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

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

WASHINGTON, DC, June 27, 2017.
I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK 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.

Trump Promise on Healthcare
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Senate is poised to completely break Donald Trump’s promises on healthcare. Remember, he promised insurance for everyone, it would be less expensive, and it wouldn’t touch Medicaid.

Well, the CBO report, out yesterday, makes it devastatingly clear that the Republicans are ready to repudiate all three of those promises. Next year alone, 15 million Americans will lose their healthcare coverage.

Over the course of the decade, that number will swell to 22 million Americans. And because they have disguised the impact to appear later in the next decade, we will watch those numbers skyrocket.

Less expensive? Well, under their proposal, a 64-year-old with a $56,800 income—not upper middle class by any stretch of the imagination—will, by 2026, face an annual insurance premium of $20,000. Impacts are most pronounced on low-income and older Americans.

Won’t touch Medicaid? Their proposal anticipates $772 billion over the next decade to be slashed from that budget, a 26 percent cut for the health insurance provider that gives care to most Americans, 16 percent fewer people, people with higher costs, less coverage, and poorer insurance.

They take a stab at the concern about the destabilization of the insurance market, which their proposal will do, by taking away the mandate that people have coverage, allowing people to wait until they are sick but still requiring insurers to cover them.

There is an escape hatch. They don’t have to provide that if there has been a break in coverage. Then there is 6 months’ delay required before people can sign up. Think about what a 6-month delay could mean for somebody who is just diagnosed for cancer. It is the equivalent of a death sentence.

The people you trust for your healthcare do not support this bill. The American Medical Association, hospitals, people who deal with rheumatism, cerebral palsy, cancer advocates, across the board they express reservations or outright opposition.

Who do you trust with your medical care—who do you rely on who supports it?

No one you rely on supports this measure.

And make no mistake, healthcare in America will be worse. That is why the people you trust don’t support it. Seniors in nursing homes and disabled children will suffer and, yes, we ought to admit it; people will die. There is very good research available that is logical, suggesting that for every 20 million people who do not have insurance coverage, an extra 24,000 people a year die year after year.

And why are we doing this?

To fulfill a campaign pledge and to be able to cut taxes for those who need it the least. This massive reduction in healthcare finances massive tax reductions. This is immoral.

There is a reason that it was hatched in secret, keeping it away even from Republican senators while it was being formulated, and why they are trying to jam this through in 1 week—a parody of Republican complaints about not enough process for ObamaCare. This is unprecedented and it is wrong.

It is our job, each and every one of us, to make sure the American public knows what is at stake before it is too late.

Support for the Venezuelan People
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of New York). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last week’s general assembly meeting of the Organization of American States, the OAS, in Cancun, was intended to get greater support from the region to hold Nicolas Maduro and his regime accountable for their horrific actions against the Venezuelan people.

However, we fell short of the 23 votes needed to fully enforce a resolution condemning Maduro for convening a fake constituent assembly with the...
purpose of undermining the democratically elected national assembly. I
commend the 20 nations. Thank you to the 20 nations that stood up to the
Venezuelan tyrant; especially I want to single out Barbados, the Bahamas, St. 
Lucia, Jamaica, Guyana, and Belize. To our allies in the Caribbean who voted with the people of Venezuela and not with the regime, I say: Thank you.

And to those who voted against the people of Venezuela and with the regime, my message to you is: Wake up.

The Maduro regime is a sinking ship and, as that economy continues to implode, it will take some of the Caribbean nations along with it.

It is in the best interest of the Caribbean nations to work with the United States, with Canada, with Mexico, and other regional allies to put an end to the abusive tactics of the Maduro regime once and for all.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, countries that are under the leadership of Ortega is a kindred spirit of Maduro. Ortega spoke out to oppose the meeting and criticized the OAS for what it called interference in Venezuelans' domestic issues.

Ortega condemned the OAS for taking its rightful action to apply the Inter-American Democratic Charter for Venezuela, yet Ortega wants us to believe that he is in favor of negotiating in good faith with the OAS to improve the moral, political, and the human rights situation in Nicaragua.

What a farce.

Ortega has been doing Maduro's bidding at the OAS since day one, and we see right through him. Ortega has illustrated time and time again that he is not interested in any reforms, nor is he interested in restoring any democratic values back to the people of Nicaragua.

But Ortega was not the only one who abandoned the people of Venezuela. No. El Salvador, my neighbor nation that has not once voted alongside the U.S. on issues related to Venezuela, even though we continue to provide funds for the Central American Alliance for Prosperity plan. They like our money. They just don't want to look at things our way at all.

Last week, I signed onto a letter led by my dear friend ALBIO SIRES from New Jersey. He wrote this letter to the Department of the Treasury, urging it to denounce El Salvador, Salvadoran Foreign Deputy Minister Jose Luis Merino as a foreign narcotics kingpin for his ties to illicit activities to drug trafficking, to money laundering, for the FARC—the FARC that is a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization.

It is pathetic that the Venezuelan regime continues to use certain countries at the OAS as its puppets to shield itself from regional criticism.

In the last 2 months, Mr. Speaker, more than 4,000 people have been killed by Maduro's regime in Venezuela. Hundreds have been arrested. Hundreds have been injured by the violence, including a 17-year-old protester who was shot in pointblank range by pro-Maduro police thugs.

It is unacceptable for us to stand idly by as this cruelty continues to happen. It is a disgrace that the region could not come together in a united front to call out the Maduro regime for the violent thugs that they are, a disgrace to our democratic principles and values, and a disgrace to the Inter-American Democratic Charter for which the OAS stands.

The deteriorating situation in Venezuela is an important matter for the region, for our own interests. Mr. Speaker. Our message must be to those countries that continue to vote against the people of Venezuela: Stop being cowards. Be courageous. Stand up to those corrupt bullies in Venezuela. Do it for the people of Venezuela. How many more have to give their lives in Venezuela for you to wake up? And if you don't stop to reassess your support for the thugs Maduro, and your willingness to turn a blind eye to the suffering of the Venezuelan people, perhaps America will start to reassess its relationship with you.

AMERICAN GROWN FLOWER MONTH

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly introduce bipartisan legislation to recognize July as American Grown Flower Month. I have seen firsthand the value of the grown flower industry playing an important role in our economy and community during my visits with our Central Coast growers in my district.

California produces three-quarters of all cut flowers grown here in the United States. This generates thousands of jobs in our State and drives a staggering $1.13 billion in the economic activity each year.

Whither it is celebrating Mother's Day, a birthday, or a graduation, flowers have been used to mark special occasions dating back thousands of years. I am committed to recognizing this industry's remarkable contribution to our country by designating July as American Grown Flower Month. We officially celebrate the incomparable beauty flowers bring to our homes and to our celebrations year round. I also want to urge the White House to consider having American flowers in the White House for all occasions.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF LEVITTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 65th anniversary of my hometown, Levittown, Pennsylvania.

On June 23, 1952, the first 20 families moved into Levittown, which is one of the first planned communities built in the U.S. With its partially framed housing, immature landscaping, and muddy streets, Levittown, in 1952, is a frontier outside of the city of Philadelphia.

Levittown's first official family, the Doughertys, moved into their home on Stonybrook Drive and embraced the American Dream of homeownership. And as Mrs. Dougherty told reporters in 1952, she saw Levittown as country living with city conveniences.

Between 1952 and 1958, Levitt & Sons built 17,311 single-family houses with lawns.

There were six models a family could choose from: the Levittowner, the Rancher, the Jubilee, the Pennsylvania, the Colonial, and the Country Cluber. Levitt & Sons pushed the boundaries of housing construction by perfecting the homebuilding assembly line.

Levittown remains a special place in Bucks County. Originally designed as a completed community, Levittown grew into the model middle class community. In fact, it became a popular place for hundreds of returning World War II veterans who wanted to start families of their own. Now Levittown is home to over 50,000 residents with schools, churches, parks, and businesses that foster a sense of community for families to live and work.

Residents of Levittown have worked in our steel mills, built our infrastructure, and served in our military—all while raising their children.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call Levittown my hometown, and I am grateful to represent this close-knit and hardworking community. Congratulations to all who have called Levittown home for the last 65 years. Happy birthday, Levittown.

RECOGNIZING NETWORK OF VICTIM ASSISTANCE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Network of Victim Assistance, NOVA, in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

NOVA seeks to support, counsel, and empower victims of sexual assault and abuse in our region through advocacy and community education. By utilizing individual and group counseling, victims of sexual assault and abuse can regain control of their lives, and through education programs, children and communities learn to be advocates for victims of abuse, as well as prevent violent and personal safety.

Additionally, NOVA Bucks County maintains a 24-hour hotline to be able to support all sexual assault victims to get the assistance that they need, as well as assistance in court and safety programs for those with disabilities. I was pleased to tour their facility earlier this year. I am thankful for the work of Penny Ettinger, Kathy Bennett, Steve Doerner, Keith Kirkner,
Mandy Mundy, Bill Hoblin, and so many of the NOVA staff and volunteers serving Bucks County, including generous volunteers such as Tina Greenwood.

Through its programs and projects, NOVA empowers victims of sexual assault and abuse, providing them with the resources and security they need to live in spaces free from violence. I am proud to stand with them in their mission to stand with victims in the fight to end sexual assault.

SENATE HEALTHCARE REPEAL

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, this week we expect that our colleagues in the Senate will vote on the latest version of TrumpCare. Recently, I voted against a very similar bill because it is a disaster for Oregonians and Americans. Under the Senate bill, millions of people—up to 22 million people—will lose coverage.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents are rightly worried. One of those is Kalpana. Kalpana is caring for locals with cancer. As she put it recently, she is sandwiched by cancer. She manages intravenous chemo treatments for her 7-year-old son who is fighting leukemia. Presently, he is winning that fight. Her father has been through cancer treatments in his decade-long battle with prostate cancer, which has now spread to his lymph nodes.

Kalpana is amazing—our own local wonder woman. Fortunately, she can devote time and attention to her family’s care without having to choose between paying for healthcare and paying for rent, food, and other basic necessities—for now. But after the House vote on TrumpCare, she said this: I feel like someone had punched me in the gut.

Before the Affordable Care Act, families lived in fear that a cancer diagnosis or a heart attack would leave them in economic ruin and make them ineligible for insurance in the future.

Early in my career, I worked at Legal Aid. I did financial counseling with clients who were struggling—often because they got sick with no insurance or because they had insurance that didn’t cover them when they needed it.

We can’t go back to the days when medical debt drove too many families into bankruptcy and financial ruin. Oregonians and Americans need the stability of knowing they will have affordable healthcare coverage when they get sick or when they are injured.

With the Affordable Care Act, families across the country have had that peace of mind and security that comes with having affordable health coverage. All of that is in jeopardy this week.

Mr. Speaker, this is the United States of America. Health care can and should be available for all, not just the healthy and the wealthy. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to reject TrumpCare, and let’s all get back to the table and talk about how we can improve—not take away—access to affordable healthcare for our constituents.

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, June is Immigrant Heritage Month, and as the son of parents who fled Castro’s Cuba, like so many other residents of south Florida, I am especially proud of my district’s rich immigrant history and culture. From small-business owners to law enforcement, hundreds of thousands of immigrants and their descendants across south Florida are contributing to our economy, culture, and local communities as living examples of American success.

I know from firsthand experience the great and good, and the bad, of America’s people and the unimaginable opportunities our Nation provides to all who are willing to work for them.

Despite the longstanding tradition of welcoming immigrants to our shores, our Nation continues to have vigorous debate about immigration policy. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the current debate has left thousands of immigrant children, who were brought to this country by their parents, in constant fear of deportation to countries of origin many of them don’t even remember.

They have attended school with our own children, graduated high school, sometimes even serving in the military, and they are seeking to contribute to American society and help grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, the President, the former President, and Members of Congress in both Chambers and from both parties agree that these young people, commonly referred to as DREAMers, should be treated with compassion.

I too agree, which is why I introduced legislation that would give these young people the certainty that they deserve. The Recognizing America’s Children Act creates three pathways to legal status for them: academic, military service, or employment. All qualified applicants would be thoroughly vetted, and any individual who has been involved in serious criminal conduct or terrorism would be disqualified.

Mr. Speaker, immigration reform means strengthening security at our border and modernizing our visa program to keep Americans safe, but it also means offering immigrants who love our country just as much as we do the opportunity to fully participate in the American experience. It is my hope that this Immigrant Heritage Month will lead us to act in this regard.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS SEMIPOSTAL STAMP ACT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, neurological and psychiatric disorders have exacted a tremendous toll on our society. Despite the great strides we’ve made in neuroscience research, the underlying causes of conditions like Alzheimer’s disease, Parkinson’s disease, autism, epilepsy, schizophrenia, depression, and traumatic brain injury remain unresolved. For true breakthroughs to occur, researchers require additional data to better treat these conditions.

To address this, the previous administration announced the Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies Initiative in 2013. Known as the BRAIN Initiative, this collaborative public-private research will advance our understanding of how the brain functions as researchers work to map the brain and study how individual cells interact in both time and space.

The data generated from this research will help scientists fill in the gaps in our current understanding and provide unprecedented opportunities for exploring how the brain enables us to think, process, store, and retrieve vast quantities of information.

This information will also provide researchers with a better understanding of mental illness and posttraumatic stress disorder in hopes of better treating these diseases and reducing the number of suicides each year.

I was pleased that the 21st Century Cures Act, which I supported here in the House and was signed into law, authorized $1.8 billion for this important research.

Mr. Speaker, to help accelerate this project and raise public attention to this initiative, today I introduced the Mental Health Awareness Semi-Postal Stamp Act with Representative GRACE FRAZIER of Tennessee, to raise awareness for this important cause. This would come at no cost to taxpayers.

Revenues generated from the sale of a specialized postage stamp would be directed to the National Institute of Mental Health to further this ambitious program that has the potential to revolutionize neurological and psychiatric care all around the world.

PHILANDO CASTILE

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the death of my former constituent, Philando Castile, whose shocking and completely unnecessary death has now been seen by millions around the world via video.

I mourn not only his death but also the complete failure of local law enforcement and the criminal justice system to protect his most precious right, the right to life.

Philando, like so many other young African Americans before him,
interacted with local law enforcement, responded peacefully, did exactly what he was supposed to do, yet he wound up dead, shot six times at pointblank range by an officer who saw him as something less than human.

He is good reason except for the color of his skin and the fact that his ethnicity fed into an implicit, sick, and deadly bias held by some police officers that Black people present an imminent threat simply by virtue of who we are. That bias is pervasive, not just among some police officers, but also throughout our criminal justice system.

Anyone who views the video of Philando’s police shooting can see that he should not be dead and that the officer who killed him should have been held accountable. But as in far too many other cases, the justice system failed Philando and his family in the most extraneous ways. The sad truth is that, in 2017, we continue to suffer under a justice system that provides justice for some but not for all.

As I join with Philando’s family and millions of other Americans who were outraged by Philando’s incomplete lack of accountability for his death, I cannot but help remember another tragic case, the death of my 18-year-old constituent, Mike Brown, almost 3 years ago in Ferguson, Missouri. As I watched Philando’s family screaming out for justice, they reminded me of something that Mike Brown’s mother, Lesley McSpadden, told me. She said: Congressman, I want them to know that he mattered to me.

Well, he mattered to me, too, as well as Philando. So did Tamir Rice, Eric Garner, Sandra Bland, Freddie Gray, and so many others who have died at the hands of local police for no good reason and without any consequence.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported local law enforcement for over 30 years, and I continue to have no doubt that the vast majority of police officers perform a difficult, dangerous, and essential job that is what this war is now all about, this 16-year war. It is being held up and continued only because so many people and companies are making money out of it.

