesses.

Once these banks are able to get back to the business of lending, my hope is that it will spur small-business growth and entrepreneurship in my district and across the country.

This legislation also ends taxpayer-funded bailouts once and for all, finally fulfilling the promises that Democrats failed to keep.

And did I mention it reduces the deficit by $33.6 billion over 10 years? President Trump has asked us to do a number on Dodd-Frank, and I support him in this endeavor, and believe the Financial CHOICE Act does just that.

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today, President Trump visited Ohio to tout his infrastructure plan. Well, Ohio needs the good jobs that direct national investment could provide, so my Democratic Ohio colleagues, Mr. RYAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, and I sent President Trump a letter encouraging him to take a wide view of what infrastructure should encompass in States like Ohio.

We urged the President to consider upgrading our foundational assets, such as drinking water systems, our national electric grid, energy efficiency, roofing and lead removal in individual homes, plus modernizing roads and bridges, our seaports and waterways, our airports and rail systems. Indeed, infrastructure investments present the best opportunity to revitalize our battered domestic steel industry as well.

We hope President Trump’s infrastructure plan won’t lead to more broken promises like with his budget, which zeros out assistance for our Great Lakes. The President’s plan lacks quantifiable specifics, but some advocates cite their Privatization and tax breaks mean bearing down more costs on taxpayers through user fees and tolls.

Mr. Speaker, Americans expect more than showmanship. It is time for a real bipartisan jobs and infrastructure plan to help modernize America from stem to stern and keep her great for years to come.

CONGRATULATING DEAN WILLIAM EASTERLING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Penn State’s own Dean William Easterling on his appointment to head the National Science Foundation’s Directorate for Geosciences, or GEO.

Dr. Easterling was dean of Penn State College of Earth and Mineral Sciences prior to beginning his 4-year appointment last week. This is an incredible opportunity for Dean Easterling, and Happy Valley is most proud of his achievement.

Science was part of Dean Easterling’s life from a very young age, as his father was a medical school physician. He told our local paper that he was taken at an early age by environmental sciences, geology, and weather, and these interests have always stuck with him.

Dr. Easterling has been the dean of Earth and Mineral Sciences at Penn State since 2007. He plans to return to the university after his appointment to the National Science Foundation.

I wholeheartedly congratulate Dean Easterling on this momentous achievement. I wish him the best over the next 4 years. And I know that his hunger for learning and his advanced research skills will serve this Nation well.

Congratulations, Dean Easterling.

DISAPPROVING OF WITHDRAWAL FROM THE PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong disapproval of President Trump’s decision to withdraw the United States from the International Paris Agreement on global climate change. The world is watching us, and history will judge this ill-considered decision harshly.

Withdrawing from the accord weakens America’s global leadership, shrinks our transition to renewable sources of energy, and make it more likely the clean energy jobs of tomorrow will be created overseas rather than here at home.

Let me be clear: Climate change is real and a present threat. America can and should be the global leader in developing innovative solutions, but this decision leaves us as an international outlier.
I am proud my hometown, Chicago, joins cities and States across the country that have pledged to continue honoring the emission reductions that are part of the Paris Agreement. That is why I am introducing a resolution to commend the States and localities and to urge the administration to reverse its position.

I invite my colleagues to join me. Irrespective of President Trump's short-sighted policies, we must continue to seek solutions to protect our planet for future generations.

IN MEMORIAM OF SPECIALIST ETIENNE J. MURPHY

(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 remember the life of Army Specialist Etienne J. Murphy, who died on May 26 when his vehicle overturned in Syria as part of Operation Inherent Resolve.

Specialist Murphy was raised in Loganville, Georgia, where, from an early age, he showed a keen interest in the American Armed Forces and for serving his country. He enlisted in the Army at 18 years old, and 2 years later he joined the 1st Battalion of the 75th Ranger Regiment, stationed at Hunter Army Airfield.

Murphy was just 5 days into his first deployment in Syria when his vehicle was involved in a nontactical rollover-related accident which is still under investigation.

Murphy’s wife and two young sons continue to reside in Savannah, Georgia, where he was stationed.

Only a short time after Memorial Day, the passing of Specialist Murphy’s passing reminds us all that freedom comes at a high price, and servicemen and -women face danger daily when fighting to preserve American values against terrorism.

I want to share my deepest condolences to his family and thank Specialist Murphy for his service, bravery, and sacrifice.

JAMES COMEY WILL TESTIFY

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning James Comey will address the Senate Intelligence Committee. I read his testimony today.

It is obvious to me that the President leaned on James Comey to try to get him involved in the Michael Flynn situation that were contrary to what Mr. Comey and I think justice would require, and that is an open investigation for the benefit of the American people and for the independence of the American Government in dealing with its relations with Russia.

I commend James Comey for being strong after being looked down on and at by the President, trying to get him to ask for his job or pledge loyalty or commit to derail that investigation.

I thank him for his integrity. I thank him for his service to the FBI. And I certainly hope that no one will try to disparage his integrity or his honesty tomorrow.

LORAL O’HARA IS A MEMBER OF 2017 NASA ASTRONAUT CANDIDATE CLASS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Sugar Land, Texas, is bursting with pride. A few hours ago, at the Johnson Space Center, Vice President Pence announced that Loral O’Hara is a member of the 2017 NASA astronaut candidate class.

She is a native Texan. Her high school is in my neighborhood. She is a proud Clements High School Ranger, class of 2001. She has a bachelor’s from a school in the former Republic of Texas, the University of Kansas, and a master’s from Purdue University.

Growing up in Houston, I know they like to take lots of huge risks, and by that standard, Loral is the most qualified candidate ever. She is a private pilot, an EMT, a wilderness first responder, a surfer, a sailor, a skier, a scuba diver, currently with the Woods Hole Oceanographic Center. That is perfect training for her because she will spend hours in the water at the Sonny Carter Neutral Buoyancy Lab outside the Johnson Space Center.

Loral, you know how to come home in style like only a Texas woman can do. You are an astronaut. Welcome home.

NATIONAL CANCER SURVIVORS DAY

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago on June 4, we recognized National Cancer Survivors Day to honor all of the incredible men and women who have battled cancer and have emerged triumphant.

This year, an estimated 1.6 million new cases of cancer will be diagnosed, and nearly 700,000 people will die of cancer in the United States.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention lists cancer now as the second leading cause of death. Fortunately, we are taking steps to lower those numbers. Last year’s 21st Century Cures Act, a bipartisan initiative, authorized $1.9 billion in funding for the Cancer Moonshot Foundation, aids in cancer research, and strives to increase the variety of treatment options while also helping to help prevent cancer and detect it at early stages.

Mr. Speaker, on National Cancer Survivors Day, we are grateful for those who have won their fight against cancer, and now we commit to honoring more survivors through research for new and improved cures.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, our current immigration policies are hurting families, tearing families apart, and deporting people who are part of the very fabric of our communities.

I have a few people in particular I plan to talk about and whose stories I will be sharing, but first I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O’ROURKE), my colleague and friend.

Mr. O’ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii for yielding to me and for her leadership on this issue. I served with her for 2 years on the Homeland Security Committee of the House of Representatives and saw her ability to balance the national interests and capitalizing and maximizing the opportunity that immigrants provide and have always provided to the United States while ensuring that we protect the homeland and our sacred commitment to every person and family that we represent to make sure that they are safe, think that the community that I have the honor of representing in Congress, El Paso, Texas, is a case in point. We are one of the safest cities in the United States today.

If you use the FBI’s crime statistics as crushed by CQ Press, they routinely rank El Paso, Texas, the safest city in not just the State of Texas, but in the United States. For the last 20 years, we have been the safest, second safest or third safest in the country. That is not in spite of the fact that we are connected with Mexico—our sister city is Ciudad Juarez—and it is not in spite of the fact that 24 percent of the people that I represent were born in another country, most of them in Mexico.