Just yesterday, in The Washington Times, there was this story entitled, "War and Waste," and I would like to read some of that story.

"Those are the basics for outfitting an Afghan soldier. But in that simple uniform combination are the threads of two troubling stories—one about the waste of millions in American taxpayer dollars—actually, it is many billions—the other about the perils of propping up a partner army in a seemingly endless war."

"Together these tales help explain why some in Congress—"why some in Congress question the wisdom of investing even more resources in Afghanistan, nearly 16 years after the United States invaded the Taliban-ruled country in response to the al-Qaida attacks of September 11, 2001. The Army general who runs the U.S. war effort in Afghanistan calls it a stalemate. Defense Secretary Jim Mattis says the U.S. is 'not winning.'"

And I will continue with this story: And, sadly, the only Americans who are being killed in recent weeks have been killed by the Afghan soldiers who we are paying and who we are there trying to help out.

Continuing this story: "The long war has generated repeated examples of wasted funds, which may be inevitable in a country such as Afghanistan, where the military has been built from scratch with corruption and relies almost completely on U.S. money for even the most basic things, including salaries and uniforms. Among the costs rarely noted publicly: The Pentagon has spent $1 billion over the past 3 years to help recruit and retain Afghan soldiers."

And then, I continue with the story: "The Pentagon has not disputed the gist of findings by its Special Inspector General for Afghanistan, John Sopko, that the U.S. spent as much as $28 million more than necessary over 10 years on uniforms for Afghan soldiers with a camouflage ‘forest’ pattern that ‘is totally inappropriate for the largely desert battlefield.'"

In a report released this past week, Sopko’s office said the Pentagon paid to license a propriety camouflage pattern even though it owns patterns it could have used for free."

The Pentagon spent $28 million to get something that it could have gotten for free."

"The choice," it said, was based on the seemingly offhand fashion preference of a single Afghan official.

"This is not an isolated event," Sopko said in a telephone interview. "The U.S. has been ‘in a mad rush to spend money like a drunken man, just throwing it on a wastebasket design it should be.' The real cartoon design is one with a huge briefcase called ‘War Incorporated,’ with a very greedy-looking man holding a"
TRUMP CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about a young man by the name of Will, who is 34 years old and tells us a story that, if he were a Canadian, there would be a good chance that he could live 17 more years. He has cystic fibrosis, and I imagine there are many families with children who have that, but he is concerned about TrumpCare and the impact.

At age 2, he was diagnosed with cystic fibrosis, a hereditary disease impacting 30,000 Americans. He says:

Imagine being under water and coming up for air, but instead of breathing, you uncontrollably cough that air out. The harder you try to breathe, the more you cough. At its worst, this disease feels like a long, drawn-out panic attack set to the soundtrack of an endless coughing cough. At 34, statistically, I have 7 more years left before my lungs cease to function.

He mentions that if he were in Canada, statistically, he would have 17 more years because of the healthcare, but he also says this is not an exaggeration:

The cold data from a recent study by the U.S. Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the conclusion is that Canada’s nationalized single-payer system guarantees health insurance for everyone that is the primary reason why Canadians with my disease will live longer.

But look what happened to him:

For the past 4 years, however, my disease has gone into reverse. I have been gradually getting better. It is an extraordinary sensation. A new medication called Kalydeco made by a company in Boston has given me the promise of extending both the length and quality of my life. I have been healthy enough to work abroad as a freelance journalist.

A year and a half ago, Will got married.

My wife and I hope to one day have kids, but today is a sobering day. The House Repeal and Replace bill puts me in a very different future than the one I plan to have.

That is what TrumpCare represents to millions of Americans: higher costs; less coverage; not 22 million now, but in 2026, 49 million Americans will not be insured.

How can you? Where is the moral standing?

It guts protections for preexisting conditions no matter what kind of smoke and mirrors the Senate is trying to tell us. It does not exist.

It has got a crushing age tax. If you are over 50, more of your income will be used for your insurance premiums, up to $12,000 to $15,000.

And it steals from Medicare. It makes the Medicare trust fund insolvent.

In my own State of Texas, here is a long chart that talks to each Member, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how many people in their district will lose their health insurance.

I would ask the question: Is there any mercy? Is there anyone that understands?

In my district alone, almost 100,000—89,000—individuals will be losing their insurance; almost 20,000 of those will be children. And it goes on in other Members’ districts. Talk about what is happening. The current outlook would likely regress back to the one that likely won’t allow me to remain on this House floor.

And then Will, who would have and has now, because of the Affordable Care Act, a decent life, with a preexisting condition that he described, how would you like to come from under water and try to breathe and that breathing is undermined by the hacking of that cough?

I hope that this bill is derailed. I hope that TrumpCare in the House and the Senate never sees the light of day, because I don’t want to work with my colleagues, but because the chronically ill will suffer and many will die. The statistics show that the State of Texas, Mr. Speaker.

I conclude with this one sentence, Mr. Speaker. I want to go back to Mr. CLAY, and I ask the Attorney General to investigate the role of Mr. Castle, and to do it now.

IMMIGRATION AND SANCTUARY CITIES

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

Mr. AARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the great State of Texas, I want to first acknowledge and produce my remarks with the fact that most people that are entering these United States illegally are doing so because they want a better life for their families. That said, it doesn’t make it right. As has been said, and I have said before, we are a nation of immigrants for sure, all of us, but we are also a nation of laws.

When the Federal Government abdicates its responsibility to secure our border and enforce our immigration laws, we not only fail in our sacred duty to uphold the Constitution and the rule of law, but we put American lives at risk. 121, that is the number of lives that have been lost from 2010 to 2014, lives that could have been saved if we had the political courage to enforce our immigration laws regarding criminal aliens.

Here is something even more outrageous. Of the over 36,000 criminal aliens released from Immigration and Customs Enforcement custody over the course of a year, 1,000 of them were reconvicted of another crime.

These avoidable, tragic deaths from violent crimes continue to happen across the country, and many of the criminal aliens who have committed them have found refuge in our Nation’s sanctuary cities. These are lawless cities, let’s be clear, cities whose actions undermine the basic American tenet that we are a nation of laws, not of men.

Fortunately, we have the opportunity to stop this madness and do the job the American people expect their government to do, their first job, and that is to keep Americans safe.

Passing the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act would impose significant penalties on States and cities that refuse to follow Federal immigration laws and cooperate with authorities. Additionally, it would allow the Secretary of Homeland Security to prohibit law-breaking immigrants in DHS custody from being transferred to sanctuary cities.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act only addresses one problem in this area, a problem that we all know will require further reform; but, nonetheless, this is a good, commonsense law, and it will move our country in the right direction towards safer, stronger communities.

In addition to supporting the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, I have co-sponsored the Davis-Oliver Act, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same. In addition to holding these cities accountable for harboring criminal aliens, we need to ensure that our State and local law enforcement officials have the authority to actually do their job, and that is enforce all of our Nation’s laws.

Together, I believe the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act and the Davis-Oliver Act will have a major impact on stopping illegal immigration and deterring lawlessness at the hands of criminal aliens who have repeatedly proven that they will break our laws, harm our citizens, and disrespect this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let’s empower the President and all local law enforcement agencies to do their job. Let’s honor the Constitution and respect the rule of law. Mr. Speaker, let’s simply put America first.
think it provided enough people with coverage. He said: “We’re going to have insurance for everybody,” and, “I’m not going to leave the lower 20 percent that can’t afford insurance.”

The Congressional Budget Office says that 17 million people will immediately lose coverage under the Trump-Ryan plan, and 24 million people will lose coverage by 2027. The Senate version of the bill isn’t much different.

Trump also promised that Americans would pay cheaper health insurance with “much lower deductibles.” His Health and Human Services Secretary, Tom Price, said that “nobody will be worse off financially.” But the GOP healthcare plan would cause an increase in health premiums by 15 to 20 percent in the first 2 years alone, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

During the Republican Presidential primary, Donald Trump bragged that he was “the first and only potential GOP candidate that there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.” But the GOP health plan guts Medicaid more than ever before. It freezes enrollment and unravels the Medicaid expansion.

Donald said the GOP leadership is breaking their promises to the American people. Their healthcare bills take away coverage from millions. Deductibles will go up. Copays will go up.

“TrumpCare would gut essential health benefits, which would mean soaring costs for people with pre-existing conditions. It will provide worse coverage to those lucky enough to still be able to afford it. And to what end?

They are stripping healthcare from millions of people in order to give a tax cut to the wealthiest Americans who need it the least. They are lining the pockets of the rich while leaving our families out to dry.

The GOP wants to take away healthcare coverage from millions of hardworking Americans who just want to feel secure and know that they and their families will be able to see a doctor and get treated if they get sick, without putting themselves or their families in financial ruin. They are robbing Peter to give Paul Ryan and his cronies a tax cut.

In Arizona, we have seen firsthand the consequences Medicaid cuts can wreak. In 2011, Arizona Governor Jan Brewer cut Arizona’s Medicaid funding and froze enrollment. Families who were on Medicaid at the time could only continue to receive benefits if their income remained below the Federal poverty level. A family who worked hard to raise their income even the tiniest amount above the poverty line would lose Medicaid coverage permanently, even if their income went down later.

About 150,000 adults in Arizona lost their Medicaid as a result of those changes. People would get sick and be unable to see a doctor just because they couldn’t afford it. In some cases, people were forced to decide between paying for lifesaving care or paying their rent.

If Medicaid expansion goes away under the GOP healthcare plan, around 400,000 Arizonans could lose coverage, according to AHCCCS in Arizona. That includes 26,700 cancer patients and about 47,000 who are working to overcome different levels of substance abuse, including opioid treatment. People in lower income families across the country would experience similar devastating outcomes.

Senators John McCain and Jeff Flake witnessed the disastrous effect it takes away healthcare coverage for people in Arizona. They know more than anyone else how many lives can be ruined.

Some Republicans have already voiced strong concerns about this bill’s impact on their constituents. If they are serious about these concerns, it will only take three Republican Senators to take a stand and grind this process to a halt. Unfortunately, so far, Senators McCain and Flake are not among them.

Senators McCain and Flake face a very stark choice: they can do the bidding of Donald Trump and deprive millions of healthcare coverage, or they can take steps to defend the health and financial security of the Arizonans they were elected to represent.

The people of Arizona haven’t been shy about letting our Senators know how they feel and why they feel it, but it is time to pressure Senators McCain and Flake must understand that they owe it to Arizona families to vote “no” on TrumpCare. If they don’t, Arizona will hold them accountable.

It is time for my colleagues in the House to put pressure on the Senators in their own States to do the right thing and vote “no” on this bill. We owe it to our constituents to stand up for them and make sure that this catastrophic plan never sees the light of day.

Monsignor William O’Neill celebrates 50 years with Savanna diocese

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Carter) for 5 minutes.

Mr. Carter of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Monsignor William O’Neill, who celebrated his Golden Jubilee of Ordination on June 4, 2017, marking his 50th year of service with the Catholic Diocese of Savannah.

Irish Catholics have been an important aspect of Savannah’s culture and history since their arrival during the mid-19th century. Today, Savannah maintains important aspects of Irish Catholic culture, and is now home to the third largest St. Patrick’s Day festival in the world.

A native of Ireland, a newly ordained O’Neill arrived in the heat of a Georgia summer in 1967. His first assignment was to St. Mary on the Hill in Augusta. Later, Father O’Neill would go on to manage the cathedral at Abercorn and Harris, which has become an architectural staple in the city of Savannah.

O’Neill’s love for the Catholic faith and its Savannah followers led him to begin the renovation of the cathedral on Abercorn and Harris in 1998, which involved the removal and cleaning of over 50 stained glass windows, the replacement of the roof, and the restoration of the building’s interior.

On February 4, 2001, Father O’Neill was made the first priest of the Savannah Diocese in nearly 34 years to be invested with the title of Monsignor, which serves as a recognition of his commitment to the Diocese. Although he has since retired, Father O’Neill remains an active part of the Diocese.

I congratulate Father O’Neill and I thank him for his commitment to the Diocese and the Catholic community of Savannah.

Retirement of FLETC Director Connor L. Patrick

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Ms. Connor L. Patrick for her service as the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, as she retires as its director this Friday, June 30, 2017.

Director Patrick began her career in law enforcement in 1976, when she was sworn in as a deputy with the Brevard County Sheriff’s Office in Titusville, Florida. Her hard work and determination gave her the opportunity for a promotion to serve as a special agent with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement.

After 20 years with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, she began her work with the FLETC. Director Patrick’s impeccable work ethic gained her a promotion to Director of the FLETC in 2002. She has since served in that capacity.

Under Director Patrick’s leadership, local, State and Federal training facility growth has increased by an astonishing 22 percent. The FLETC has also trained more students during her tenure than it did in its first 30 years of existence.

As Director of this division of Homeland Security, Director Patrick oversaw training for a majority of Federal, State and local law enforcement officers annually. To date, Director Patrick is the longest-serving head of any component of the Department of Homeland Security.

Director Patrick has also found the time to serve as a leader among members of the National Sheriffs’ Association Education and Awards Committee, as well as the executive committee of the National Law Enforcement Exploring Committee.

I thank Director Patrick for her invaluable dedication to ensuring that
our law enforcement officers are properly trained to protect our loved ones.

ST. MARY MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the St. Mary Missionary Baptist Church on its 75th anniversary.

In 1940, St. Mary was established as a congregation that serves nearly 500 households in my district. Since coming to the House 30 years ago, I have been privileged to be a part of its history and future.

I congratulate Minister Baker on his impressive leadership of this dynamic organization.

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

☐ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Rabbi Gary Klein, Temple Ahavat Shalom, Palm Harbor, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Religious traditions teach that people and God are to work together to create a better world. Therefore, as we begin this day of work of the House of Representatives, we pray first, O God, that You join with medical professionals to help Congressman SCALISE and others injured with him experience complete recoveries.

As pastors came and went over the years, each had their own vision on how to improve and enrich the church and its congregation. The church’s current leader, Minister Lawrence F. Baker, Sr., joined St. Mary as its pastor in 2005 and made many improvements and purchases that helped the church grow its membership while never losing sight of its vision.

St. Mary is a truly blessed congregation with its kind and charitable members serving the community in any way they can. As the church continues to grow, the good people of St. Mary touch more lives every day. On June 11, communities and congregations from all over came together to celebrate St. Mary’s history and future.

I congratulate Minister Baker on his impressive leadership of this dynamic organization.

WELCOMING RABBI GARY KLEIN

The Speaker. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome my great friend, Rabbi Gary Klein, who has led the Temple Ahavat Shalom in Palm Harbor, Florida, for the past 30 years.

Temple Ahavat Shalom is a congregation that serves nearly 500 households in my district. Since coming to Pinellas County in 1967, he served on the board of the St. Leo University Center for Catholic-Jewish studies and currently serves on the National Council of AIPAC.

BMW CREATES JOBS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, I was grateful to be with Governor Carroll Campbell, Senator John Russell, and Senator Verne Smith when BMW held the groundbreaking for their first American manufacturing facility in the upstate of South Carolina.

Today, with an investment of nearly $8 billion by BMW, South Carolina is the leading exporter of cars of any State, and the Greer plant is the largest BMW manufacturing facility in the world, with $9.5 billion worth of autos exported from the Port of Charleston last year. This fulfills the vision of the legendary industrialist, Roger Milliken.

BMW has excelled by being a leader of apprenticeship training programs, creating over 30,000 jobs with ontime delivery of suppliers, and a total of 120,000 jobs nationwide.

I was grateful to join Governor Henry McMaster; Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM; President of BMW, Knudt Flor; and chairman of the board, Harald Kruger, yesterday as BMW announced an additional expansion of $900 million and 1,000 more jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SENATE HEALTHCARE BILL

DENIES COVERAGE

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a vote on clause 1, rule I. I demand a vote on the Speaker's approval thereof.

The Speaker. Pursuant to clause 8, the question will be postponed.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Speaker. Will the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIMES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

Rabbi Klein is a long-time advocate on behalf of the U.S.-Israel alliance.

As co-chair of the Congressional Hol- lenic Israeli Alliance, I welcome his continued advice and counsel, especially as it relates to security in the Eastern Mediterranean.

For several years now, I have joined Rabbi Klein and the congregation for Passover Seder, and I very much look forward to continuing this tradition.

I am thankful for his friendship, and I wish him many more years of blessed leadership.
Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning because yesterday the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan organization that we rely on in this Chamber for truth, told us that the Senate healthcare bill—so-called healthcare bill—will throw 22 million Americans off of their insurance. Two-thirds of those, 14 million, are Medicaid patients—the poorest people in America, elderly people in nursing homes.

I don’t have a voice in the Senate, Mr. Speaker, but if I did, I would say: I understand how important it is to deliver on the promise you have been making for 7 years to repeal ObamaCare. The Republican base is demanding it, but it can’t possibly be demanding the throwing off of their healthcare 22 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I also don’t have a voice in the oval office, but if I did, I would ask this President, I would say: Sir, you said to do three things: you promised to increase coverage, to lower deductibles, and to lower premiums for the American people. I would say: President, this bill in the Senate does the exact opposite of all three of those things.

So I would say: President, if you keep your word, stop this Senate bill from passing.

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Indiana’s Rural Teacher of the Year, James Wildermuth of North Miami Community Schools. Mr. Wildermuth is well deserving of this high honor awarded by the Indiana Small and Rural Schools Association. He is truly an exceptional Hoosier educator who has had a profound impact on student achievement and who exemplifies leadership in a way that should inspire all of us.

In addition to his 17 years as a teacher, Mr. Wildermuth also serves as a district adviser for the local Future Farmers of America program. I am grateful that North Miami’s students have Mr. Wildermuth as a role model and a mentor, always keeping them not only engaged in the lesson at hand but focused on using these lessons to succeed in life.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Second District Hoosiers, I want to thank Mr. Wildermuth for all he does to educate, support, and guide his students on the path to achievement and to make our community stronger.

POSTTRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS
(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about posttraumatic stress disorder, otherwise referred to as PTSD. Roughly, 5.2 million adults in the United States have been diagnosed in a given year with post-traumatic stress disorder.

Many of these individuals are men and women who have bravely served our Nation’s armed forces. The Department of Veterans Affairs indicates that between 15 and 30 percent of Vietnam veterans have had PTSD in their lifetime; about 12 percent of Desert Storm veterans have been diagnosed with PTSD in a given year; and between 11 and 20 percent of those serving in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom have also been diagnosed with PTSD in a given year.

So today, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day, I call on all of us to do more to help our fellow Americans. We can do more, and we must do more.

We must be able to look at those Americans with PTSD in their eyes and say: You are not alone, and we are with you, and we are going to continue to give you the same service that you have given our country.

HONORING SERGEANT DILLON BALDRIDGE
(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Dillon Baldridge, who was killed in action on June 10, 2017, from wounds sustained in Nangarhar province, Afghanistan, while supporting Operation Freedom’s Sentinel.

He was posthumously awarded the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart, Combat Infantry Badge, and the Army Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster. His prior awards and decorations included the Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal with three oak clusters, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, and the Expert Infantry Badge.

Last week, hundreds of North Carolinians gathered in Ashe County to pay tribute to Sergeant Baldridge as he was laid to rest. We should all take time to pause, reflect, and honor the sacrifices of those like this young man from Youngsville, North Carolina, who have given their lives in the pursuit of a more prosperous and free America. May we endeavor to live worthy of their legacy and guard vigilantly the history and stories of our fallen.

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, Western New Yorkers witnessed tragedy due to inadequate pilot training. A poorly trained pilot crashed a commercial jet into a neighborhood in our community, ending the lives of those on board and one on the ground.

Today, the victims’ families of Flight 3407, who suffered unimaginable loss on that day, have turned their grief into a powerful citizens’ fight to strengthen pilot training and flight safety rules.

So today, I call on all of us to do more to help our fellow Americans. We can do more, and we must do more.

We must be able to look at those Americans with PTSD in their eyes and say: You are not alone, and we are with you, and we are going to continue to give you the same service that you have given our country.

MAINTAINING GREAT LAKES’ ECOSYSTEM
(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes are a national treasure, and nobody knows this better than the people in my home State of Michigan.

Our environment, economy, and quality of life depend upon maintaining a healthy Great Lakes ecosystem. One of the most harmful threats are invasive species like Asian carp that decimate every ecosystem in their path.

Last week, we learned some alarming news when a live Asian carp was found just nine miles from Lake Michigan beyond the electric barrier. If Asian carp are able to infiltrate the Great Lakes, it would be devastating for Michigan’s fishing, boating, and tourism industries and all the jobs they support.

The Army Corps of Engineers has completed a report called the “Brandon Road Study” that provides a roadmap of how to best prevent Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes. They should release it immediately.

We must take bipartisan action before it is too late. We simply cannot allow, Mr. Speaker, Asian carp to wreak havoc on the Great Lakes.

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose TrumpCare, a bill that
Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, with the Shelby County v. Holder decision, the Supreme Court effectively gutted the Voting Rights Act.

At the time, Chief Justice John Roberts said that the key protections the Court removed from the act were, as he put it: “extraordinary measures to address an extraordinary problem.”

Sadly and extraordinarily, many of those problems still exist. I would argue that the Voting Rights Act was extraordinarily successful.

Since the passage of the Federal Court commented that a voter ID law in North Carolina didn’t stop fraud. Instead, the provisions that were struck down “target African Americans with almost surgical precision.”

Courts found significant disenfranchisement caused by new laws in Wisconsin as well.

Mr. Speaker, every American has a right and the freedom to cast their vote without interference. People have fought and died for that right. We are in danger of going back to a time when those rights were cast aside.

That is why it is time for Congress to pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act to modernize the law, to put back in place provisions stripped from the Voting Rights Act, and to ensure that no State can discriminate by creating barriers to the ballot box.

If we want to remain a nation that empowers its citizens, we need swift action on this bill.

Patriot Week

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we need to get back to the core values that define our Nation’s history to be taught in schools and honored in workplaces across America.

Patriot Week would begin on the solemn anniversary of September 11 and end with Constitution Day on September 17.

Mr. Speaker, our founding principles have been ignored and eroded. Society has seemingly lost interest in the long-standing history that made our country great.

As we approach Independence Day, we must reflect on who we are as a nation and how we can improve what is good for generations to come. America has become too divided, and we must get back to the core values that make our country great.

Just as immigrants learn the history of our country, high school seniors should be exposed to the same citizenship exam upon graduation. Ronald Reagan once said that “freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction.” His words must serve as a wake-up call to every one of us today.

I urge my colleagues to support Patriot Week, and I would like to take this opportunity to wish our Nation a happy and safe Independence Day. We must honor and defend the freedom we have to keep us safe at home, in our Nation’s Capital, and all over the world.

Recognizing Lexmark’s Exciting New Program to Train Veterans

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to proudly recognize Lexmark International, a global leader in printing solutions headquartered in Lexington, Kentucky, for its development of an innovative program for training U.S. veterans and soon-to-be-separated Active Duty personnel with the goal that they can become certified service technicians of Lexmark printers.

The program, called the Lexmark Printer Service Training Partnership, is under the auspices of VALORR, the Veterans Association of Lexmark: Organized to Recognize and Respect.

It will provide veterans with tremendous know-how and a can-do attitude, the ability to step into new fields and master them quickly. By completing the printer
service training program, these veterans will be certified to service Lexmark printers worldwide.

I am proud that my constituents at Lexmark have developed such a thoughtful program for veterans. I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing those companies and organizations going the extra mile for those who have served our Nation in uniform.

MEDICAID CUTS

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

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep misgivings about the recent healthcare proposals put forth by the Senate. This bill, like the American Health Care Act, proposes drastic cuts to Medicaid and would saddle my constituents and Americans with skyrocketing premiums and deductibles.

We are placing our hardworking families and young children, our elderly, veterans, and Native Americans in harm’s way by making coverage unaffordable and unattainable.

The cost of this legislation will be paid by those who can least afford it. Recent reports show that the cost of Medicaid cuts in this bill would cost Arizona more than $7 billion. This means hundreds of thousands of people, including nursing home patients who rely on affordable, lifesaving coverage, will be kicked off their Medicaid coverage.

From the beginning, these pieces of legislation have been crafted behind closed doors without input from doctors, nurses, and healthcare leaders. While we play partisan games, the health and well-being of our families, friends, and neighbors are at risk. If we want to get serious about fixing our healthcare system and bringing down costs, we must work together on bipartisan legislation.

TRUMPCARE

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this week, Senate Republicans are very likely to vote on a bill that would take away health insurance from 22 million Americans like Marcia and Grace Kohler in Boulder, Colorado. The Kohlers, like many other families, were able to have access to healthcare through the Affordable Care Act.

At the age of 8½, Marcia’s youngest daughter Grace, was diagnosed with childhood leukemia. She endured 26 months of extensive treatments and several chemotherapy sessions per week. In Marcia’s own words: “Going through this process without the assistance of healthcare is unimaginable. It brings tears back to my own eyes.”

We are simply not a nation that turns its back on our most vulnerable citizens. 39 percent of all children in this country are supported on Medicaid, 64 percent of nursing home residents, and 30 percent of adults with disabilities.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate right now think of Grace and all those like her. I hope that they think about the millions of Americans that will have the rug pulled out from underneath them if they pass their cruel bill. For some it is a matter of debt or taxes, but for many it is simply a matter of life or death.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

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

Dear Speaker Ryan: Respectfully, I write to tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security. It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Sincerely,
Tom Marino,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

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

Dear Speaker Ryan: Respectfully, I write to tender my resignation as a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. It has been an honor to serve on the Committee under the leadership of Chairman Smith.

Sincerely,
Gary Palmer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY AND COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:
Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 382 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 382

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. 1215) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-T. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall arise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the chair?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further consent that all Members may tender their remarks.

There was no objection.
We must pass this legislation for the American taxpayer. The taxpayer doesn’t deserve to have their hard-earned dollars simply end up in the pockets of trial lawyers due to frivolous lawsuits. That is why H.R. 1215 is a critical step toward legal reform.

Unlimited and opportunistic lawsuits help no one except trial lawyers. Consequently, our doctors have to increase their costs and practice expensive defensive medicine, costing patients and taxpayers. And when our physicians are not here, we are not.

Trial lawyers too often stand between patients and their doctors. With the looming threat of excessive, unending lawsuits, healthcare providers have to worry more about the trial lawyer at their door than the patient in their office. H.R. 1215 places important limits on these lawsuits so that the truly wronged are compensated without enriching trial lawyers at the same time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, and that provides for consideration of the Protecting Access to Care Act. This bill would significantly alter how families and patients that are injured as a result of medical error are able to hold healthcare providers, or device makers accountable to make sure that that same thing doesn’t happen to other people.

This bill decreases patient safety. It undermines the ability of people who are wrongfully injured by medical malpractice or faulty medical devices to be compensated for their injuries, and it violates the 10th Amendment to our Constitution, the rights reserved to the States.

Before I turn to the merits, or lack thereof, of this bill, I want to discuss the process under which this bill came to the floor.

The Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over this bill, had zero hearings on this legislation, heard from zero experts, and went straight to markup. Despite the overwhelming opposition to this legislation, the Judiciary Committee did not want to hear from groups like the American Bar Association, Patient Safety America, the National Disability Rights Network, or the National Patient Advocate. When I see the American Bar Association, who the committee refused to hear from—I know my colleague from Colorado is an attorney. I just want to inquire of my colleague from Colorado if he is a member of the American Bar Association, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUCK. Proudly, no.

Mr. POLIS. Okay. Well, that is the association which many attorneys, excepting, of course, my friend from Colorado, are a member of.

The supporters of this bill point to its consideration in previous Congresses for hearings, but we have over 50 new Members who didn’t hear a word about this bill from any experts before it was rushed to the floor.

We are considering this bill under a very restrictive rule. That means there were 26 Members allowed to speak, this rule only allows the House to debate and vote on five of them. That means 19 of them, amendments offered by Democrats and Republicans, were simply just tossed out in the Rules Committee. That is what this rule does.

If this rule passes, it would mean that the efforts of 19 Members to offer ideas to improve healthcare wouldn’t even be allowed to be debated or voted upon here on the floor of this House. It is no coincidence that eight amendments filed by Democrats, and not one Democratic amendment was made in order. Only 5 out of 24 ideas from Democrats and Republicans were made in order.

One amendment filed by my colleague, Representative JACKSON LEE, would have provided an exception to the bill for any medical-related injury to a child, which seems like common sense. At least have a debate about it. If people disagree, let them disagree. Let’s have debate.

This rule continues this very closed process, where Democrats and Republicans are shut out of participating in the bills that appear fully formed without the opportunity for us to represent our constituents and offer amendments to improve and make these bills better, to reduce costs, to improve the quality of care.

What I wonder, Mr. Speaker, is: Where is the open process promised by Speaker RYAN? This Congress hasn’t even considered a single piece of legislation under an open rule, and we have had many, many bills brought to the floor under closed rules and without any committee hearings. But, you know, we are no more surprised so much anymore because secrecy seems to be the standard that Republicans are setting in this Congress.

How the Republicans have handled their healthcare bill from start through now is a perfect example of the closed-door, secretive process that has become, tragically, the standard operating procedure for this Congress.

The Republican healthcare bill will increase insurance costs for 22 million fewer people will be covered—increase costs for those who are lucky enough to keep their current coverage, and reduce access to healthcare for the American people. It puts a burden on small businesses, on the middle class, and on our healthcare providers, while denying hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to big corporations and special interests.

TrumpCare is a billionaire’s tax cut disguised as a healthcare bill, and it will be one of the largest transfers of wealth from the middle class and the working families to the top 1 percent of Americans. Effectively, it is removing benefits from people in rural counties and cities across our country and giving those tax cuts mostly to people in New York and Hollywood. That is what Republicans are delivering with this bill.

When the American people were finally given the chance to see the Senate’s healthcare legislation, the American people overwhelmingly rejected it. Only 16 percent of the American people approve of the plan. Democrats oppose it; Republicans oppose it; independents oppose it.

The Congressional Budget Office’s recent score of the bill says that coverage will significantly decrease under this bill and that the costs of deductibles for patients will go up. Patients will have to spend more out of pocket, those that are lucky enough to even have insurance after this cruel bill.

But there is still time to stop it, and I call upon my colleagues to prevent this bill from moving forward.

The bill that Republicans are trying to ram through Congress is not truly meant to make improvements to our healthcare system but to take money away from the middle class and working families and put it into the pockets of a very few people who benefit from the tax cuts under this bill: for people making millions of dollars a year.

This bill makes it harder for middle-income families and for low-income families to access quality, affordable healthcare, makes it harder for individuals who have preexisting conditions or have genetic disorders or long-term diseases from accessing lifesaving medical attention, and cuts critical healthcare services for disabled children in schools that many of our school districts rely on. And they want to do this all with a closed process.

I offered three amendments to improve healthcare in our Education and the Workforce Committee. All were defeated on a partisan vote.

Every Republican voted not to allow those. No Democrat, as far as I know—certainly not me—has been invited to present our ideas to Republican leadership or President Trump.