In fact, our success, our strength is connected to the fact that we are a city of immigrants, that we are connected to the rest of the world through our shared border with Mexico, and that understanding that is critical to preserving the security and public safety which is such a critical part of our job. I will give you an example.

Today, we celebrate the 60th anniversary of the beginning of Operation Wetback, which was the systematic roundup of every last Mexican that had not been documented and deported. This was a program not only to assure that we were safe, but to get the Mexican labor needed to make our food.

There is no doubt that we are safer today than we were in the 1950s, for which we can, in large part, thank Operation Wetback. But we can’t become complacent. In fact, a new study released yesterday shows that unauthorized immigration is at its lowest in decades.

We can celebrate this fact, but not as an occasion to rescind the recent executive actions that President Trump has taken to safeguard border security while honoring the constitutional principle that all Americans are equal before the law. And I say this because I am a proud member of the 2017 NASA astronaut candidate class.
Not too long ago, under this administration, a woman who was an undocumented immigrant from Mexico was in an El Paso County courtroom seeking a protective order because her boyfriend threatened her life. The judge in that courtroom granted that protective order. The woman was leaving the courtroom, she was apprehended by a plainclothes Border Patrol agent. That has never, to my knowledge, happened in our community in the El Paso County Courthouse.

The possibility of that are not just that one person was taken off the streets and placed into detention and custody. The consequence is that we have fewer people from the immigrant community in El Paso coming forward to serve as witnesses to crimes, to report crimes in the first place, to testify, to take part in the criminal justice system in a way that has kept our community safe.

By definition, today, because of that one act and because of the climate of fear and intimidation and anxiety produced by this administration, El Paso, Texas, the State of Texas, this country is less safe.

If we want to respond to the most urgent issue that each constituent of ours depends on us for, that is their safety, their security, that of the community and the country that we serve, then we need to make sure that we treat everyone within our communities the same that we represent with dignity and respect. We need to make sure that local law enforcement is not seen as a tool of Federal immigration law, but that they are there to preserve and to protect the peace and to serve the constituents and the people who live in those communities.

I would also add that next week marks the fifth anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program implemented under President Obama. It was an important step that this country took to realize the gains that we and future generations will receive by ensuring that those young people who arrived on our shores and through our land ports of entry like El Paso, through no fault of their own, at the tender age of 5 or 6 years old and who are now in school or want to serve in our military or want to create jobs themselves are able to stay here and flourish so that we receive the benefit of their potential.

I hope this Congress, every colleague from both sides of the aisle, will work with me and others to ensure that we have, if not comprehensive immigration reform, which I think should remain the goal, reform in those areas like for the DREAMers and the DACA beneficiaries that is most urgent and to the States that we represent and serve, like Texas, with 200,000 DACA beneficiaries out of 700,000 nationwide. It is the right thing to do for our security, it is the right thing to do for economic growth and job creation. It is the right thing to do in the best interests and traditions of this country.

So I conclude by again thanking the gentlewoman from Hawaii for leading this discussion on this critically important issue, and I thank her for the privilege of being able to speak tonight.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his leadership and his commitment to not only the families and the people in his district, but to the challenges that many families are facing all across the country, and I look forward to continuing to work with him on this.

Some of these challenges that face families across the country touch my constituents in Hawaii as well. I would like to share a few of their stories and their challenges here today in the hopes that Congress and this administration take action and do the right thing for them and for our country.

We are a nation of immigrants. Andres Magana Ortiz’s story is not a new one. It is not one that will surprise anyone.

In fact, it will be quite recognizable to most of us. No tradition is as American as the story of our relatives and ancestors who, against all odds and great difficulties, found and made a home here on our shores.

But while our family histories remind us of how far we have come, Andres’s story reminds us that we have yet to make and who is hurt and affected by the lack of that progress today.

Andres Ortiz came to Hawaii seeking the American Dream. With hard work, perseverance, and a little luck, Andres demonstrated what, as Americans, know to be true and that we strive for: if you work hard, you can succeed and get ahead.

Andres started a new life in 1996 picking coffee—backbreaking, tough work, for anyone who has done it before. In the Kona region on the island of Hawaii, he proved himself smart and capable, and he was soon promoted to supervisor. By 2010, he saved enough to buy his own coffee farm. Today, he owns 20 acres of coffee trees, and manages another 150 acres for his neighbors.

Andres quickly earned a reputation as a knowledgeable and skillful farmer. When an invasive beetle, called the coffee berry borer, began to ravish our Kona coffee farms and trees, Andres began a pioneering system to help his community track and eradicate this infestation, even before our U.S. Department of Agriculture took action. Now, this information was just a small matter. It was something that cost our farmers millions of dollars.

Our country offered Andres the means to become an entrepreneur, and he paid us back in full: he started a business, he creates jobs, he takes care of his family, he is a leader in our community. Andres is not a legal resident of Hawaii, but Hawaii owes him a debt for his contributions.

Managing the coffee farm is a family affair for Andres. He is a proud husband and father of three children. His wife and kids are all American citizens, and his kids only know Hawaii as home.

Andres embodies the spirit of the American Dream, and serves as an example of why we should welcome courageous, hardworking immigrants into our community. The reality that Andres faces now, sadly, is far different.

Andres is deportable because as is supposed to happen in just a few days, his family, their farm, and Kona coffee growers are going to face an uncertain future. Without Andres to run the business, his family could lose their farm and lose their home. Their neighbors will lose a friend and a business partner. Brenda, his wife, will be without her husband, and their three children will be without their father.

If Andres is forced to leave, the law will keep him from his family for 30 years. Should the family move to Mexico with Andres, they will have to learn a new language and a new culture. His daughter will have to drop out of college at the University of Hawaii and begin a new life in another country. Relocating to Mexico would deprive them of the benefits afforded to the citizens of this country.

Now, unfortunately, Andres’s story is not a singular one. Unfortunately, there are more.

Just last week, Graham Ellis of Waimea, a 67-year-old British national and leukemia patient, heard a knock on his door. It was two Department of Homeland Security agents who have come to begin the deportation process back to the U.K. after Graham had made Hawaii his home for over 36 years. After a few short minutes of conversation in front of his wife, Dena, who is an American citizen, Graham agreed to turn himself in at a field office in Honolulu the following day. Now, like Mr. Ortiz, Graham is a pillar within our community in Hawaii. But unlike Mr. Ortiz, Graham had already made the decision to return to the U.K. because he feared that deportation was inevitable under the heightened threats faced under our current immigration policies. Graham had made the decision to leave by the end of summer, thinking that these remaining months would give him time to get his affairs in order, and say every goodbye to the place that was the home that he grew to love for so long.

A circus performer by training, Graham spent much of his life in Hawaii teaching children from low-income and at-risk communities circus arts, bringing smiles and laughter to their faces and their lives.

He served on the Puna Community Council, and was the founding president of the Kalapana Seaview Estates Community Association. In his remaining final months, he had planned to make a trip to Kauai, where he would instruct his last group of young, passionate students at a 2-week...
superhero-themed circus camp before shutting it down for good.

Our immigration system is broken. We need a pathway to citizenship for immigrants to ensure people who deserve to be here can find a way to be a part of our great country. We need real immigration reform that keeps families together and integrates hard-working, tax-paying immigrants into our community. We need to preserve, protect, and restore the values that underlie the greatness of our country.

I stand with these immigrants who live in my community, who live in my district, and who have a proven record of upstanding contributions to our community.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), my colleague.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the beautiful State of Hawaii for yielding to me.

I thank her also for being a champion of immigration, both in her State and across the Nation.

It is Immigrant Heritage Month this month, and I think it is critical that we talk about the constituents to talk about the state of immigration here in the United States. I can’t do that any better than by talking about a few stories of what I have experienced over the past few months.

On January 27 of this year, we saw President Trump sign his executive order, quite expeditiously, on a travel ban that specifically targeted the Muslim community, with seven countries, where 90-plus percent of the population practice Islam.