Democrats have lots of ideas to improve the Affordable Care Act. I am sure many Republicans do, too. Those ideas are not reflected whatsoever in this bill or in the closed process that prohibits Republicans and Democrats from even offering our suggestions to improve this bill.

So, here we are, debating another piece of healthcare legislation that did not go through an open process. Democrats were shut out of the amendment process completely.

This bill would make it more difficult for victims of medical malpractice to seek or receive compensation for their injuries. It is inconsistent with the 10th Amendment, which reserves these rights to the States that are not enumerated in the
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Mr. POLIS. Some of the groups are the Gerontological Advanced Practice Nurses Association, Justice in Aging, Long Term Care Community Coalition, National Education Association, National Consumers League, National Disability Rights Network, Public Citizen, Public Justice, and many, many other great organizations.

I hope my friend from Colorado is a member of at least two or three of these wonderful organizations. I will furnish the entire list to him.

This bill preempts State tort law that has been developed over the last 200 years and is a violation of the 10th Amendment of our Constitution. It im-
poses an arbitrary cap on the amount of noneconomic damages a victim can collect under a Federal law coopting the ability of States to do their own medical malpractice laws and hamstringing them with regard to the reforms that they can undertake.

In fact, capping damages also in-

spending. According to a joint study by Northwestern Uni-
versity and the University of Illinois, they found that capping economic dam-
ages actually increases Medicare part B spending.

I would point out another horrible feature of the cruel Republican healthcare bill. It would cut the Medicare trust fund and would lead to Medi-
care becoming insolvent sooner rather than later by draining the Medicare trust fund of over $100 billion. That is another aspect of this bill.

No wonder they didn’t want us to see it, Mr. Speaker. No wonder they kept it in a locked closet from even Repub-
cicans who were allegedly writing it, like KEN BUCK and my friend, Senator GARDNER, who was on the committee that didn’t even see it. No wonder it was hidden, when you found out it actually leads to Medi-
care insolvency sooner, when you find that it throws 22 million people off the insurance that they already have, when you find out it raises rates for those who are lucky enough to maintain their insurance, when you find it takes money out of our schools, when you find that it risks throwing our elderly out of their nursing homes who rely on Medicaid.

This bill is a symptom of a problem. I am not a doctor; my friend from Colorado is not a doctor; but when I ask my doctor what you do when there are
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I would point out another horrible feature of the cruel Republican healthcare bill. It would cut the Medicare trust fund and would lead to Medi-
care becoming insolvent sooner rather than later by draining the Medicare trust fund of over $100 billion. That is another aspect of this bill.
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sponsors, it is treat the underlying cause.

Let’s do that. This bill doesn’t do that. This Republican Senate bill that throws people off insurance doesn’t do that. Let’s begin a process where we get ideas from Democrats and Republicans to work together to reduce costs in healthcare, to expand coverage in healthcare, and to improve the quality of healthcare for American families.

This bill is not focused on protecting patients. It increases the risk to patients. It drains Medicare of additional money. This bill will not reduce costs to patients. In fact, no healthcare bill being debated in Congress right now actually improves patient care or reduces costs to patients.

Those should be two pillars, two goals of healthcare reform: Can we reduce costs, and can we improve patient care?

This bill risks making patient care worse in an unconstitutional way. The Senate Republican healthcare bill meets none of those three critical criteria that the American people demand in healthcare reform: reducing costs, increasing coverage, and improving the quality of care for ourselves and for our loved ones.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what this bill really underlies is a fundamental mistrust for our constituents. Think about it. Jur- ies are made up of our constituents. What you are really worried about is that your constituency will not get it right when they are sitting in that jury box and making decisions.

Your constituents are wise enough to send me and 435 of us here to the Congress to make decisions about trillion-dollar budgets. Just don’t trust the jury box and making decisions. That you trust the jury box and making decisions is really a fundamental mistrust for people on the floor who are not lawyers, you can’t honestly believe this bill gives you equal access to justice, and here is why: You have a cap on noneconomic damages.

As a young medical student, I was taught the law of malpractice by our patients. As a matter of fact, I am an obstetrician. I think, of all the professions impacted by malpractice issues, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, obstetricians have been the most impacted.

I remember going back as a medical student and trying to figure out what type of doctor I wanted to become. My father was a doctor. I never had any doubt that little baby, I wanted to do that.

So I started telling my professors I wanted to be an obstetrician. Every professor I met said: Don’t do it. You are going to get sued. Malpractice insurance is going to be very, very, very expensive. You are not going to like that job anymore. No one wants to go into obstetrics.

Well, guess what? My professors were right. I did it anyway.

The average American gets sued between two and four times in their career. Malpractice remains the biggest deterrent of physicians choosing to go into obstetrics. The average obstetrician has to spend 2 to 3 months every year just to pay for their malpractice insurance.

I am very blessed. Over 20 years ago, Kansas undertook similar tort reform as this, and our malpractice costs have stabilized. My malpractice insurance was pretty much the same 20 years ago after we enacted the legislation to curb some of these costs.

I think it will be true for me to say that my friends that are obstetricians in other States without malpractice reform, their premiums are often three times higher than ours in Kansas. We have seen this work very, very well in Kansas. The good news is that this legislation will not impact any of that work as well.

I very much am in favor of this malpractice reform and how it is going to impact healthcare. I predict that this will help lower premium costs some 3 to 4 percent when enacted.

Malpractice is a huge cost of the current cost of healthcare. This is a first step of many that Republicans are encouraging or want to implement to start lowering those costs of premiums.

Small Business Association members were here in D.C. just 2 months ago. When they walked out of that meeting, I was expecting them to come back and tell me that their concerns were mostly regulatory concerns, but their number one concern was the cost of healthcare premiums.

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

I am not an attorney either, Mr. Speaker. I am a physician. As a matter of fact, I am an obstetrician. I think, of all the professions impacted by malpractice issues, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, obstetricians have been the most impacted.

I remember going back as a medical student and trying to figure out what type of doctor I wanted to become. My father was a doctor. I never had any doubt that little baby, I wanted to do that.

So I started telling my professors I wanted to be an obstetrician. Every professor I met said: Don’t do it. You are going to get sued. Malpractice insurance is going to be very, very, very expensive. You are not going to like that job anymore. No one wants to go into obstetrics.

Well, guess what? My professors were right. I did it anyway.

The average American gets sued between two and four times in their career. Malpractice remains the biggest deterrent of physicians choosing to go into obstetrics. The average obstetrician has to spend 2 to 3 months every year just to pay for their malpractice insurance.

I am very blessed. Over 20 years ago, Kansas undertook similar tort reform as this, and our malpractice costs have stabilized. My malpractice insurance was pretty much the same 20 years ago after we enacted the legislation to curb some of these costs.

I think it will be true for me to say that my friends that are obstetricians in other States without malpractice reform, their premiums are often three times higher than ours in Kansas. We have seen this work very, very well in Kansas. The good news is that this legislation will not impact any of that work as well.

I very much am in favor of this malpractice reform and how it is going to impact healthcare. I predict that this will help lower premium costs some 3 to 4 percent when enacted.

Malpractice is a huge cost of the current cost of healthcare. This is a first step of many that Republicans are encouraging or want to implement to start lowering those costs of premiums. Small Business Association members were here in D.C. just 2 months ago. When they walked out of that meeting, I was expecting them to come back and tell me that their concerns were mostly regulatory concerns, but their number one concern was the cost of healthcare premiums.
Amendment. So there are actually two Amendments. I am not even an attorney, but I know this violates two Amendments to our Constitution. That is pretty impressive for one bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. Schaakowski).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1215.

My Republican colleagues seem to see no need for a cap at all. In their healthcare bill, they slash Medicaid and, for the first time in its history, cap Federal funding. The result: hospital closures, reimbursement and staffing cuts, reduced access, and lower quality. Now, in this bill, they want to impose another cap, a cap on non-economic damages for injured healthcare consumers.

So who will be hurt?

It will be people like the 76-year-old woman whose treatment had to be removed because her bed sores went untreated for 12 days or an 81-year-old resident who died because her ventilator was dislodged, alarms sounded, and no one responded.

How about the family of a 92-year-old man who died after suffering from malnutrition and dehydration and was found with live insects in his eyes and mouth?

How do we put a $250,000 value on those injured?

Besides, this is a solution looking for a problem. There is no medical malpractice crisis. Between 2000 and 2015, the number of claims dropped more than 40 percent and the amount paid fell 23 percent.

But we do face a medical crisis. Nearly half a million Americans die every year from preventable medical errors, and many more are permanently injured. This bill does nothing to solve that problem. Instead, it just takes away the right of the injured consumers.

I would like to inquire of my friend from Colorado whether recognizing those savings is in fact a Federal responsibility or a State responsibility. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I will remind my friend from Colorado that the very $250,000 cap that we are talking about in this bill is the same cap that has been adopted by the Colorado State Legislature.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, exactly. What I would further add, then, is whose prerogative is it to institute this kind of cap: States like our own State of Colorado, which has that cap? Or Washington, D.C. insiders behind closed doors?

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my friend again that the States that have adopted any cap—it could be $250,000, it could be $1 million in non-economic damage caps—will not be affected by this bill. This bill only affects those States that have no caps, and it is Federal money that is being used to pay for these.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. This effectively co-ops States and forces other States to do the same thing that my colleague’s and my State of Colorado has already done. It goes beyond that as well. Under the 10th Amendment of the Constitution, this should be a power reserved for the States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to shed light on a serious issue facing millions of students nationally and in my home State of Colorado. Every day, 50 million students and 3 million teachers face significant health and safety threats due to inadequate school facilities. I have heard about many in Colorado, school gyms that are closed down because their roofs are falling in, staggering statistics that disproportionately affect high-poverty schools, particularly urban and rural schools, and many schools serving a high percentage of minority students.

Today we have a chance to address this rampant inequality throughout our school districts and to create jobs in the process.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative Bobby Scott’s Rebuild America’s Schools Act, H.R. 2475, which is also a proud co-sponsor of Mr. Scott’s legislation would invest $100 billion in the physical and digital infrastructure needs of our schools, creating nearly 2 million jobs and creating the education infrastructure we need for the 21st century.

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 (Mr. Donovan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Scott), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Polis) for proposing this amendment.

The Rebuild America’s Schools Act will help ensure that 49 States and the Nation’s 50 million public school students, taught by 3 million teachers, will have access to safe, healthy, and high-quality learning facilities and internet access sufficient for digital learning in the classroom.

This bold proposal would create nearly 2 million jobs, improve student learning, and revitalize under-resourced communities.

The Rebuild America’s Schools Act is a win for students, families, workers, and the economy; and any responsible infrastructure proposal put forth by Congress should include a bold investment in our Nation’s public schools.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced on the 63rd anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education because, despite the promise of Brown, our public school facilities remain largely separate and woefully unequal.

Last year, on the 52nd anniversary of Brown, Ranking Member Conyers and I unveiled the findings of a GAO report that found that more students are attending schools highly segregated by race and class.

Now, that most recent GAO report examining the state of our public schools’ infrastructure saw that low-income and minority students are served by poor and inadequate school facilities.

If we are to fully achieve the promise of Brown, then no child should remain in a classroom with a leaking roof or a broken heating system. All students should have equitable access to science labs, meeting rooms for high-quality career and technical educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, 12 States do not invest any money in capital construction projects in public schools, leaving responsibility of ensuring high-quality classrooms up to localities and local property taxes, which virtually guarantees inequitable funding between high- and low-income districts.

This bill targets Federal funding for school infrastructure to districts and schools buildings with the greatest need for improvement to their physical and digital infrastructure, which would be an important step in fulfilling the promise of Brown.

All too often, when Congress talks about infrastructure investment, we speak only about investments in roads, bridges, and other public buildings. Public schools are often left out of this conversation, but schools must be part of that conversation on infrastructure.

The Rebuild America’s Schools Act will ensure safe drinking water in schools, prevent instructional materials like textbooks from being ruined.
Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, when we think about healthcare, we all think about, of course, first and foremost, ourselves and our loved ones and our families. As Republicans, we should also think about constituents that we know, that we have met, for whom healthcare is literally a life-and-death situation.

I think of my friend Debbie and her son Sam. Debbie’s son Sam was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes when he was 4 years old. He is now 20 or 21 or so. He was a healthy kid, he ate healthy food, an active young child. As Debbie pointed out to me, it is not that anybody chooses an illness or a condition, the illness chooses you. Through the luck of the draw, her son Sam is afflicted with type 1 diabetes. Like many people with autoimmune diseases, it was not poor choices, it was not lifestyle decisions that gave him the disease or even increased his risk of disease. He was dealt a bad hand with an autoimmune gene that his family didn’t even know that they had.

Because of that, Sam has a costly disease. Thankfully, one that can be treated, but a costly disease for the rest of his life. There is no cure, and the cost of insulin and other lifesaving technologies is very high.

Sam has what here in Washington people call a preexisting condition. That is what we are talking about. Without insurance, the cost per month would go from about $300, which Debbie and her husband are able to afford and put together for Sam, to $2,500 a month, which they could not possibly afford to do.

Sam is now 20, and because of the Affordable Care Act, he will be on the family’s health insurance until he is 26. That is, if the family can keep their health insurance. Usually, insurance companies, like so many others, that they might be one of those 22 million families that loses coverage under this Republican healthcare bill. It is a lot of families.

It is not going to be any of my colleagues’ families. My colleagues have a government health insurance plan from serving in the House of Representatives. Their congressional staff has access to the exchanges, just like we do, to buy insurance. But 22 million people in each and every one of our districts, 435 districts in this country, in each and every one of our districts, not dozens of people, not hundreds of people, but thousands of real people like Deb and Sam, like a story I shared earlier of Marcia and Grace, will actually lose their healthcare. They will be forced to give up their home, become insolvent, go bankrupt, or die. A choice that no American should have to face.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration today on of many that didn’t go through regular order. There were no hearings. Closed process. They cut out all the Democratic amendments that we had to improve the bill. That is how the Republicans have been handling healthcare legislation this Congress. That is why this approach isn’t working. It is why this approach is so unpopular. No hearings, shut Members out of the legislative process, bring a bill to the floor that was hidden in some closet, written in secret, widely unpopular, throwing people off healthcare insurance, raising rates for those who are lucky enough to keep their insurance.

This bill is not aimed at protecting patients. This bill before us and the Senate Republican healthcare bill make it more difficult for Americans to deal with real-life healthcare issues that were dealt over the course of life for ourselves and our families.

We need a reset, Mr. Speaker. We need to reset and start real discussions about improving healthcare.

How could Democrats or Republicans work together to reduce costs?

Democrats and Republicans should work together to reduce costs. We shouldn’t be talking about whether 22 million people lose coverage or 10 million people lose coverage or 5 million people lose coverage. Let’s talk about 5 million people gaining coverage, 10 million people losing coverage. Let’s reset and frame the discussion about how more people can have access to healthcare.

The problem we are trying to solve is not how can we get less Americans to have access to healthcare. That is why this bill is so unpopular. If that is the problem Republicans are trying to solve, they solved it in this bill. Less Americans will have healthcare. But that is not the problem that the American people want us to address in Congress.

More people with healthcare, and people want to save money. They want their insurance rates to be lower, their deductibles to be lower. They want to save money. There are some low-hanging fruit in terms of costs in healthcare, administrative overhead, wasteful and duplicative spending, that we can go after together. These are good ideas, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican.

One of the amendments that I proposed was pricing transparency. One of the problems in the healthcare marketplace is nobody knows how much anybody charges. Different insurers and private payers pay widely different amounts for the exact same procedure. Let’s at least disclose the pricing and have transparency so market mechanisms will work to pull down rates by promoting competition.

By not allowing the market into healthcare, we are creating inefficiencies and raising rates. Let’s come together on that. Let’s come together around a lot of good ideas that Democrats and Republicans have bills on and have amendments on. But, no, they are not even allowed to be debated and not even allowed to be voted on either on
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this bill, in which every Democratic amendment was shut down, or in the Republican healthcare bill, in which no process was allowed for Democrats to improve the bill.

We have never even been invited into the spin room to figure out what was being debated. We didn’t even see the bill until it was presented fully formed days before it had to be voted on, affecting the lives of 22 million Americans, one-eighth of our entire economy. I am heartbroken by this absence of any hearing, without any expert testimony, and only days to digest this hundred-page bill.

So look, let’s reset, let’s work together to bring down costs, expanding coverage, and improving quality, and create a work product in healthcare reform that we can be proud of as Republicans, as Democrats, and as Americans; one in which Debbie and her son, Sam, don’t have to worry about giving up their home or facing death; or one in which Debbie and her mother are able to live out their lives without worrying about their preexisting condition.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to reject this closed rule, and I yield the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend’s newfound sense of bipartisanship. The Affordable Care Act was passed without a single Republican vote in the House, without a single Republican vote in the Senate, and without any concern of Republican thoughts about how healthcare should be run in this country. Now that the Affordable Care Act is, in fact, failing; now that we have over 90 counties in America that have zero health insurers to choose from in the individual market; and now that we see the Affordable Care Act in a death spiral, all of a sudden, we are concerned about the bipartisanship and how to fix the problem.

We have heard zero amendments in the past 6 years to the Affordable Care Act. In fact, in almost, in our amendment to the Affordable Care Act from the other side of the aisle while they had the President in the White House, and now, all of a sudden, we are looking for bipartisanship and solutions. We will find that bipartisanship and those solutions in the bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017. H.R. 1215 provides immunity for healthcare providers and whose lives will never be the same.

Consider the case of Olivia, an exceptionally bright high school senior from Santa Monica, California, who had gained early acceptance to Smith College in Massachusetts.

She passed away, and her promising future is over. She never made it to Smith College, because after a medical procedure was completed and while Olivia was still under anesthesia, a fellow-in-training pulled the catheter causing Olivia’s vital signs to plummet. Hospital staff waited more than ten minutes to resuscitate her, but it was far too late for Olivia.

In his budget speech, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitz Gerald, who has asked the gentleman to
The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . (and) has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatever." But that is not what they have said always. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, 6th edition, page 135. Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controls the time, . . . when the motion for the previous question is defeated, the control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or offer for the purpose of amendment." In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the chapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] does have substantive policy implication . . . (and) is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution. The question is on ordering the previous question. The question was taken; and the yeas and nays appeared.

Ms. MORIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yea and nay.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and
Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 184, not voting 15, as follows:

Yeas—234

Nay—184

The yea vote exceeded the nay vote by 48 votes.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a recorded vote.
So the resolution was agreed to. The vote of the result was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during roll call votes Nos. 323, 324, No. 325, and No. 326 due to my spouse’s health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on H.R. 2547—Veterans Expanded Trucking Opportunities Act of 2017. I would have also voted “yea” on H.R. 2258—ADVANCE Act. I would have also voted “nay” on H.R. 337—Motion on Condering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1215. I would have also voted “nay” on H. Res. 382—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1215—Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

Questions is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic devices, and there were—yeas 238, nays 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

YEAS—238

Buck, Ja’M热心

Bush, Bush

Butler, Butler

Blevins, Blevins

Blevins, Blevins

Blevins, Blevins

Blevins, Blevins

Blevins, Blevins

Blevins, Blevins

Blevins, Blevins

Blevins, Blevins
Resolved, That pursuant to section 1(b) of House Resolution 1372, Ninety-fourth Congress, agreed to July 1, 1976, as enacted into permanent law by section 101 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1977 (2 U.S.C. 451h), the Members' Representational Allowance applicable as of the date of the adoption of this resolution for each Member of the House of Representatives (including the Delegates and Resident Commissioner to the Congress) is increased by $25,000, to be available through January 2, 2018.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 412

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Mr. Waltz.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) (during the vote).

So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 325 regarding “On Ordering the Previous Question” (H. Res. 382). Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

I missed rollcall vote No. 326 regarding “Providing for consideration of H.R. 1215” (H. Res. 382). Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

ADJUSTING THE AMOUNT OF THE MEMBERS’ REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCE

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 411

Whereas on June 14, 2017, an armed gunman opened fire at a practice for the annual Congressional Baseball Game for Charity, wounding five individuals;

Whereas Members of the House are understandably concerned about the security of their staff and the constituents they serve, as well as their personal security;

Whereas the Members’ Representational Allowance (MRA) is available for ordinary and necessary expenses associated with security measures; and

Whereas heightened security concerns necessitate an adjustment in the MRA to provide Members with additional resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That pursuant to section 1(b) of House Resolution 1372, Ninety-fourth Congress, agreed to July 1, 1976, as enacted into permanent law by section 101 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1977 (2 U.S.C. 451h), the Members’ Representational Allowance applicable as of the date of the adoption of this resolution for each Member of the House of Representatives (including the Delegates and Resident Commissioner to the Congress) is increased by $25,000, to be available through January 2, 2018.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTA ANA RIVER WASH PLAN LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 497) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in certain other cases non-Federal lands, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 497

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 “Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONSERVATION DISTRICT.—The term “Conservation District” means the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, a political subdivision of the State of California.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term “non-Federal Land” means any such portion of land owned by the Conservation District generally depicted as “SBVWCD” on the Map.

(3) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map titled “Santa Ana River Wash Land Exchange” and dated September 3, 2015.

(4) NON-FEDERAL EXCHANGE PARCEL.—The term “non-Federal exchange parcel” means the approximately 90 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management generally depicted as “BLM Equalization Land” on the Map and is to be conveyed to the United States if necessary to equalize the fair market values of the lands otherwise to be exchanged.

(5) FEDERAL EXCHANGE PARCEL.—The term “Federal exchange parcel” means the approximately 327 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management generally depicted as “BLM Land to SBVWCD” on the Map.

(6) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 90 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management generally depicted as “BLM Equalization Land to SBVWCD” on the Map.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. EXCHANGE OF LAND; EQUALIZATION OF VALUE.

(a) EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202, 210, and 211 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1720-21), subject to valid existing rights, and conditioned upon any equalization payment necessary under section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)), and subsection (b) of this Act, as soon as practicable, but not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, if the Conservation District offers the Federal land to the United States, the Secretary shall:

(1) convey to the Conservation District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land, and any such portion of the Federal exchange parcel as may be required to equalize the values of the lands exchanged; and

(2) accept from the Conservation District a conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the Conservation District in and to the non-Federal land, and any such portion of the non-Federal exchange parcel as may be required to equalize the values of the lands exchanged.

(b) EQUALIZATION PAYMENT.—To the extent an equalization payment is necessary under section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716), the amount of such equalization payment shall first be made by way of in-kind transfer of such portion of the Federal exchange parcel to the Conservation District, or transfer of such portion of the non-Federal exchange parcel to the United States, as the case may be, as may be necessary to equalize the fair market values of the exchanged properties. The fair market value of the Federal exchange parcel or non-Federal exchange parcel,
as the case may be, shall be credited against any required equalization payment. To the extent such credit is not sufficient to offset the entire amount of equalization payment so indicated, any remaining amount of equalization payment shall be treated as follows:

(1) If the equalization payment is to equalize values by which the Federal land exceeds the non-Federal land exchanged for the non-Federal exchange parcel, Conservation District may make the equalization payment to the United States, notwithstanding any limitation regarding the amount of the equalization payment under section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716). In the event Conservation District opts not to make the equalization payment, the exchange shall not proceed.

(2) If the equalization payment is to equalize values by which the non-Federal land exceeds the Federal land and the credited value of the Federal exchange parcel, the Secretary shall order the exchange without requirement of any additional equalization payment by the United States to the Conservation District.

(c) APPRAISALS.—

(1) The value of the land to be exchanged under this Act shall be determined by appraisals conducted by 1 or more independent and qualified appraisers.

(2) Such appraisals shall be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including, as appropriate, the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and Uniform Appraisal Standards for Professional Appraisal Practice.

(d) TITLE APPROVAL.—Title to the land to be exchanged under this Act shall be determined by appraisals conducted by 1 or more independent and qualified appraisers.

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

There was no objection.

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

I am proud to sponsor this bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation, the Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act. This bill reflects a compromise negotiated at the grassroots level among the cities, county, mining companies, wildlife agencies, and water organizations decades in the Upper Santa Ana Wash area.

The bill simply authorizes a land exchange of 327 acres of Bureau of Land Management land for 310 acres of land currently owned by the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District. This exchange facilitates the implementation of the broader Upper Santa Ana Wash Land Management and Habitat Conservation Plan, which identifies opportunities to expand existing aggregate mining to support new infrastructure developments; enhance water storage for the surrounding communities; and establish protected habitats for certain threatened and endangered plants and species.

After the exchange, the Bureau of Land Management will use the land to protect critical habitat and will enhance the region’s water conservation and storage efforts by recharging more than 77 water basins. The land acquired by the Water Conservation District, which is currently adjacent to two aggregate mines, will allow local mining companies to expand and create greater efficiency in their current mining operations.

The companies estimate that this small exchange will result in approximately $8.5 million in new infrastructure projects and a $36 million increase in annual payrolls from the new sites. This bill is supported by a wide variety of stakeholders in my district, including the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino County, the city of Highland, California, the city of Redlands, California, CEMEX, the Endangered and Threatened Species Act, and the Bureau of Land Management.

This legislation allows the BLM and the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District to trade parcels of land which will benefit both the BLM and the conservation district.

This land exchange will empower mining companies, Robertson’s Ready Mix, and CEMEX, which sit on land managed by the BLM, to increase efficiency. And as the gentleman mentioned, by increasing that efficiency, these local mining companies will produce aggregate that will support numerous infrastructure projects and approximately $36 million in annual payroll from this site alone.

Additionally, the land exchange creates 59 acres of land for the conservation district purposes to protect endangered species and for recharging water in more than 70 basins.

The wash plan has been an ongoing project since the late 1980s, when it was a proposal from the city of Highland for recharging water. As he mentioned, I worked on this project at the local level. Years, and actually decades, of studies and committee reports have culminated in this final presentation of the Upper Santa Ana River Wash Plan.

The Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act moves this decades-long process forward, which will
TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION AUTHORIZATION

(H.R. 220)

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 220) to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 220

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

SECTION 1. TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION AUTHORIZATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(2) TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT.—The term "Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project" means the project identified in section 1325 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3212), and which is Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project number 747.

(3) UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION EXPANSION.—The term "Upper Hidden Basin Diversion Expansion" means the expansion of the Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project as generally described in Exhibit E to the Upper Hidden Basin Diversion Expansion Environmental Review, dated July 2, 2014, and submitted to the Alaska Energy Authority Renewable Energy Fund Round VIII by Kodiak Electric Association, Inc.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The license for the Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project may occupy not more than 20 acres of Federal land to construct, operate, and maintain the Upper Hidden Basin Diversion Expansion without further authorization of the Secretary of the Interior or under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.).

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—The Upper Hidden Basin Diversion Expansion shall be subject to appropriate terms and conditions included in an amendment to a license issued by the Commission pursuant to the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), including section 4(e) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 797(e)), following an environmental review by the Commission under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken.

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

Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Fish and Wildlife Service supports this, there is no objection to it, it is a solution waiting to happen, so we are going to dig a tunnel. This is really about a tunnel.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Fish and Wildlife Service supports this, there is no objection to it, it is a solution waiting to happen, so we are going to dig a tunnel. This is really about a tunnel.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 220 would authorize an expansion of the existing Terror Lake Hydropower project in Alaska to meet increased power demands from Kodiak Island.

The expansion would have to comply with environmental protections required under the Federal Power Act and National Environmental Policy Act.

This bill unanimously passed both the House Natural Resources Committee and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

I want to thank Mr. Young for his persuasive presentation both in committee and on the House floor. I fully support the sensible bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I was going to say a few words about this bill here, but I would be in fear of my life if I changed anything on Congressman Young’s statement.

So with that, I think he did an outstanding job presenting, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.
COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 220, as amended. The question was taken. The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COOK. 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 motion will be postponed.

Robert Emmet Statue Dedication Committee.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1500) to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as "Robert Emmet Park", and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1500

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 "Robert Emmet Park Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS. Congress finds as follows:

(1) Robert Emmet was one of Ireland's most prominent historical figures, having led an effort to secure Irish independence in 1803.

(2) Although Emmet's efforts initially failed, they succeeded in inspiring new generations of Irish men and women to struggle for independence.

(3) For his efforts to gain Irish independence, Emmet was found guilty of treason and sentenced to death by hanging.

(4) His "Speech from the Dock" motivated many of the efforts that led to an independent Ireland following 1916's Easter Rising; (Emmet famously said that "To [Ireland] I owe every selfish, every lasting sentiment . . . I wished to place her independence beyond the reach of any power of earth . . . to procure for my country the guarantee which Washington procured for America . . . to exalt her to that proud station in the world."). Emmet was strongly influenced by American democracy and the American Revolution.

(5) Emmet had family members similarly admiring of the United States and dedicated to the cause of Irish independence, including his brother Thomas Addis Emmet, who went on to become a prominent Attorney General of the United States.

(6) Emmet has been revered by generations of Irish-American leaders, including then-Speaker of the House John W. McCormack, Senator Everett Dirksen, and Mike Mansfield served on the Robert Emmet Statue Dedication Committee.

(10) Other members of that committee and participants in the dedication ceremony included Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, Representative Michael Kirwan, Ambassador Ireland William P. Ryan, and Rector of St. Matthew's Cathedral John K. Cartwright.

SEC. 3. REDEDICATION OF ROBERT EMMET PARK

(a) REDEDICATION.—The small triangular property designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302, shall be known as "Robert Emmet Park".

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, paper, or other record of the United States to the property referred to in subsection (a) is deemed to be a reference to "Robert Emmet Park".

(c) SIGNAGE.—The Secretary of the Interior may post signs on or near Robert Emmet Park that include one or more of the following:

(1) Information on Robert Emmet, his contribution to Irish Independence, and his respect for the United States and the American Revolution.

(2) Information on the history of the statue of Robert Emmet located in Robert Emmet Park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY). Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extra-aneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1500, offered by my colleague, Representative JOSPEH CROWLEY of New York, renames a small triangular property owned by the National Park Service in Washington, D.C., as Robert Emmet Park.

Robert Emmet, sometimes referred to as the George Washington of Ireland, was a prominent historical figure known for his role in the Irish rebellion of 1803 and for his classic "Speech from the Dock" that inspired future efforts to gain Irish independence.

The small National Park Service reservation that is redesignated by this bill was originally cast in 1916 by Irish-American artist Jerome Connor. In April of last year, the statue was rededicated at a ceremony that also jointly marked the centennial of the 1916 Easter Rising.

I wish to thank Representative CROWLEY for his sponsorship of this bill, and also Mr. Jack O'Brien of the Ancient Order of Hibernians for his tireless work in support of this legislation and his lifelong dedication to Irish cultural projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, Mr. Cook, just pointed out, H.R. 1500 designates a small triangle of land in Washington, D.C., as Robert Emmet Park. The parcel is home to a statue of Robert Emmet, a seminal figure in Ireland's struggle for independence. The bill also authorizes the National Park Service, which manages the area, to add interpretive displays and signage to the area.

Emmet admired the independence we achieved in this country and only wanted the same freedom and liberty for his compatriots in Ireland. Designating this small plot of land and the accompanying statue as Robert Emmet Park will stand as a constant reminder of the call to liberty and freedom that binds our Nation together.