It was an interesting moment for me. My wife and I were having dinner with a few friends of ours in the district, and one of them had asked me: Well, how is this ban going to affect you? How is it going to affect your district?

At the moment, I wasn’t really sure, but then I got a call only a few minutes later by my district director. Our first constituent was identified as coming back on a United Arab Emirates flight back from Iraq and was scheduled to land the next morning: a girl who had graduated from the University of Central Florida and lived a very productive life as a legal resident in central Florida for the last 6 years after her graduation.

So we went the next day—early the next morning because, if anything, my legislative experience in the State legislature has told me: go to where the action is, go to where the controversy is, and do what you can to help.

Finally, we went to Customs and Border Protection, and we got no response. We actually got surprise responses of what were we even doing there, because this was not a matter they were prepared to handle.

So we went to the airport and were greeted by Greater Orlando Aviation Authority officials who were very helpful and understood that these were central Floridians who had been flying for 20 hours and were just about to arrive back into Florida, where they lived.

That morning, I also met a young man who was a citizen from an area just north of the district, who was waiting for his two parents to come in on the ESEA flight. We found out that the constituent and the two parents were three people who were held back and questioned.

Throughout the day, we would get updates on whether we found there was very little information because there was very little understanding by Customs and Border Protection about how to implement this very vague order. The court had just ruled that it was potentially unconstitutional.

So working with our local officials after hours of building up, hours of waiting with the families, hours of press starting to arrive, hours of TV coverage, and hours of protest, right when we were in the middle of doing interviews, that is when the families were finally released, after 7 hours of being questioned without water, without food, after a 20-hour flight.

You could not have scripted this to make the point of how misguided this ban was, what happened: Right in front of TV cameras from across central Florida, first, the two parents came down—parents of a citizen who hadn’t seen his parents in over 5 years.

The scene was traumatic: crying, hugs, cameras wondering what had happened to these two individuals. These were simply two citizens of Iraq trying to come over to visit their son, who already been given visas to come on over.

A few minutes later, our constituent finally arrived as well. She also had been held for 8 hours without water, without food, after a 20-hour flight, and a barrage of questions.

After that, we saw public opinion change, shock, shame, and anger in central Florida as people saw these were the alleged people that were getting extreme vetting: people who were visiting their son in central Florida, longtime residents, who only had productive lives in central Florida.

A few weeks later, we had the deportation force memo come down. I was shocked. We sent out letters to our sheriffs, we sent out letters to our schools, asking if they were planning to participate in the deportation force that President Trump had called upon to help implement and enforce our immigration laws.

We called immediately a round table, where we invited immigrant groups, we invited law enforcement groups, and so on, and many others to talk about the issues that were happening.

Two of my three sheriffs immediately said they weren’t planning on participating, that this was a Federal issue.

A third ended up going from fully participating to a day later, walking back that position, to just picking up folks who had been accused of violent felonies.

Then our schools responded very quickly after they were posed with a scenario—a situation that was going down the very same day: a citizen, a young woman of Mexican descent, whose parents were also legal immigrants, was asked in front of their classmates about her status.

Afterwards, there were a lot of finger-pointing and excuses that these were questions that were being levied to determine whether she needed to participate in the DHS call. But at that moment, it was just more of this anti-immigrant rhetoric that was coming out of so many areas in central Florida.

But like that incident, which was covered at length, minds and hearts changed in central Florida. There was an apology given to this young woman who was a citizen, and they changed the policy so that no one would be asked about immigration status in front of their peers, even if it was for something as harmless as the ESEA program.

With our sheriffs clarifying their policies to not join this DHS call for deportation force, once again to have an inclusive society in central Florida where we welcome everybody. We are such an international community, home to the best theme parks in the world, a world-class convention center and hotels, and we welcome everybody from across the globe.

Then, in addition, I just received a letter from a constituent. Her daughter had grown up, gotten a job, fallen in love, and had a girlfriend of the same gender. But she worried because her daughter’s boyfriend potentially could be deported because he is on an H-1 visa.

These types of policies, breaking up families don’t serve any interest in helping people pursue the American Dream and don’t serve any interest in protecting our economy and protecting growth in central Florida, where we have such a large cattle industry and where we have such a large citrus industry.

Finally, we have so many DREAMers, young students, who live in central Florida, who are working and striving, rising up in our society, and helping people along the way. Immigrants who potentially could be one of 40 percent of creators of Fortune 500 companies that have been created here in America, one of the 65,000 servicemen and women who are immigrants, who serve in our United States military. And we find that, with every 100 immigrants, we are creating 120 new jobs because our country has been founded and created on growth and equality.

I am going to vote no on this DHS call for deportation force.

I don’t think it is going to affect your district. I don’t think it is going to affect you.

I would like to see a few things happen, things that I believe Democrats and Republicans can agree on. We need to make sure to ratify the DREAMer program, the Deferred Action program. You have bipartisan co-sponsorship for this bill. This is something we could get done, especially for...
our veterans and those serving in our U.S. military.

In addition, I believe that we need to relook at the H-1 visa program, the farmworker program. We need to acknowledge the reality that we have had for the two or three years of agricultural workers here in the United States, which is that we rely on many of our immigrants coming from Mexico and Central and South America to help with our agriculture. This has been going on for over a century.

What we can do is simply go from a 1-year to maybe a 3-year or 5-year program. I know our immigrants’ rights would support it. I know our agriculture communities would support it; and we wouldn’t have people unwittingly not getting back to their country of origin after the 1-year visa expires, when they just want to go back and come back again to help out as seasonal laborers.

Then thirdly, there is an arbitrary cap on highly skilled workers here in this country. We train them in Ivy League schools, in brilliant schools in Texas, California, Florida, and across this country. We then, because of what is an arbitrary cap that no one wants to change because of the hot-button issue of immigration, then we send them on their way, back to their countries of origin, rather than keep them here and harness their talent for the future of our economy.

Canada has even got word of this and welcomes these folks. When they realize their visas are up, they beg them to come to Canada to help start new businesses.

So these are some of the ideas that we can fix, that we could all agree on, that both parties can agree on. And of course, in the end, we need a comprehensive immigration reform. But, in the meantime, let’s get some things done that we all agree on and move our country forward.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii, one of the most beautiful States of the Union, for her leadership.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Florida for complimenting my State, but for, most importantly, again, putting a face and names to those who are suffering as a result of our broken immigration policy.

You know, for us here, we can stand here and talk about policies and debate them, but legislation that needs to be passed. But it is really those folks at home who make it all very real. It is not just a bill number, it is their own family that is being torn apart, it is their own children who are being affected.

Now, you know, I talked about Mr. Ortiz in Hawaii. He and his family are going through this, as we speak, where, in just a few days, he faces being deported. He and his family have exhausted all the options available to them, given the time that they have.

Our delegation from Hawaii, both my colleague, Congresswoman HANABUSA, as well as our Senators, Senator HIRONO and Senator SCHATZ, we have all sent a letter to Secretary Kelly, Department of Homeland Security, urging him to reconsider this order and to halt Mr. Ortiz’s deportation, taking a much more compassionate consideration to him and his circumstances and his longstanding commitment and leadership in our community.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 2794, which is what is called a private bill specifically for the relief of Andres Magana Ortiz. And the purpose of this bill is to help Mr. Ortiz with his extremely challenging situation and to help him on his own path to citizenship.

I urge Chairman GOOLITTLE to give positive consideration to this bill that has been referred to his committee. I urge Secretary Kelly, the Department of Homeland Security, to revisit their policy and their decision and to put a halt on Mr. Ortiz’s deportation. He is not just a number. He is not just a statistic. He and his family are facing this reality today.

It is always the right time to do the right thing. I urge these leaders to do that right thing.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to be here. I do greatly appreciate my friend from Hawaii, her views. I know she is a person of integrity; calls them like she sees them. I appreciate her very much.

There are just a number of things that really need to be called out. Here is an article from the Guardian. Julian Borger, June 6, that would be yesterday. The headline is: “Cancel Donald Trump state visit, says Sadiq Khan, after London attack tweets.”

It states: “London mayor says U.S. President is wrong about many things and that state visit to Britain should not go ahead.”

“The London mayor, Sadiq Khan, has called on the British Government to cancel a planned state visit by Donald Trump, after the Mayor of London’s tweet by yesterday. The headline is: “Cancel Donald Trump state visit, says Sadiq Khan, after London attack tweets.”

It states: “London mayor says U.S. President is wrong about many things and that state visit to Britain should not go ahead.”

“The London mayor, Sadiq Khan, has called on the British Government to cancel a planned state visit by Donald Trump, after his tweets on Saturday.”

Now, it really is interesting that the London mayor, after he has his citizens—his people are viciously mutilated, killed in the streets of his city, and, instead of going through a self-examination, is there something more I could have done as mayor of this town? Is there something more I could have encouraged? Is there something more we could have done here in England, in Great Britain, in the U.K.? Have we done everything that I, in a position of authority, could have done to stop this, to help, at least help stop this?

But Mr. Sadiq Khan apparently didn’t go through that, as people were grieving, not just in London but all over the world, here in the United States, praying for the families, grieving with those who were attacked, so many attacked, dozens attacked, innocent people perhaps suffering, maybe we don’t have our policies quite right this is yet another attack, and maybe the Britain leaders should have thought, you know, we have been saying that the real key—it has been said around England, maybe the stopping radical Islam and the mutilation of innocent people, the slashing of throats, the beheading, the terrible things that have been done by radical Islamists, maybe the way to stop them we were told—not maybe—they said the way to stop them is the Paris climate accord.

If we just show them enough love as they are beheading us, or slashing our throats, and we have signed on, and we are fully part embraced in the Paris climate accord, maybe the radical Islamists, maybe the way to stop them we were told—maybe—they said the way to stop them is the Paris climate accord.

And in England, there are people who have indicated as much, how outrageous it was that President Trump pulled the United States out of the Paris accord, because he saw the damage that was going to be done to the United States economy. He saw the damage that would be done to the United States jobs.

We talked to people in east Texas last weekend, different places around east Texas, and they kept coming back: I am so grateful that Donald Trump pulled out of the Paris accord. One of them has a new—some type of concrete business. They have got rights to a specific process that is great for the environment. It is green.

So then we find out our business was going to be devastated if we stayed in the Paris climate accord. It would have gutted our business. We would have had to have been having to file for bankruptcy. Others, you know, the same day, last Saturday, were telling me the same things, different places, same song. We found out how much our business would have been gutted if the President had not pulled out of the Paris accord.

And, of course, we want to be fair to the 160 countries or so that have condemned the United States, said that we are the one partner in the Paris climate accord, just like in Kyoto, and Reykjavik, and all these others, the United States is the most important partner in those accords. Well, yeah, I guess so.

We were going to be the one country that was going to pay billions of dollars to other countries because we have been successful, and we have been innovative, and our Constitution, the brilliance of the Founders to ensure in our Constitution that we were going to really use intellectual property, intellectual thought, would stir intellectual creations. And we loved this idea of private property, you know, before the
last 50 years, we loved this idea of private property, and the Nation has grown.

But as, you know, people have continued to make inroads, taking away private property rights, of course, the economy at the rates that it has in previous days. But at least by pulling out of Paris, we have got a shot to continue to be the most humanitarian, the most charitable Nation, I believe in the history of the world; that even Solomon's Israel did not have the kind of freedoms and the kind of individual ability to be charitable.

Billions of dollars that have been given. I don't know. Maybe trillions over the years in today's dollars around the world for so many good purposes. And yet if we had stayed in the Paris accord, we would have done so much damage to our own economy.

So I have told many people, thank God, and thank Donald Trump that he got us out of that mess so that we can continue our climb out of the economic malaise of the Obama years; that we can continue to get back a thriving economy that cannot produce and manufacture the things that are needed in a time of war will not remain a world power past the next war. It won't. So it boosts us back to a great thing to get rid of the Paris accord.

Now we have got to cut taxes. And I know there is a lot of screaming from the left about how, gee, wanting to cut taxes for the rich. Well, actually, under President Obama where there was so much damage done to the middle classes. The middle class shrunk in numbers of people, it appears, while the gap between the poor and the rich got even bigger. And as President Obama is on video admitting, it must have been tough, but he admitted, yeah, it is true. It was true.

It is true that, under President Obama, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, the first time, 95 percent of the Nation's income went to the top 1 percent. So we have heard all this stuff about Republicans helping the rich and hurting the poor.

There is no President's policy in the history of our Nation that has done more damage to the poor, to the middle class, than the policies of the Obama administration. There is no President's administration that has done more damage, to all kinds of middle class, to widen the gap between the poor and the rich. And most of those rich who give money seem to just keep giving to the Democratic Party.

You know, I love, whether it is Republicans, Democrats, or Independents coming up with a great idea and making money on it. It is fantastic. You know, as long as it is legal, but it is fantastic.

With all of my faults, jealousy is not one I suffer from. It is great to see anybody work hard, come up with something innovative, and make money. I think it is fantastic. I love the fact that this Nation, for most of our history, has done what we could to incentivize that process.

So the mayor of London condemning President Trump.

Well, who is this guy?

He has got plenty of his own problems. He has got plenty of his own issues. But it wasn't just the mayor of London, Mr. Sadiq Khan. We also heard from the Acting U.S. Ambassador over in London, Lewis Lukens, and he sent out this message: "I commend the strong leadership of the mayor of London as he leads the city forward after the heinous attack.

And by virtue of this statement, of course, he is incorporating the decisions by the mayor of London, the decisions by those with whom the mayor of London is consort, those decisions that have allowed so many radical Islamists to be creating plots and plans to kill Londoners. That has been going on, we find out after this attack. We should have known from the one before, the one before, that this has been going on.

Lewis Lukens, our highest U.S. ranking official in London, basically condemned President Trump by siding with the mayor of London, who is more concerned about condemning the President of the United States than he is about grieving for his own people, or doing everything within the mayor's conceivable power to stop the next radical attack.

Under the thinking of people like the mayor of London, there should not have ever been an attack here in England, not recently, for sure, because they didn't pull out of the Paris accord. And if the Paris accord was going to save the world from radical Islam, then, wow, all of the attacks should be happening in the United States of America.

Unless we get our friends on the other side of the aisle to help us as we need to do to pass legislation that give us the protection we need, the attacks will be continuing. And that shouldn't make any sense—if you believe people like this, and those that say Paris is the key to ending radical Islam, it wouldn't make sense that London would be hit twice instead of the United States. They didn't pull out. They condemned us for pulling out.

So it makes you think, when you really look at everything, maybe the key to defeating radical Islam is what Americans who have fought them know: there is only one way to defeat radical Islam, and that is to defeat it; to fight it, kill it, defeat it. I saw President Carter here on television here in the last few days. I had it on mute, so I don't know what he said. A sweet man. Of course, he does seem to have some pretty strong anti-Semitic feelings, so it is hard to feel too much about the sweetness when you see and hear comments that make you think that the United States cares really much for certain Jews or Israel. But I know he meant well when he abandoned the Shah of Iran, not a nice man like Qaddafi—not a great man, not a nice man, but at least he was keeping radical Islam in the box, keeping it boxed up.

When President Carter saw the Shah deposed and the Ayatollah Khomeini comes into Iran, he didn't recognize that he had literally opened Pandora's box and it was going to be a plague upon the world for years and years to come, and that thousands and thousands of Americans would die trying to put radical Islam back in the box from which President Carter let it escape and which President Obama encouraged more—not intentionally, but the actions have consequences, and Americans have continued to die and will continue until radical Islam, with the help of our Muslim friends that don't want to be radical Islamists, with their help—we have got to have their help—we can get it back in the box the way it once was.