I would like to thank my friend, Representative CROWLEY from New York City, who is also a proud son of St. Patrick, for his work on this bill, and I urge it be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time.

I also want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the National Resources Committee here in the House of Representatives for moving this bill and helping to put this bill on the floor today in a bipartisan spirit. I would also like to acknowledge the majority and minority staff who have been very helpful to my office in this effort.

True, this is not the first time this measure has been considered. It passed the House during the last Congress, but the session ended before it could be moved forward in the Senate and into law. It was then, as it is now, a bipartisan bill. I would like to acknowledge all of the Members who are cosponsors. In substance, the bill would, as has been said, name a small parcel of the land in Washington, D.C., as Robert Emmet Park.

Emmet was honored by the United States over 100 years ago when a statue of his likeness was donated to the Smithsonian Institution. That statue, created by Robert Edmondotomy, was received by President Woodrow Wilson himself.

After 50 years, the museum moved the statue to the land where it rests now, an unnamed parcel of land. The rededication committee counted many key leaders, including then-Speaker of the House John McCormack, Senator Everett Dirksen, and Senator Mike Mansfield. Even President Lyndon Johnson conveyed his pride in Emmet, stating: "We Americans are proud to accord a place of honor here in the Nation's Capital to Robert Emmet, whose struggles and sacrifices bespeak the yearnings of mankind throughout the ages."
So it is clear that, on a bipartisan basis, Congress has long recognized the significance of this statue and its role in keeping alive not only the memory of Robert Emmet, but the ideals for which he stood.

At present, the statue of Emmet is the only statue on this small piece of land. This bill would take the next logical step by naming the land for Emmet. It is a fitting tribute since, for generations, many American schoolchildren learned the words of Emmet’s famous speech, which became known as the “Speech from the Dock.”

I often wonder what Abraham Lincoln was taught as a boy. We all learned the Gettysburg Address, but, in fact, Abraham Lincoln could recite the “Speech from the Dock” by memory. It couldn’t have been an easy speech for Emmet to give when one considers that he was expected to be executed after giving that speech.

Emmet had been an Irish independence leader who was deeply influenced by George Washington and the struggle for American independence. He was inspired by the American fight for democracy and self-determination. But after a failed effort to achieve independence, he was captured by the British, as were many others over centuries of struggle.

In his speech, Emmet said:

Let no man write my epitaph; for as no man who knows my motives dare now vindicate them, let them not prejudice or ignore asperse the fame and me rest in bounty and peace, and my tomb remain uninscribed, and my memory in oblivion, until other times and other men can do justice to my character. When my country takes her place among the nations of the Earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written.

Shortly after giving that speech on September 18, 1803, Robert Emmet was hanged, drawn, and quartered. But Emmet’s words lived on. In fact, groups named the Emmet Monument Association were founded in the United States. Their stated purpose was to build a burial monument to Emmet, one that wasn’t uninscribed, and my memory in oblivion.

But because Emmet called for Ireland to be free before his epitaph was written, these groups were actually Fenian freedom organizations. They and other American groups were quite active in the United States for many years all across our Nation. They came before subsequent American roles in the struggle for Irish independence, and their presence played a major role in American political life for many decades.

So I respectfully urge the passage of this bill. It does not require spending funds, and it does not alter the park or the parkland. But it would basically include the name Robert Emmet Park to a small piece of land where the Emmet statue rests.

Many Americans, as well as our government, have long recognized the significance of this event and in keeping alive not just the history of Robert Emmet, but what he stood for. I am glad that continues today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again thank the majority and the minority members of the Natural Resources Committee as well as their staffs. Their support made it possible for this measure to once again be on the floor today. I would like to thank the hard-working staffs of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service who have taken care of the Emmet statue and park for these many, many years.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1500.

The question was taken.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1073  
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEFINITION.  
In this Act, the term “Arlington Ridge tract” means the parcel of Federal land located in Arlington County, Virginia, known as the Marine Corps Ridge tract, and transferred to the Department of the Interior in 1953, that is bounded generally by—  
(1) Arlington Boulevard (United States Route 29) to the north;  
(2) Jefferson Davis Highway (Virginia Route 110) to the east;  
(3) Marshall Drive to the south; and  
(4) North Meade Street to the west.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF A VISITOR SERVICES FACILITY ON THE ARLINGTON RIDGE TRACT

Notwithstanding section 268(g) of Public Law 107–107, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct a structure for visitor services to include a public restroom facility on the Arlington Ridge tract in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, for other purposes.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1073, brought to us by our Natural Resources Committee colleague Congressman DON BEYER of Virginia, would authorize the National Park Service to construct a visitor services center at the United States Marine Corps Memorial in Arlington, Virginia.

The United States Marine Corps Memorial is one of the emblematic sites of our Nation’s Capital. As a marine, the memorial is especially near and dear to my heart. It represents our Nation’s gratitude and esteem for the Marines and those who have fought beside them.

While the statue depicts the flag raising on Iwo Jima—one of the most iconic events in World War II—the memorial is dedicated to all marines who have given their lives in defense of the United States since 1775.

Each year, the memorial attracts over 1 million visitors and hosts several popular events, including Summer Sunset Parades and the Marine Corps Marathon.

Despite this popularity, the memorial lacks basic visitor services such as permanent restroom facilities. The bill before us authorizes the construction of a visitor services center that includes permanent restroom facilities, thus allowing the thousands of visitors to our Nation’s Capital to visit and appreciate this grand memorial with increased comfort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 1073, authorizes the National Park Service to construct a visitor services facility that includes a restroom at the U.S. Marine Corps Memorial, also known as the Iwo Jima Memorial. The memorial is located in Arlington, Virginia, adjacent to Arlington National Cemetery, and a short drive from the Pentagon and from here.

This iconic statue of marines raising the flag over Iwo Jima is one of the country’s most recognized memorials—the most recognized memorial in the whole world—and receives a tremendous amount of visitation. Unfortunately, there are no permanent restroom facilities at the site. It goes without saying that this is a major hurdle to visitor comfort, especially given that this is a popular destination of veterans, not all of whom are able-bodied.

However, once this bill becomes law, the National Park Service will be able
to construct a restroom with funds that have already been donated for this purpose. This is in keeping with a broad policy of improving accessibility of all the memorials on and around The National Mall.

The House has a long time coming. I want to thank my bill cosponsors for their support, Mr. Cook of California and Mr. Graves of Louisiana.

I understand that our good friends from the Park Service are watching with excitement and pleasure this afternoon as we take this up on the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Cook) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1073.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAUTHORIZING THE HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1135) to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) to respond to the motion.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1135

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

SECTION 1. HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM REAUTHORIZED.

Section 507(d)(2) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (54 U.S.C. 2001 note) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “and each of fiscal years 2018 through 2024.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. Cook) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Beatty) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 295, introduced by Congressman James Clyburn from South Carolina, reauthorizes the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

Since 1988, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program has awarded over $60 million in grants to assist Historically Black Colleges and Universities with needed maintenance and rehabilitation of historic buildings on their campuses. These projects may include repairing damaged masonry, upgrading electrical and plumbing systems, or fixing roofs.

Although the needs of our Nation’s Historically Black Colleges and Universities exceed the amounts authorized by this legislation, future funding provided to this program will help to ensure that the rich history of these campuses remains preserved for future generations.

I urge adoption of this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1135 reauthorizes the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program. This program provides grants to revitalize and conserve historic structures at Historically Black Colleges and Universities in Virginia.

I am very proud and grateful of the five HBCUs we have in Virginia: Virginia State, Norfolk State, Hampton University, Virginia Union University, and Virginia University of Lynchburg.

I point out that the Nation’s first elected African-American Governor, Douglas L. Wilder, was a graduate of Virginia Union University.

Since the program was first authorized in 1988, as Mr. Cook has said, there has been over $60 million in grants to help restore iconic structures on many of these college campuses, and two-thirds of this money appropriated has been leveraged to generate matching funds from communities, universities, and other funders.

But despite all the progress made with respect to revitalizing these campuses, there is still a lot of work that remains to be done in all 107 HBCUs.

Reauthorization and sustained support for this program is long overdue. So I would like to thank my esteemed colleague from South Carolina (Mr. Clyburn) for all of his hard work and relentless bring this bill to the attention of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this good bill.

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

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Clyburn), the distinguished leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a student and former teacher of history, I have worked during my tenure in Congress to preserve and protect our Nation’s historic treasures.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities, commonly called HBCUs, are some of the most important historic educational institutions in our country. There are over 100 of them across the country, and eight of them are in South Carolina. I proudly represent seven of them and I am a graduate of one.

Many of them have buildings and sites on their campuses that have existed for over a century and are of great historical significance. Unfortunately, many of the historic buildings and sites on these campuses have deteriorated over the years and are at risk of being lost if not preserved and protected.

In 1998, at the behest of the Congressional Black Caucus, the United States Government Accountability Office, the GAO, surveyed 103 HBCU campuses to identify the historically significant buildings and sites on these campuses and projected the cost of restoring and preserving these properties. The GAO identified 712 historic buildings and sites, and projected a cost of $755 million to restore and preserve them. Each of these sites has historically significant African American history, and I believe we have an obligation to be stewards of these historic treasures.

In 2003, working with our former colleague Jim Hansen of Utah and our current colleague and my dear friend Jimmy Duncan of Tennessee, Congress expanded the program and authorized expenditures of $10 million annually for 5 years. I have seen the results firsthand. Last year, Allen University rededicated the historic Chappelle Auditorium on its campus in Columbia, South Carolina, which was painstakingly restored thanks to funding from this program. Originally built in 1925, this building was central to the cultural life of African Americans in South Carolina for generations.

In 1947, Reverend Joseph A. DeLaine attended an NAACP event at Chappelle Auditorium that inspired him to organize Black families in Clarendon County to petition their school district to provide buses for Black students; at the time, were forced to make a daily walk of 9.4 miles to school. That was 9.4 miles to school and 9.4 miles back home.

The legal case that grew from this petition, Briggs v. Elliott, precipitated the frontal attack on segregation in the country and was later combined with four other cases that became Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, at the Supreme Court. Overturning the separate but equal fallacy, Brown ended legal segregation throughout America.

This is just a singular example of the history living on HBCU campuses. Because of our past efforts, many buildings and sites at 50 HBCUs in 20 States have received funding from this program. However, many historic structures are still endangered.
Consequently, in the omnibus appropriations bill for 2017, which passed earlier this year, Congress included $4 million for HBCU Historic Preservation so that we could continue this progress.

Last year, the House passed this bill unanimously, but it was not taken up by the Senate. I thank Chairman Bishop and Ranking Member Grijalva for supporting it again today. This bill is supported by the United Negro College Fund, the Targeted Minority College Fund, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The HBCU Historic Preservation program serves as an essential purpose to HBCUs, which have a special place in the fabric of American history, culture, and education. Countless individuals have worked tirelessly to cultivate HBCUs, and their legacy is seen in graduates whose achievements adorn the pages of American history. From Booker T., McLeod Bethune, W.E.B. DuBois, to Martin Luther King, Jr., HBCU visionaries and graduates have set powerful examples of leadership.

The HBCUs is one of significant courage and steadfast determination. The structures on these campuses across the country are living testaments to African-American history, and they deserve to be stabilized and restored. The HBCUs are among America’s national treasures that must be preserved and protected for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this needed legislation.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Adams), a distinguished Member of Congress.

Ms. Adams. Ms. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the reauthorization of the HBCU Historic Preservation program. There are ten HBCUs in North Carolina. The Johnson C. Smith University is in my district.

I am pleased to see strong bipartisan support that recognizes how integral Historically Black Colleges and Universities are to our Nation.

I am a proud graduate twice of North Carolina A&T, a retired 40-year professor at Bennett College—both HBCUs in my state.

Most of the structures that this program will help preserve date back to the founding of these schools, most founded in the 19th century. These structures teach us about the lengths that African Americans went through to be educated and to fight for their place in American society.

They also provide important lessons for today, reminding us of how far we have come as a society and how these structures were once built to cope with Jim Crow America but now are used to educate our future lawyers, doctors, and politicians.

They also remind us of how far we have to go, how we must continue to address the numerous inequities HBCUs face compared to other universities when it comes to educating the next generation.

Funding from this program finances repairs that schools with large endowments take for granted, repairs from water damage, asbestos, lead paint, improvements to heating and ventilation systems, and increased physical accessibility for the disabled.

The program helps modernize HBCU campuses, creating a suitable environment for learning and achievement, while allowing these institutions to attract prospective students who deserve an education.

W.E.B. DuBois reminded us: Of all of the civil rights for which the world has struggled and fought for for 500 years, but the right to learn is undoubtedly the most fundamental.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this program is necessary to mitigate HBCU infrastructure and maintain their competitive edge as institutions of higher learning supporting that fundamental right.

The President has said these schools are a priority for his administration. They are absolutely a priority for me as well as for my colleagues of the CBC and the bipartisan HBCU Caucus. So passing it proves that Congress can come together to achieve something substantial for these schools and continue the conversation surrounding HBCUs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Butterfield).

Mr. Butterfield. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my good friend Congressman Jim Clyburn’s bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

I am so grateful to Congressman Clyburn for his leadership over the years to strengthen and protect the Historic Preservation program on behalf of our Nation’s HBCUs. He has been a tireless advocate on behalf of the reauthorization of HBCUs, and I am honored today to join him in this effort. Mr. Clyburn has worked tirelessly during his time in Congress to preserve and protect our Nation’s historic treasures and the legacies of those who came before us.

Many of us have HBCUs in our district. They represent a steep history of student activism in the civil rights movement. Many of the buildings, sites, and historic records that exist on the campuses have survived over a century and a half. In 1998, as a matter of fact, the GAO found that there were 712 historic buildings and sites on HBCU campuses. If we do not do more to protect and preserve the vestiges that we will surely lose this important history.

Tuskegee University is one university in my home State of Alabama, where Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, and the Tuskegee Airmen made their place in our Nation’s history.

Stillman College; Selma University; Concordia College; Miles College;
Talladega College: Alabama A&M University; and Alabama State University, where my mother and father graduated, are Historically Black Colleges in the State of Alabama.

At Talladega College, these funds were used to restore Foster Hall, which was erected for girls and teachers in 1869, and is the oldest dorm on that campus. This program has helped so many HBCUs in my State. The buildings were nearly destroyed 5 years ago, but the funds from the historic program helped restore the buildings on Talladega’s campus.

When I think about my own district, the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, at Miles College in Birmingham, students were leaders in the civil rights movement and led a selective-buying campaign at local department stores and major retailers in 1963.

Congress has recognized that we have a responsibility to be stewards of these great national resources since we first enacted grants to HBCUs for historic preservation in 1996. The program was then expanded in 2003, thanks to Mr. CLYBURN and others. Historical buildings and sites at more than 60 HBCUs have benefited.

If we continue making investments in this program, we can meet the dire historic preservation and restoration needs that remain at these threatened sites. We must not only know our history, but we must also protect our history.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to continue this important work by voting for this bill today to reauthorize the HBCU Historic Preservation program through 2024.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a graduate of the University of Virginia School of Law.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of this legislation, the cosponsors, Mr. CLYBURN, and so many others who have been part of this historic legislation for their leadership on it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the bipartisan Congressional HBCU Caucus and as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1135.

H.R. 1135 would authorize the appropriation of millions of dollars from 2018 through 2024 to the Historic Preservation program to provide assistance for the restoration and preservation of historic structures at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Let me indicate that this has been a long journey. The reauthorization is very special and emotional to many of us. As many of us know, Historically Black Colleges and Universities came at the wake of the ending of slavery and were a place of refuge for so many students.