But there are people like Lewis Lukens, our highest ranking U.S. official in London, who don't recognize this. But the name to so many sounded familiar, Lewis Lukens. I know I have heard that name before. Oh, well, after tweeting out, or sending out the message and it is going to be a plague upon the world for years and years to come.

And by virtue of this statement, of course, he is incorporating the decisions by the mayor of London, the decisions by those with whom the mayor of London is consort, those decisions that have allowed so many radical Islamists to be creating plots and plans to kill Londoners. That has been going on, we find out after this attack. We should have known from the one before, the one before, that this has been going on.

Lewis Lukens, our highest U.S. ranking official in London, basically condemned President Trump by siding with the mayor of London, who is more concerned about condemning the President of the United States than he is about grieving for his own people, or doing everything within the mayor's conceivable power to stop the next radical attack.

Under the thinking of people like the mayor of London, there should not have ever been an attack here in England, not recently, for sure, because they didn't pull out of the Paris accord. And if the Paris accord was going to save the world from radical Islam, then, wow, all of the attacks should be happening in the United States of America.

Unless we get our friends on the other side of the aisle to help us as we need to do to pass legislation that give us the protection we need, the attacks will be continuing. And that shouldn't make any sense—if you believe people like this, and those that say Paris is the key to ending radical Islam, it wouldn't make sense that London would be hit twice instead of the United States. They didn't pull out. They condemned us for pulling out.

So it makes you think, when you really look at everything, maybe the key to defeating radical Islam is what Americans who have fought them know: there is only one way to defeat radical Islam, and that is to defeat it; to fight it, kill it, defeat it. I saw President Carter here on television here in the last few days. I had it on mute, so I don't know what he said. A sweet man. Of course, he does seem to have some pretty strong anti-Semitic feelings, so it is hard to feel too much about the sweetness when you see and hear comments that make you think that the United States cares really much for certain Jews or Israel. But I know he meant well when he abandoned the Shah of Iran, not a nice man like Qaddafi—not a great man, not a nice man, but at least he was keeping radical Islam in the box, keeping it boxed up.

When President Carter saw the Shah deposed and the Ayatollah Khomeini comes into Iran, he didn't recognize that he had literally opened Pandora's box and it was going to be a plague upon the world for years and years to come, and that thousands and thousands of Americans would die trying to put radical Islam back in the box from which President Carter let it escape and which President Obama encouraged more—not intentionally, but the actions have consequences, and Americans have continued to die and will continue until radical Islam, with the help of our Muslim friends that don't want to be radical Islamists, with their help—we have got to have their help—we can get it back in the box the way it once was.
sure they meant well, even though they were violating the law right and left.

But Lukens takes the side of the mayor, and he is the same guy that came up with the private server idea for Hillary Clinton. So I know, on behalf of Senator John McCain, and on behalf of Senator Trump, we greatly appreciate the damage that he did to the Democratic Party. Lukens—and, hopefully, he won’t be long for being the highest ranking U.S. official in London. Hopefully, nobody ever over there that doesn’t have great ideas like he had for Hillary Clinton that causes our British friends the kind of trouble he caused for Hillary Clinton.

And then we have got this from Will Carr, WGMN News Radio:

“Concerns are being raised on Capitol Hill about whether partisan politics could impact the 2020 Census and swing congressional redistricting in favor of Democrats.”

“FOX News has learned that last summer, a pro-Democratic analytics firm that described itself as ‘a platform for hope and change’. . . .”

“Wow, Yeah, as we saw over the last 8 years, 86 million Americans—the highest number ever recorded—have been looking for work. So they weren’t reflected in the unemployment numbers, but they just gave up. It was so hopeless. So much for hope and change.

Anyway, this analytics firm is ‘a platform for hope and change’ . . . included as a subcontractor in a $415 million advertising contract for the 2020 Census.

“The data firm, Civis Analytics, was founded by the chief analytics officer on former President Barack Obama’s 2012 reelection campaign.

“Since congressional redistricting, which occurs every 10 years, is based on the results of the national Census, the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee is now asking the Secretary of the Department of Commerce to ensure that the Census will be conducted in a nonpartisan fashion—and that redistricting will not be impacted.”

“In 2016, the Bureau awarded an advertising contract that included a subcontractor with close ties to the partisan politics that reportedly ‘spun out of’ the reelection campaign of President Obama,’ Senator ROB JOHNSON—our friend from Wisconsin—“wrote to Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross in a letter obtained by FOX News.”

Our friend, Senator ROB JOHNSON, says: “This partisan lineage raises concern in light of a Democratic initiative to use the results of the 2020 Census to draw district lines in a manner favorable to Democratic candidates.”

So, wow, what a deal. The Obama administration has got their own consulting firm helping with the 2020 Census. I can’t get over how many people want to make sure that our little experiment as a democratic republic does not come to an end. As Ben Franklin warned, we could have it as long—if we could keep it, that is.

But the shocking story today that I am not hearing enough talk about, and printed out by Circa, John Solomon and Sara Carter today: “A former U.S. intelligence contractor tells Circa he walked away from the Census contract last fall after a contractor with close ties to the presidential campaign told him that he was being unmasked by the Census bureau. This is a U.S. intelligence contractor. Where have we heard that term? That is what we were told that Edward Snowden was.

Well, this says: “And now he is suing former FBI Director James Comey and other government figures, alleging the Bureau has covered up evidence that he provided them showing widespread spying on Americans that violated civil liberties.

“The suit, filed late Monday night by Dennis Montgomery, was assigned to the same Federal judge who has already ruled that some of the NSA’s collection of data on Americans violates the Fourth Amendment, setting up an intriguing legal proceeding in the Nation’s Capital this summer.

“Montgomery says the evidence he gave to the FBI chronicled the NSA’s warrantless collection—"of phone, financial and personal data and the unmasking of identities in spy data about millions of Americans."

“‘This domestic surveillance was all being done on computers supplied by the FBI,’ Montgomery told Circa in an interview. ‘So these supercomputers, which are FBI computers, the CIA is using them to do domestic surveillance.’”

Gee, we have been assured that does not happen. We have been assured in hearings in our Judiciary Committee over the last 12 years I have been here—and we have had a lot of hearings on these issues. We have been assured this isn’t happening. This guy who knows enough to steal 600 million classified documents on 47 hard drives without getting caught says it is happening.

Mr. Speaker, let me parenthetically insert here, we have had a number of conversations with FBI and different intelligence officials, because section 702 that allows this kind of widespread collection. If we are going after what we were told would be foreign terrorists, known foreign terrorists, and they happened to capture an American, the name is masked. You can’t get that information. There has to be probable cause to get anything about the American. We know there’s a bunch out making names have been unmasked.

Now, this information by Montgomery is that things are leaked about Americans. Widespread information is being collected on Americans with no probable cause they committed any crime.

I have told numerous DOJ and intelligence officials—and I am very serious about this—they must answer: Do they have police power over themselves? Who are they violating the law, the rights of people who are violating Americans’ civil rights and gathering information in ways Orwell could never have dreamed of. As my friend THOMAS MASSIE was printing out today Orwell thought it was so strange that people would take people to spy on other people. He never dreamed that we, the government, would be able to collect warehouses full of information on little disks that would be used and pulled out later any time they wanted to go after an individual—but it sure looks like it is happening.

If our own justice and intelligence officials cannot police themselves and produce the very people who have leaked information and who have unmasked Americans, and we have had so much information, I will join with many of my friends in the Democratic side of the aisle to vote against them ever having those types of powers again. They are going to have to police themselves. They are going to have to put an end to this kind of unmasking, who have been unmasking, and who have been spying on Americans without legal authority. They are going to have to produce those people, because if they can’t and if they don’t, they are going to have to have this kind of power. I know it has got a lot of our justice officials and intelligence officials upset.

Based on the way things have been going and from what we keep finding out, I am sure somebody has been going through my background with a fine-tooth comb looking for anything so they can take me out, but good luck.

I am sure, as Heritage Foundation has written before, most Americans are committing a number of Federal crimes a day we don’t even know about. So, apparently, it can be done if Heritage is right, as I think they are. But the fact is it ought to scare every American that there is this much Federal intervention in their own personal lives.

The truth is we have got to get rid of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. They have no right and they have not had any authority to gather people’s financial information unless there is probable cause to believe a crime has been committed and that this person has committed the crime, and then get a warrant to get it. It is time to end that for real. It is time to end this behavior of personal snooping on American citizens.

This article goes on and says: “Documents obtained by Circa outside of the lawsuit show that the U.S. Attorney’s Office in Washington in 2015 approved a grant of limited immunity for Montgomery so he could explain how he managed to walk out of his contract and the buildings he worked in with
Thank God he ruled as he did. "The agency has since ended that practice but the pending case, which is winding its way through appeals and motions, is likely to shine a light on whether Americans' civil liberties were violated during more than a decade of the war on terror.

This is incredible. When we hope the courts may be our help, we see another answer that is incredibly discouraging. Federal courts and some people have no authority. Federal court, district court, court of appeals, they have no authority to grant standing to people that are not in the United States, standing and rights to people that are not American citizens and not on American soil. But that is the effect of what they are doing when they say that the President and, actually, Congress, which gave the President much of the power he has on the issue of travel bans and immigration, that we don’t have any authority.

Well, under the Constitution, we do have the authority. Congress has the authority and the President has authority to protect us when it comes to national security. He has authority to make decisions. There is no constitutional right under the United States Constitution for someone in another country to have a right to come into the United States. There is no such constitutional right. For any judge in America to say that indicates that this is like artificial intelligence becoming self-aware: Wow, I can do whatever I want. Once it becomes like AI, once it becomes self-aware, then it begins to protect itself. Anyone who has authority or ability to rein them in: We have got to slap them down and limit their ability to rein us in with our artificial intelligence—which is more than some of the judges.

Mr. Speaker, I am not singling out an individual so I am not violating the House rules.

But this is serious. This is a blow to our experiment as a little, self-governing republic. It is a threat to our ability to proceed as such. But every Federal court except for the Supreme Court owes its entire existence and jurisdiction to the United States Congress. Congress brings those issues into being by law and we can take them out. Congress gives them their jurisdiction, and we can take them out.

I think it is time to begin to take out some of these courts that, like artificial intelligence, have become self-aware and now are trying to lash out and take power away from those under our Constitution that have it and to take it unto themselves in a self-protection mode.

It is getting dangerous in the United States of America for number of reasons. Radical Islam is only one of the reasons, but courts are going so far to overrule common sense and overrule the words of the Constitution and overrule the words of lawfully passed bills in the House and the Senate signed by Presidents and approved in other case law.

Courts are coming back now and just deciding: We are like artificial intelligence. We are most important now than ever before as the courts, and we are going to do everything we can to limit congressional authority and executive authority and bring all power and protection unto ourselves in the courts.

It is getting dangerous from a constitutional standpoint. All of this is occurring.

There is an article from Conservative Review by Daniel Horowitz, June 5: "7th Circuit Codifies Transgenderism into the Constitution."

The courts did such a great thing in America pointing out the importance of immutable characteristics. Characteristics that are immutable are not changeable, whether it is the color of your skin, a race, or a gender. Things that are immutable need to be protected from discrimination.

Once the courts began to get into protecting characteristics that change on the whim of the carrier of those characteristics, then the courts started going the wrong way. This also is a threat to a constitutional republic with private property rights, with privacy rights, and with the freedoms that we used to have and that are being infringed.

When the courts come back and say that you have to protect non-immutable characteristics that may change day to day wholly in the mind of the proponent, where does it stop?

It is a destructive force. We all agreed on race, everybody I know. I am sure there are some racists in America. In fact, I know there are still some. We have come so far. I feel like, after the lessons that should have been learned from the Holocaust, hate Jews, hate Israel, want it destroyed, removed. Incredible.

The courts are saying we have to preserve some right that none of the rest of us can know, some characteristic none of the rest of us can know. It could change moment by moment. One moment someone is saying: I feel like a girl; I am going in the girl’s restroom; or I feel like a boy today. Who can know? If it is not apparent, then how can somebody be said to be bigoted against or take some action against when you couldn’t even know what was in their head? How did I know?

I didn’t discriminate against somebody for something I didn’t know they had. It was all in their mind. How can I know? When the courts get us into that kind of quagmire, we can’t recover. It will sink our ship.

In this case, as Daniel Horowitz says: "Last week, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals became the latest Federal appeals court to codify..."
transgenderism into law and the Constitution.

"Although Obama's executive mandates for transgender bathrooms have gone by the wayside, thanks to Attorney General Jeff Sessions overruling the 2016 guidelines of Education Secretary Betsy DeVos, the courts are engaging in their own social transformation on behalf of the defeated Democrats."

"Whitaker v. Kenosha Unified School District, a unanimous opinion from the three-judge panel ordered a Wisconsin school district to allow a girl to use the boys' bathroom in school. Following in the footsteps of the Sixth and Fourth Circuits, this Seventh Circuit panel, which included GOP-appointee Ilana Rovner, ruled that the 1972 title IX education law and the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause cover transgenderism as a protected class."

"As the courts redefine our national sovereignty, rewrite election laws and redistricting in favor of Democrats, redefine criminal justice law for mass murderers, and mandate publicly funded liberal media outlets are using their self-acclaimed status as kings to redefine sexuality retroactive to laws and amendments codified long before the sex-identity movement was in vogue."

"In an emotional screed disguised as law, this opinion uses male pronouns to describe a woman with female parts. In any other era, these judges would have been deemed mentally unstable to serve on a bench."

"While refusing to recognize biological sex as immutable—or, even significantly—the court contended that there is absolutely no disruption or privacy concerns over opposite sexes using the wrong bathroom."

"A transgender student's presence in the restroom provides no more of a risk to other students' privacy rights than the presence of an overly curious student of the same name. Biological sex suicides sneak glances at his or her classmates performing their bodily functions."

"The court then appealed to common sense to disregard any remaining privacy concerns as 'conjecture and abstraction.'"

"Why is it I have a sneaking suspicion that when title IX was drafted in 1972, much less when the 14th Amendment was drafted in 1867, they could have foreseen any concerns but would have never fathomed judges maniacally referring to a Y chromosome as an X chromosome?"

"Amazingly, the legal liberals are the ones with the hypocritical argument. They, according to their own twisted logic, how could this school district be guilty of violating equal protection and engaging in stereotyping for actually applying science equally, and not going along with the deliberate stereotyping requested by the plaintiff?"

"There is no greater stereotype than saying that a girl, despite being a girl, should be treated like a boy because she acts out in a 'manly' way. The entire sexual-identity movement is built upon the very sex stereotypes they want to codify into law but also protect from discrimination."

"This is part of a broader hypocrisy in which the transgender lobby is filing lawsuits to allow disability laws to gender-confused individuals, but, on the other hand, are suing on discrimination grounds for stereotyping and recognizing this 'disability' as a disability and not as a natural phenomenon."

"Either way, the courts will always reach the legal conclusion that best promotes the socially licentious political outcome... even when the 'jurisprudence' is contradictory."

"Last year, the Fourth and Sixth Circuits said that transgenderism being codified into civil rights and the Constitution is 'settled law,' demonstrating how irremediably broken the courts are not just the Ninth Circuit; we have yet to find a single circuit willing to understand the most immutable laws of nature. Thus, it is not surprising that almost every court is creating a right for Somalis to immigrate, marriage and human sexuality are subjective, so are the borders of a nation."