I am reminded of those individuals who, as freed slaves, told stories of walking miles to be able to get to a school like Fisk University or to a school for so many in North Carolina and South Carolina or all throughout the South. They were great refuges for individuals who wanted a better life.

It is important to note that in the 1960s, the National Park Service awarded more than $65 million. These grants were part of the funding of the Historic Preservation project. So it is not a handout. It is a hand-up. It is preserving the history of this great Nation.

I am very grateful to the Congressional Black Caucus. When the question is asked, “What is the Congressional Black Caucus and what do we do,” I will say without shame that we are the conscience of this Nation and we recognize that we have a responsibility to protect the vulnerable things of this Nation, whether it be people or things.

So the idea was to make sure that not only students have a brilliant education, but those who would seek knowledge will be able to come to the campuses of these Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

I happen to represent two State schools: Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M. There are many HBCUs throughout the State of Texas. We are grateful for the leadership that they have given. They have history.

Soon I want to start establishing what we call the Emancipation Trail, which chronicles the announcement of freedom in Texas. It was called Juneteenth. It was 2 years that some learned about their freedom after everyone else was free.

Those stories are being told at the HBCUs, but at the same time, STEM education is being taught. Oakwood College, a historically Black college of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, educates huge numbers of doctors. I am told it has the largest number of African Americans that go into medical school.

STEM is very important to our HBCUs. Texas Southern University has a renowned homeland security program.

This is a good bill, and I thank my colleagues for voting for this very right and positive bill.

Mr. Speaker, a member of the Bipartisan Congressional HBCU Caucus and an original co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1135, which reauthorizes the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program.

H.R. 1135 would authorize the appropriation of $10 million annually from 2018 through 2024 for the Historic Preservation Fund to provide assistance for the restoration and preservation of historic structures at Historically Black Colleges (HBCUs).

Specifically, H.R. 1135, reauthorizes $10 million in annual appropriations for the National Park Service grant program supporting the preservation of historic buildings on the campuses of historically black colleges and universities.

Since the 1980s, the National Park Service (NPS) has awarded more than $65 million to more than 80 HBCUs to repair historic buildings on their campuses.

To be eligible for grants under the program, recipients must have to cover 30 percent of the cost of a project.

Eligible projects include stabilization, masonry repair, removing lead paint or other hazards, and the improvement of access for the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Preservation Program exists to repair, restore, and stabilize historic structures on HBCU campuses through projects such as structural stabilization, masonry repair, replacement of antiquated electrical and plumbing systems, abating environmental hazards such as asbestos, ameliorating termite damage, and replacing leaking roofs.

Historic protection project is critically important because much of the history of African Americans has been lost due to it not being considered important enough by historians to study and the fact that many of the repositories of that history—black churches—have been destroyed by arson.

I thank and my colleague, Assistant Democratic Leader JAMES CLYBURN for his work in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that one of the greatest HBCUs in the country, Texas Southern University, is located in my congressional district.

Texas Southern University has a rich history with nine academic units, 1,000 dedicated staff members, and over 9,200 esteemed students.

I worked closely with my local HBCU to provide funding and resources needed to enable them to fulfill their mission of educating the next generation of social engineers and conducting research programs addressing issues of major concern to the African American community.

I was proud to spearhead the initiative that brought more than $13 million in financial aid relief for the students and campus of Texas Southern University.

I also worked with TSU administrators to initiate digital archive projects to preserve the records of two of its most distinguished alumni, the legendary Barbara Jordan and Mickey Leland, both of whom preceded me as the Member of Congress for the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas.

I was pleased to facilitate a partnership between Comcast and TSU’s School of Communication to provide scholarships and internships to TSU students and in-kind marketing services to the university.

I helped secure funding needed to establish the Center for Transportation, Training and Research in the TSU College of Science, Engineering, and Technology.

HBCU’s have played a critical role in American history.

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. stated:

"The function of education is to teach one to think intensively and to think critically. Intelligence plus character—that is the goal of true education.”

HBCUs do not just educate—HBCUs have and will continue to fill an important role in education opportunity and engagement for millions of young people from diverse backgrounds.

I ask my colleagues to support reauthorization of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program by joining me in voting to pass H.R. 1135.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Cook) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1135.

The motion was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PUMPED STORAGE HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1135) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1135

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 "Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY FOR PUMPED STORAGE HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT UTILIZING MULTIPLE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION RESERVOIRS.

Section 9(c)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)(1)) is amended by inserting "and pumped storage hydropower development exclusively utilizing Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs" after "including small conduit hydropower development".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK), a valuable member of the Committee on Natural Resources, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are here to consider a bill that aims to remove barriers to improve our Nation's water and power infrastructure.

Just last Thursday, the House passed a bill designating the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency when it comes to permitting new and expanded water storage projects. Today, the bill before us seeks to clear up regulatory confusion over the development of new pumped storage hydropower.

Hydropower can and should be part of our all-of-the-above energy strategy for the future. It is a reliable and emissions-free source of electricity that accounts for a majority of the Nation's total renewable electricity generation.

In our home State of Colorado, we have over 60 operating hydropower facilities that generate more than 1,100 megawatts, including new projects such as Carter Lake, South Canal, and Ridgeway Reservoir. However, as is the case nationwide, there is potential for new hydropower generation in Colorado.

My bill, the Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act, H.R. 1135, looks to pave the way by clearing up regulatory permitting confusion at existing Bureau of Reclamation facilities.

We worked with our colleague from central Washington State, Mr. NEWHOUSE, on this bill. His interest stems from a real-life example of where it is unclear whether the Bureau of Reclamation or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission have permitting jurisdiction on pumped storage hydropower projects at the Columbia Basin Project.

The project's proponents want to build a project that pumps water to and from two of the project's reservoirs for hydroelectric generation. But because of potential dual permitting requirements, there have been serious delays in bringing this potential 500 megawatt project online.

Similar to a public law authored in 2013 by our committee colleague and fellow Coloradan, SCOTT TIPPETT, that cleared confusion on the Bureau of Reclamation's pipes and canals, my bill makes it clear that the Bureau of Reclamation is the lead agency that to date has been given regulatory authority to permit pumped storage projects utilizing Bureau of Reclamation facilities.

The regulatory clarification in my bill will help pave the way for more pumped storage by incentivizing developers who will, in turn, pay the American taxpayers for the use of Federal facilities.

In doing so, this legislation would not only create new hydropower generation at existing Federal facilities but also encourage the development of pumped storage facilities at multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, as this Chamber considers H.R. 1135, the "Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act," I would like to provide some brief remarks regarding issues raised by the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has been participating in a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceeding related to a proposed pumped storage project on Lake Roosevelt and Banks Lake in central Washington State. A portion of Lake Roosevelt is within the boundaries of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has raised several questions about the project's potential impacts to culturally and economically important fisheries in Lake Roosevelt, water quality, and to revenues the Tribe receives from the Bonneville Power Administration from the operation of the Grand Coulee Dam.
Because of these questions, the Colville Tribe and the project proponents have been involved in ongoing discussions in hopes of reaching an agreement on how to proceed with the project review process. As those discussions proceed, I would like to provide my commitment to work with the Colville Tribe and the project proponents as the legislative process moves forward.

Mrs. McMorris Rodger. Mr. Speaker, as this chamber considers H.R. 1667, the “Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydroelectric Development Act,” I would like to provide some brief remarks regarding issues raised by the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has been participating in a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceeding related to a proposed pumped storage project on Lake Roosevelt and Banks Lake in north central Washington. A portion of Lake Roosevelt is within the boundaries of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has raised several questions about the project’s potential impacts to culturally and economically important fisheries in Lake Roosevelt, water quality, and to revenues the Tribe receives from the Bonneville Power Administration from the operation of the Grand Coulee Dam.

Because of these questions, the Colville Tribe and the project proponents have been involved in ongoing discussions in hopes of reaching an agreement on how to proceed with the project review process. As those discussions proceed, I would like to provide my commitment to work with the Colville Tribe and the project proponents as the legislative process moves forward.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by Mr. Royce to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1667, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION’S PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE DEFENSE

Mr. Royce of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 397) solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 397

Whereas more than 250,000 Americans died in the Second World War to liberate Europe from the scourge of genocidal fascism;

Whereas in the wake of the cataclysm of the Second World War, the United States, Canada, and European partners founded the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Washington in 1949;

Whereas the foundation of NATO is collective defense and Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty states that, “The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.”;

Whereas NATO is one of the most successful military alliances in history, deterring the outbreak of another world war, protecting the territorial integrity of its members, and seeing the Cold War through to a peaceful conclusion;

Whereas Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty has only been invoked once in history when alliance members came to the aid of the United States following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas NATO allies and partners, including Canada and countries in Central, Eastern, and Northern Europe, including countries of the Western Balkans, and the former Soviet Union have stood alongside the United States in joint operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the world;

Whereas NATO remains the foundation of United States foreign policy of promoting a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace;

Whereas at the NATO Summit in 2014, NATO leaders agreed that each alliance member would spend at least two percent of its nation’s gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

Whereas multiple Presidents have reaffirmed the commitment of the United States to the collective defense guarantees in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the sole power to declare war. Now, therefore:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) solemnly reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty;

(2) strongly supports the decision at the NATO Wales Summit in 2014 that each alliance member would spend at least two percent of its nation’s gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

(3) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of any NATO ally; and

(4) welcomes the Republic of Montenegro as the 29th member of the NATO Alliance.

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. Royce) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Engel) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

General Leave

Mr. Royce of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Speaker Ryan and Minority Leader Pelosi, I want to thank Leader McCarty and Minority Whip Hoyer for their leadership on this important resolution and, of course, Ranking Member Engel, who has also been a strong supporter of the NATO alliance.

Speaker. In 1949, 12 free, democratic nations bound themselves together in an unprecedented defense alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These founding members acted in the aftermath of the Second World War to promote peace in Europe, to promote their freedom, and to face the threats they saw emerging on the horizon. Now, more than six decades later, this alliance has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security, and it has attracted other freedom-loving democratic nations to join its ranks.

Of course, article 5’s principle of collective defense has been key to the success of the alliance, and we will not forget how the United States has benefited from that principle as NATO members unanimously elected to come to our support after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cyber attacks, nonconventional attacks by terrorist groups against our people, these are threats that NATO’s founders could not have anticipated, yet they are the challenges that we must act now to address. We are stronger, no question, when we act together.

Now, Moscow’s strategic objective is to break apart the NATO alliance to boost Russian geopolitical influence in Western Europe. Instead of running from this, it is even more important that NATO members meet the standard of investing 2 percent of their GDP on defense. We appreciate the few who already meet the minimum requirement: Estonia, Greece, Poland, and the U.K. At the administration’s urging, others have stepped up their game, such as Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania, but others have further to go.

This resolution calls on NATO members to meet these commitments while also reaffirming our commitment to NATO and to the article 5 provision for collective defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure. Let me start by thanking the leader of the aisle who worked to bring this measure forward: Speaker Ryan and Leader Pelosi; the majority leader, Mr. McCarthy; the minority whip, Mr. Hoyer; and my friend from California, Mr. Royce, our chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, NATO has been the most effective alliance of the 20th and 21st centuries. It stood as a bulwark against communist aggression during the Cold War. Since the fall of the Soviet Union, it has played a critical role in building an integrated Europe that is whole, free, and at peace.
At the heart of the alliance is the value enshrined in article 5: An attack on any ally is an attack on all allies. That commitment has been so strong across the decades, that the alliance never once invoked article 5 during the long standoff between East and West during the Cold War.

In fact, article 5 has only been invoked one time in NATO’s history, when the ruins of the World Trade Center were smouldering in New York City as the world rallied around the United States after the attacks of September 11, 2001. NATO allies did what we always knew they would: they said the attack on us was an attack on all of them as well. Since then, for nearly 16 years, American troops have fought and shed blood and died alongside men and women serving in the uniforms of our NATO allies.

Mr. Speaker, this isn’t a commitment we as Americans can take lightly. While I am glad President Trump finally committed the United States to article 5, I think it is important for Congress to do it as well.

The administration’s hot-and-cold approach to the alliance caused a lot of unneeded heartburn for our allies and caused us to remove the best of friends to question our commitment.

NATO is not a thing that can just be thrown in with everything else. It is very important to us, and we should allow our allies to meet their commitments laid out at the NATO summit in Wales. It is very important that we do that.

Right now, especially, we need to be clear on our commitment to NATO. The danger that Russia poses to the alliance, to Western democracy and an integrated, unified Europe, is the greatest test in a generation. If there are cracks in the surface, you can bet that Vladimir Putin will do all he can to exploit them. Fracturing Western unity is his true goal, and the United States needs to be strong in our commitment to NATO.

Today, the House is saying we will not waver. We are sending a message to our allies and partners and to Moscow that a wager against NATO is a losing bet. I would like to see the House take an even tougher stance against Moscow and immediately pass the Senate’s Russia sanctions bill. This legislation won overwhelmingly bipartisan support in the other body, and I am confident we could act on it swiftly in the House.

With this measure today, we are saying with one voice that article 5 is sacred, that NATO is strong, and the resolve of the United States and our allies won’t be weakened by a bully sitting in Moscow.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our esteemed chairman as well as the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Speaker Ryan’s measure which reaffirms America’s commitment to NATO, article 5 and the principle of collective defense.

Like my colleagues, I believe that NATO has been indispensable in deterring another world war and in protecting Western countries. It is our commitment to each other and to those ideals that have made our alliance so strong, so effective. It is that commitment to each other that has enhanced the territorial security and stability of each one of us.

Let us not forget that it was following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 that NATO invoked article 5 for the only time in its history, coming to the defense of the United States. This was a signal of unity, of strength, and that is what makes article 5 so special.

I also appreciate the pledges of our alliance members to share the burden of the cost of our mutual defense by aiming to spend at least 2 percent of their GDP on defense by the year 2024. That is so important, Mr. Speaker, because NATO’s role over the years has evolved. We are no longer facing just the threat of communist aggression; we are facing a plethora of threats against our mutual national security interests around the globe, and we need to be prepared for whatever comes our way.

I am pleased to reiterate my support for Speaker Ryan’s resolution. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their commitment to NATO and to the principle of collective defense. It is ever so important in these dangerous times.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was in Brussels, and we met with NATO officials on a codel led by the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his extraordinary leadership on the committee, as well as the bipartisan nature of this legislation that Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL are bringing to the floor. I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished former chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. Speaker, article 5, the bipartisan resolution reassures our friends, it renews our foes, and it reminds the world that America’s commitment to NATO’s common defense pledge is ironclad.

When President Truman signed the NATO treaty almost 70 years ago, he called the alliance, “a long step toward permanent peace in the whole world.” NATO has guaranteed the security of the American people and our allies for decades. Now some people don’t remember what those decades were like, fighting the threat of communism. Article 5, the collective defense provision, is the core of that security guarantee.

Article 5, as the gentlewoman just mentioned, was invoked only once: when America’s allies joined in the fight against al-Qaeda after the September 11 terrorist attacks on our country.

Many of my colleagues, have traveled to Afghanistan, Iraq, and other places and seen that our NATO partners have shed blood in the name of article 5 in our common fight against terrorism.

Our commitment to article 5 is a commitment to brave men and women across the world who risk and give their lives for the NATO alliance. Previous administrations, both Democratic and Republican, have strongly and unambiguously stood by NATO and article 5.

I was very sad, I will be very honest with you, my colleagues, when meeting with NATO leaders at the alliance’s headquarters in Brussels, a building dedicated to the victims of the 9/11 attacks, President Trump refused to clearly and unequivocally reassure our NATO partners that he would honor article 5.

We in this Congress of the United States, acting in a bipartisan way, are removing all obstacles to the U.S. commitment to the principles of a mutual defense embodied by NATO are ironclad. I keep using that word. Every day, Putin searches for cracks in our NATO alliance. We must convey to him that this alliance is ironclad.