"Although the Supreme Court punted the Fourth Circuit case, Grimm v. Gloucester County, because that one was brought by a Liberal's obsolete transgender mandate, it is quite clear that another case will end up before the high court within the next year."

"Given Justice Anthony Kennedy's history on this issue—and his penchant for being influenced by growing momentum in the lower courts and the legal profession—it's fairly safe to say we will be confronted with the transgender version of Obergfell in the near future."

"The transgender case comes just 2 months after the Seventh Circuit codified sexual orientation into Title VII of the Civil Rights Act."

"That is a court passing legislation illegally, unconstitutionally, just by fiat by the court. Their signature, just like any good oligarch."

"This circuit, like many others, is drifting more and more to the far left. A number of the GOP appointees, such as Richard Posner and Ilana Rovner, are among the worst offenders."

"There are only two reliable originalists on the court, Michael Kanne and Diane Sykes. That is why it is so important for Trump to immediately fill the two vacancies on the court with known originalists. Even more importantly, this is yet one more reason to make the courts less consequential by reforming their jurisdiction and scope of power."

"And I would add, taking them out. If they are that irresponsible, let's take them out."

"What they refuse to look at is real science—real medical science. That is exactly what Dr. Paul McHugh did. He published this article in The Wall Street Journal on May 13, 2016. It was updated, apparently, from June 12, 2014."

"This was the head of psychiatry, Dr. Paul McHugh, at Johns Hopkins Hospital, the first hospital in America to actually carry out sex-change operations in America. These were liberal, far-thinking, far-reaching ideas within surgery at Johns Hopkins. Well, yes, we can cut off organs, change their sexuality. Dr. Paul McHugh was head of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins."

"Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?"

"The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining."

"Mr. GOMERT. Dr. McHugh is a man who knows the medical science, not some idea that fleet by that may be gone tomorrow about someone's sexuality."

"Dr. McHugh says: "The transgendered suffer a disorder of 'assumption' like those in other disorders familiar to psychiatrists. With the transgendered, the disordered assumption is that the individual differs from what seems given in nature—namely one's maleness or femaleness. Other kinds of disordered assumptions are held by those who suffer from anorexia and bulimia nervosa, where the assumption that departs from physical reality is the belief by the dangerously thin that they are overweight.""

"He goes on and says: "With body dysmorphic disorder, an often socially crippling condition, the individual is consumed by the assumption 'I'm ugly.' These disorders occur in subjects who have come to believe that some of their psycho-social conflicts or problems will be resolved if they can change the way that they appear to others. Such ideas work like ruling passions in their subjects' mind and tend to be accompanied by a solipsistic argument."

"For the transgendered, this argument holds that one's feeling of 'gender' is a conscious, subjective sense that, being in one's mind, cannot be questioned by others. The individual often seeks not just society's tolerance of this 'personal truth' but affirmation of it. Here rests the support for 'transgender equality,' the demands for government payment for medical and surgical treatments, and for access to all sex-based public roles and privileges.""

"He goes on and says: "We at Johns Hopkins University—which in the 1960s was the first American medical center to venture into 'sex-reassignment surgery'—launched a study in the 1970s comparing the outcomes of transgendered people who had the surgery with the outcomes of those who did not. Most of the surgically treated patients described themselves as 'happy' by that methodology. Subsequent psycho-social adjustments were no better than those who didn't have the surgery. And so at Hopkins we..."
stopped doing sex-reassignment surgery, since producing a ‘satisfied’ but still troubled patient seemed an inadequate reason for surgically amputating normal organs.

‘It now appears that our long-ago decision was a mistake,’ Dr. McHugh says. ‘A study at the Karolinska Institute in Sweden produced the most illuminating results yet regarding the transgendered, evidence that should give advocates pause,’ including the courts that think that they can see a fleeting thought in a little boy and say, Oh, there is a fleeting thought, that is an immutable characteristic. Therefore, we are going to give it rights, even though we can’t see it, we don’t know what it is. We have just got some idea, so we will call it an immutable characteristic.

But according to the Karolinska Institute study—which is a long-term study, and, for 30 years, they followed 324 people who had sex-reassignment surgery—’

‘The study revealed that beginning about 10 years after having the surgery, the transgendered began to experience increasing mental difficulties. Most shockingly, their suicide mortality rose almost twentyfold above the comparable nontransgender population. This disturbing result has as yet no explanation but probably reflects the growing sense of isolation reported by the aging transgendered after surgery. The high suicide rate certainly challenges the surgery prescription.

Some of these Federal judges don’t realize they are contributing to problems of indescribable proportions that may not be known, as the study indicated, for 10 years or so.

As Dr. McHugh points out: ‘Another subgroup consists of young men and women susceptible to suggestion from ‘everything is normal’ sex education, amplified by internet chat groups. These are the transgender subjects who notice distinct sex roles in the culture and, exploring how they fit in, some may say that is sexist, but there are men who may grow up acting feminized and they grow up to be some of the most handsome, beautiful men you would ever know, but quite masculine. These courts are not helping. They are playing with the latest fad, and their playing is doing massive destructive damage to our United States Constitution, to our court system, to our freedom, and to what is left of our Republic.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) for June 6 and the balance of the week on account of attending his son’s graduation.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 2:30 p.m. and on the balance of the week on account of a medical procedure.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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


Pacific Tuna Fisheries: Fishing Restrictions for Tropical Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (Docket No.: 170223137-7311-01) (RIN: 0666-BG97) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 T.S.A. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.


1943. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — MU-2B Series Airplane Training Requirements Update; Correction (Docket No.: FAA-2006-24881; Amdt. Nos. 61-136A, 91-344A, and 135-134A) (RIN: 2120-AK50) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1944. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Certification of Manned Avionics Airplanes (Docket No.: FAA-2016-9569; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-052-AD; Amendment 39-18865; AD 2017-06-03) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1945. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Administration’s principles for reforming the Nation’s Air Traffic Control System (H. Doc. No. 120, 115th Congress, 1st Session) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

1946. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2017 Global Defense Posture Report; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

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:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2335. A bill to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; with an amendment (Rept. 115-165). 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 Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2795. A bill to increase coordination among relevant Federal departments and agencies to address United States security and humanitarian interests in Yemen, 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 Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. BARIN, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 2796. A bill to prohibit access by the Government of the Russian Federation to certain Russian-owned diplomatic facilities and properties located in the States of Maryland and New York; for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2797. A bill to prohibit any provision as Title VIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care coordination services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASKIEVICH:

H.R. 2798. A bill to prohibit the Executive Branch from expelling or removing any alien subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, transmitting the 2017 Global Defense Posture Report; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Com.

By Mr. McNERNEY (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2799. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize certain recycled water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DeFAZIO (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIEKES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ENY of Connecticut, Mr. FRANKEN of Florida, Mrs. BUSSTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BROWN of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LAWRENCE, and Mr. DeSAULNIER):

H.R. 2800. A little 49, United States Code, to ensure improvement of air traffic control services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, the Budget, and Appropriations, 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. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. Schakowsky):

H.R. 2801. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring all new passenger motor vehicles to be equipped with a child safety alert system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. OLSON of Minnesota, Mr. CASE of New York, and Mr. ROBB):

H.R. 2802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax-preferred savings account for first-time homebuyers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 2803. A bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2804. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to implement changes to improve air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 2805. A bill to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BRRHMAN (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. DINGEL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HUIZenga, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MUSgrave, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 2806. A bill to increase authorized funding for the Boo Locks; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THORNBERY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STEFANSKI, and Mr. LANGSEY):

H.R. 2807. A bill to amend United States Code, to require congressional notification concerning sensitive military cyber operations and cyber weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 2808. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount that can be withdrawn without penalty from individual retirement accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. BARR, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HULTOREN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. KINZER):

H.R. 2809. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for the authorization and supervision of nongovernmental space activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. THORNBERY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington) (both by request):

H.R. 2810. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. Cicilline (for himself and Mr. GAGG)

H.R. 2811. A bill to preserve the integrity of American elections by providing for the position of United States Attorney General with the investigative tools to identify and prosecute foreign agents who seek to circumvent Federal registration requirements and unlawfully influence the political process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Ms. BASS: H.R. 2786. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for executing any of Congress’ enumerated powers.

By Mr. OLSON: H.R. 2796. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To Make Laws which shall be necessary and proper for executing any of Congress’ enumerated powers.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER: H.R. 2797. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill modifies the Social Security Act, which Congress enacted pursuant to its powers under the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution, we as its powers to tax and spend for the general welfare. Congress has the power under those provisions to enact this legislation as well.

By Mr. PASCHELL: H.R. 2796. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make All Laws which shall be necessary and proper for executing any of Congress’ enumerated powers.

By Mr. DEFAZIO: H.R. 2793. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. BLUMENAUER: H.R. 2794. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

H.R. 2790. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. PASCHELL: H.R. 2796. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make All Laws which shall be necessary and proper for executing any of Congress’ enumerated powers.

By Mr. DEFAZIO: H.R. 2800. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make All Laws which shall be necessary and proper for executing any of Congress’ enumerated powers.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the general Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:
H.R. 2011.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CORREA:
H.R. 2012.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, section 8.
By Mr. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 2013.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Impost and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, section 8, clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Mr. KHAANA:
H.R. 2014.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Amendment XVI to the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, duties, imposts and excises, for the payment of the Public Debt, and providing for the same may be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mr. TIBERI:
H.R. 2011.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8.
By Mr. YOHO:
H.R. 2022.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. Himes.
H.R. 26: Mr. Budd.
H.R. 38: Mr. Walden.
H.R. 44: Mr. Norcross.
H.R. 80: Mr. Smith of Missouri.
H.R. 93: Ms. Moore, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Thompson of California, and Ms. Pingree.
H.R. 154: Mr. Poe of Texas, Ms. Barragan, Mr. Sean Patrick of New York, Mr. Ruppersberger, and Mr. Tonko.
H.R. 169: Mr. Grijalva.
H.R. 173: Mrs. Torres, Mr. Schiff, and Mr. Espallart.
H.R. 184: Mrs. Torres.
H.R. 227: Mr. LoBiondo, Mr. Raskin, and Mr. Schiff.
H.R. 296: Ms. Velazquez and Mr. Norcross.
H.R. 314: Mr. Allen.
H.R. 338: Mr. Gohman and Mr. Dunn.
H.R. 367: Mr. Graves of Missouri.
H.R. 377: Mr. Gartz, Mr. Parentholt, Mr. Olson, and Mr. Renacci.
H.R. 391: Mr. DeSousa.
H.R. 392: Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Thomas J. Rooney of Florida, and Mr. Raskin.
H.R. 397: Mr. Rokita.
H.R. 422: Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Yoho, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Issa, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Pittenger, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, and Mr. Barr.
H.R. 468: Ms. Lowgren, Mr. Palazzo, and Mr. DeSaulnier.
H.R. 478: Ms. Slaughter and Mr. Donovan.
H.R. 490: Mr. Hariss.
H.R. 507: Mr. Sensenbrenner.
H.R. 529: Mr. DeFazio.
H.R. 545: Mr. Cook, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, and Mr. MacArthur.
H.R. 552: Mr. Rouhi of Alabama, Mr. Jenkins of West Virginia, Mr. Fortenberry, Mr. Engel, Mr. Bridenstine, Mr. Cook, Mr. Joedy B. Hice of Georgia, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, and Mr. Crist.
H.R. 632: Mr. Bishop of Utah.
H.R. 662: Mr. Hastings.
H.R. 661: Mr. Wenstrup, Mr. Pearce, and Mr. Conaway.
H.R. 721: Mr. Rouzer, Mr. O’Halleran, Mrs. Walorski, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Bishop of Michigan, and Mr. Lynch.
H.R. 740: Mr. Bishop of Michigan.
H.R. 747: Mr. Zeldin.
H.R. 750: Mr. Donovan, Ms. Bonamici, and Mr. Gutierrez.
H.R. 754: Mr. Crist.
H.R. 761: Mr. Sensenbrenner.
H.R. 795: Ms. Shea-Porter, Mr. Ross, Mr. Womack of Indiana, and Mr. O’Halleran.
H.R. 796: Mr. Rokita.
H.R. 799: Mr. Allen,

H.R. 807: Mr. Norcross.
H.R. 820: Mr. Allen.
H.R. 823: Ms. Tsongas.
H.R. 846: Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Himes, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Posey, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Pittenger, and Mr. Roezer.
H.R. 848: Mr. Smucker and Mr. LaMalfa.
H.R. 873: Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Moen-LaVan, Ms. Tenney, and Mr. Lewis of Minnesota.
H.R. 889: Mr. Paschell and Mr. Harper.
H.R. 881: Ms. Titus.
H.R. 916: Mr. Barletta.
H.R. 935: Mr. Steuben, Mr. Kildee, Mrs. Demings, Ms. Rosen, Mr. Meadows, Mr. Cook, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Palazzo, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mrs. Bratton, and Mr. Franks of Arizona.
H.R. 947: Ms. Sanchez.
H.R. 952: Mr. Hastings.
H.R. 969: Mr. Aguilar.
H.R. 964: Mr. Carbajal, Mrs. Napolitano, and Mr. Ruppersberger.
H.R. 997: Mr. Bilirakis.
H.R. 1000: Mr. Lucas, Mr. Norcross, and Mr. Deutch.
H.R. 1034: Mr. Payne and Mr. Grijalva.
H.R. 1046: Mr. Kildee, Mr. Turner, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Garcia of Florida, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Ms. Slaughter, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Ms. Matsui, Ms. Kelly of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Duncan of Tennessee.
H.R. 1057: Mr. Lance, Mr. Smith of Texas, Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Norcross, and Mr. Collin of West Virginia and Mr. Mulloy.
H.R. 1098: Ms. Fudhie and Mrs. Comstock.
H.R. 1099: Mr. Himes.
H.R. 1111: Mr. Norcross.
H.R. 1116: Mr. MacArthur.
H.R. 1120: Ms. Tenney.
H.R. 1136: Mr. Smith of Texas.
H.R. 1146: Mr. Beyer.
H.R. 1154: Mr. Curberson.
H.R. 1158: Mr. Kinzinger and Mr. Smith of Missouri.
H.R. 1164: Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1205: Mr. Panetta, Ms. Tittus, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cohen, and Mr. Graves of Louisiana.
H.R. 1212: Mrs. Bratton.
H.R. 1231: Mr. Pocan.
H.R. 1244: Mr. Takano.
H.R. 1251: Ms. Torres and Mr. Ruppersberger.
H.R. 1316: Mr. Velasquez, Mr. Harper, and Ms. Stefanik.
H.R. 1339: Mr. Gosar and Mr. Moen-LaVan.
H.R. 1349: Mr. Chaffetz and Mr. Rokita.
H.R. 1361: Mr. Donovan and Ms. Bonamici.
H.R. 1421: Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. Bishop of Pennsylvania, Mr. Delaney, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, and Ms. Titus.
H.R. 1422: Mr. Luetkemeyer.
H.R. 1441: Mr. Byrne, Mrs. Comstock, Mrs. Brooks of Indiana, and Mr. Kelly of Mississippi.
H.R. 1456: Mr. Paulsen and Mr. Gutierrez.
H.R. 1478: Mr. Norcross.
H.R. 1480: Ms. Lowgren.
H.R. 1503: Mr. Peters.
H.R. 1511: Mr. Walz, Mr. DeFazio, and Ms. Jayapal.
H.R. 1529: Mr. Barton.
H.R. 1540: Mr. Allen.
H.R. 1552: Ms. Comstock.
H.R. 1554: Mr. Swalwell of California.
H.R. 1555: Mr. Gosar.
DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2560: Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.