And now, just on another related subject, it is about our national security. While we are glad to be passing this resolution affirming America’s commitment to article 5, the bipartisan bill sanctioning Russia languishes in the House. While the White House ca ters to Putin, Congress must hold Russia accountable for its actions by passing the Iran-Russia sanctions bill. It passed the Senate 98–2—98–2—strong bipartisan resolution to clearly and unequivocally reassure our NATO partners that he would honor article 5.

We can’t go home for the Fourth of July without passing that legislation. It is my understanding it was just a blue slip problem that could be easily resolved. That is how it was characterized when the President of Ukraine said to us that they really need the Russian sanctions enforced and strengthened.

Let us have the courage to stand up to those who menace the free world and stand by our partners in support of a peaceful, democratic, and free future for all.

What we are doing today is very important. It is not just about a bill. It is not just about an agreement. It is about values. It is about security as a value, something we take an oath to protect and defend. This NATO agreement helps us do that, but we must also do what flows from it and say to the Russians, who see the point of NATO, you are exactly what we feared because of your aggression in Eastern Europe, and at the same time send that message to the Iranians.
Mr. Speaker, I urge a very strong unanimous vote for this. This is something so bipartisan, so wonderful. It is a good day. It is a good bill. It gives us all hope.

I urge our colleagues to vote “aye” and call upon the Speaker to bring the other bill before the floor. I hope our distinguished chair and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee will be able to be part of bringing it to the floor very soon.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the distinguished ranking member, and I thank my friend Mr. ROYCE, the chairman of the committee, for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 397, reaffirming the commitment of the United States to NATO’s principle of collective defense as enunciated in article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

As the head of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and as rapporteur for the Transatlantic Subcommittee, I can attest to the anxiety within NATO regarding the administration’s commitment to the alliance.

Case in point, one cannot talk about the U.S. commitment to article 5 in 2017 without mentioning President Trump’s failure to embrace it. Since the House failed the leadership test on this account, let’s redeem ourselves by taking up the Engel-Connelly bill on Russian’s sanctions, and the Iran-Russia sanctions package recently passed in the Senate by 98-2, and send it to the President’s desk for signature.

Any delay only furthers the trend of obsequiousness to the executive branch and enables this administration’s disingenuousness to the executive branch. I hope our distinguished chair and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee will be able to be part of bringing it to the floor very soon.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Like my colleague, who just spoke, over the last 4 years, I have been privileged to help represent the United States at the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to borrow a line from a very well-known poet who said, “No man is an island,” recognizing that human beings do not thrive when isolated, a concept that is recognized by all religions.

This is more true than ever as our world becomes increasingly dangerous. And, more than ever, the United States of America needs friends to stand strong and stand up for our mutual democratic values.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution, committing the United States to NATO article 5 collective defense.

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

Mr. ENGEL of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip, who is an original cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL for their leadership. I also want to thank Mr. MCCARTHY, Speaker RYAN, and Leader PELOSI for their strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I went to Brussels over the Memorial Day break. We met in Brussels with the NATO leaders. The Deputy Secretary General was there, and we spoke about the confidence that our European allies had, and needed, for the continuing viability of NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and our commitment to the mutual defense of the members of NATO.

That has been for 70 years the critical—over 70 years, really—the critical stability that we have seen in the European Plain, and it needs to continue to be.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor this resolution, which reaffirms our Nation’s commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s article 5 and the common defense among our NATO allies.

For 70 years, as I said, NATO has kept the peace in Europe and around the world. Now, that does not mean that we have had peace everywhere in the world, but it does mean that we have not had world conflagration, as we saw in the last century.

From the Cuban Missile Crisis to the fall of the Iron Curtain, NATO’s unity in the face of common threats has helped prevent a direct Soviet attack against America and against our allies.

Since the end of the Cold War, NATO has been adapting to meet threats new and old. Together, NATO members have served on the ground in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and enlargement has made the allegiance even stronger.

Now, with Russia once again putting our democracy on the defensive, we are on the brink once again. With a leader who attacks the free nations of the West, and is developing, and is developing, defenses to attack our NATO allies to subvert their democratic institutions as well, Estonia, in particular, has developed, is developing, defenses to cyber attacks.

We, the United States, the leader of the free world, must make it clear, unequivocally so, both to Vladimir Putin and to our NATO allies, that the United States stands firmly by its commitment to the alliance and its collective defense.

It has only been once that article 5 has been implicated, and that was after the attacks against our NATO allies to subvert their democratic institutions and their unity and their alliance and action. An attack on one is an attack on all—on all nations and democracies, on freedom, on the values that this country and our NATO allies stand for.

It is in that context, Mr. Speaker, that I urge my colleagues to join us in giving this resolution—it says here on this text—a strong vote of passage. More than that, I hope this is a unanimous vote of passage. This is the opposition of the leader of the free world that we will not only lead, but we will act.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we should be clear that Vladimir Putin is testing us. He attacked our democracy lines in last year’s election, he is working to create divisions among our allies, and he would love nothing more than to see NATO fail.

If the United States offers anything less than our full-throated support for the alliance, and our ironclad commitments to article 5, Moscow will see that as an invitation to undercut transatlantic unity and fracture our critical bond with Europe.

I am glad the House is coming together to ensure that it doesn’t happen. I hope we can continue to work in a bipartisan way to shore up our alliances and push back on Russian aggression. This is a real threat. Russia is not our ally.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this measure, and I urge all Members to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, as a coauthor of this resolution, I also want to thank the other coauthors, including STEVE COHEN of Tennessee, who has been a leader on NATO issues.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say, for the advancement of our own security, the promotion of our values, and
a strong statement of support for our friends and allies. I urge my colleagues to support passage of this resolution.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker. I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 397, a resolution that reaffirms the United States’ commitment to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty and its principle of collective defense.

In the aftermath of World War II, the greatest conflict in human history, the United States and their Western European allies founded the North American Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 in Washington.

Founded on the principle of collective defense, Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty states that, “The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.”

In the 68 years since the Treaty’s ratification, Article 5 has only been invoked once, following words spoken by President Kennedy in 1962, when NATO members came to the aid of the United States.

NATO sent seven planes with 830 crewmen from 13 countries to protect American skies until May 2002, marking the first time in American history that NATO continental United States was protected by foreign forces.

NATO allies and partners have stood with the United States in joint operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the world.

Until this year, every American president since the treaty’s signing in 1949—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama—has publicly reaffirmed the American commitment to Article 5.

American presidents have affirmed this nation’s commitment to come to the aid of any NATO member that is under attack.

That is the symbolic meaning of the immortal words spoken by President Kennedy in West Berlin at the Brandenburg Gate in 1963: “Ich bin ein Berliner.”

Mr. Speaker, the principle of collective defense is the core of NATO’s founding treaty and the NATO alliance has been the backbone of American national security and foreign policy for nearly 70 years.

The strength and solidarity of this western alliance kept Western Europe whole, prosperous, and free and paved the way for the collapse of the Soviet Union and the liberation of the nations of Eastern and Central Europe, many of which have now been integrated into NATO.

The Constitution of the United States grants Congress the sole power to declare war, but Article 5 does not increase the chance of war. Rather, NATO is a bulwark against the outbreak of war because it deters aggression by any adversary.

As a result, NATO is the most successful military alliance in world history, successfully deterring the outbreak of a third world war, seeing the Cold War to a victorious conclusion, and protecting the principle of territorial integrity.

This is why I strongly support H. Res. 397, which reaffirms the commitment of the People’s House to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The resolution also expresses support for the agreement reached at the 2014 NATO Wales Summit calling upon each NATO member nation to allocate at least two percent of its gross domestic product to defense by 2024.

The resolution also condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and security of any NATO ally and welcomes the Republic of Montenegro as the 29th member of the NATO alliance.

I urge all Members to join me in affirming the commitment of the United States to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty for this important resolution by voting for H. Res. 397.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution. H. Res. 397.

The question was taken. The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE of California. 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 motion will be postponed.

CONDEMNING THE VIOLENCE AND PERSECUTION IN CHECHNYA

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 351) condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 351

Whereas, on April 1, 2017, the Russian newspaper Novaya Gazeta reported that authorities in Chechnya, a republic of the Russian Federation, had abducted, detained, and tortured over 500 men on the basis of their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas multiple independent and firsthand accounts have subsequently corroborated the Novaya Gazeta report, and describe a campaign of persecution by Chechen officials against men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas, as a result of this persecution, at least three deaths have been reported and many individuals have been forced to flee Chechnya;

Whereas Chechen officials have denied the existence of such persecution, including through a statement by the spokesman for Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov that “You cannot arrest or repress people who don’t exist in the republic.”;

Whereas the same spokesman for Ramzan Kadyrov has also stated that “If such people existed in Chechnya, law enforcement would not have to worry about them, as their own relatives would have sent them to where they could never return,” and credible reports indicate that Chechen authorities have encouraged families to carry out so-called “honor killings” of relatives due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas Chechens are a constituent republic of the Russian Federation and subject to its laws, and Ramzan Kadyrov was installed as the leader of Chechnya by Russian President Vladimir Putin;

Whereas Chechen authorities have a long history of violating the fundamental human rights of their citizens, including through extrajudicial executions, forced disappearances, and torture of government critics;

Whereas Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov dismissed reports of torture in Chechnya and termed them “phantom complaints”;

Whereas Russia’s Human Rights Ombudsman Tatyana Moskalkova claimed that such reports should not be believed because formal complaints have not been registered with the appropriate authorities;

Whereas the Russian Federation is a participating State of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and thus has an obligation to guarantee the fundamental human rights of all of its citizens;

Whereas, on April 7, 2017, the United States Department of State issued a statement saying “We categorically condemn the persecution of individuals based on their sexual orientation” and urging the Government of the Russian Federation to take steps to ensure the release of all those wrongfully detained in Chechnya, and to conduct a credible investigation of the reports; and

Whereas, on April 7, 2017, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley issued a statement saying “Chechen authorities must immediately investigate these allegations, hold anyone involved accountable, and take steps to prevent future abuses. We are against all forms of discrimination, including against people based on sexual orientation. When left unchecked, discrimination and human rights abuses can lead to destabilization and conflict.:.”;

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the violence and persecution in Chechnya and calls on Chechen officials to immediately cease these abusive detention, violation and torture of individuals on the basis of their actual or suspected sexual orientation, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(2) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to protect the human rights of all its citizens, condemn the violence and persecution in Chechnya, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(3) calls on the United States Government to continue to condemn the violence and persecution in Chechnya, demand the release of individuals wrongfully detained, and identify those individuals whose involvement in these crimes qualifies for sanctions under the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) or the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Public Law 114–328); and

(4) affirms that the rights to freedom of assembly, association, and expression and freedom from extrajudicial detention and violence are universal human rights that apply to all persons, and that countries that fail to respect these rights undermine the security and prosperity of all their citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. Let me first thank my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, particularly Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN from Florida, and Mr. CICILLINE from Rhode Island, for their work on this measure, and for their leadership supporting LGBT communities around the world. I also thank Chairman ROYCE for support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, day after day, we hear new reports of abuse of LGBT individuals in Chechnya. This spring, authorities rounded up hundreds of gay men. Some were tortured, some were murdered. Reports from civil society and activists tell us that Chechen authorities have rounded up LGBT individuals, beaten them, and electrocuted them to their families in the perverse hope of provoking so-called “honor killings.” This is horrific.

Let’s not forget that Chechnya is part of Russia, as the chairman said. These crimes—this disregard for human rights and human dignity lie at the feet of Vladimir Putin and his cronies in Chechnya, Ramzan Kadyrov.

No one anywhere should face violence, persecution, or death because of who they love. “Gay rights are human rights, and human rights are gay rights,” as Hillary Clinton said when she was Secretary of State. But under Putin’s rule, those rights are a myth. So I was disappointed when Secretary Tillerson testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee about whether those atrocities were on the agenda with his Russian counterparts.

>“These are on the pending list,” he told us.

The United States should never put basic human rights on the “pending list.” Unless we shed a light on these abuses and demand that they be stopped, we are betraying our most fundamental values. So today I am glad the House, in a bipartisan way, is speaking out to condemn this violence and persecution, to stand up for the freedoms of assembly and expression, and to say that we believe that LGBT rights are human rights that must be protected around the world. I am glad to support this measure. Again, I thank Chairman ED ROYCE, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and DAVID CICILLINE.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, of course, the author of this measure.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank, as always, our esteemed chairman, Mr. ROYCE from California, as well as Mr. ENGEL from New York, who really run our committee in the most fair, bipartisan way possible.

I think that our committee is an example for the rest of the House. But I am so grateful to have worked alongside my chairman and ranking member all of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in a bipartisan manner; particularly, Mr. ISA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. LOWENTHAL, in introducing and bringing to the floor this important resolution, H. Res. 561, Condemning the Violent Persecution of LGBT individuals in Chechnya.

Since early April, there have been credible reports that gay or perceived-to-be-gay men in the Russian republic of Chechnya have been rounded up, have been detained, have been put into prison camps by the authorities of Chechnya. And according to international human rights groups and activists on the ground, the situation has rapidly escalated. Despite the international attention and the rage, the beatings and torture continue. Men continued to be tortured on a daily basis, and, allegedly, at least 20 men have been killed.

The latest reports indicate that lesbians are also being targeted now. This campaign against LGBT individuals is also inciting “honor killings.” Families are being threatened and act out of fear of also being persecuted. This is appalling.

Putin has given free rein to the Chechen leader and has significant influence over what goes on in Chechnya. Let’s not forget Russia’s deplorable human rights record of silencing religious minorities, of prohibiting freedom of expression, of restricting free association of LGBT individuals. This is Russia’s record. It is Chechnya’s as well.

Nothing has been done. No perpetrators have been brought to justice. This is why it is up to us in the United States to not sit idly by. This state-sponsored persecution is ongoing.

This bipartisan resolution, Mr. Speaker, does not only shed light on this dreadful human rights disaster, but it also calls on the officials of Chechnya to immediately put an end to the abduction and violence of individuals based on their real or perceived sexual orientation.

It calls on Putin to uphold the international commitments and protect the human rights of all people upon which Russia has entered. They have signed these commitments, yet they don’t fulfill them. It holds accountable those individuals in the attacks who will also be sanctioned under two existing U.S. sanctions laws that we have passed: Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act and the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act.

Today, this body has the ability to once again, as the author of this measure for humanity and all individuals to and send a clear message to any oppressor that the United States will not turn a blind eye against violence, harassment,
and discrimination, no matter where it happens.

As a country, we have the responsibility to promote our deeply cherished American values and reaffirm our commitment to fundamental freedom, especially for those who live under the shadow of oppression and tyranny. We stand in solidarity with the persecuted, with the religious minorities, with the ethnic groups, with the suppressed women, and, in this case, with the LGBT community, because the respect of human rights of all people remains a U.S. foreign policy priority.

I thank my colleagues for their overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle who have supported this important resolution, which sends a unified message that the United States is committed to promoting human rights and that this crisis must end now because this matter is not just an LGBT issue—as important as it is—it is a human life matter and it deserves support from all of us.

Everyone deserves dignity. Everyone deserves respect in the place they call home, no matter where that is around the world. It is time to put an end to Chechnya’s barbaric LGBT purge.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman for the time and I thank the ranking member as well.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a co-author of this resolution and someone who is fighting for human rights all the time.

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

Mr. Speaker. I rise to support H. Res. 351, which condemns the violence and persecution against LGBT or perceived-to-be LGBT individuals in Chechnya. This resolution is an example of the strong bipartisan commitment of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to protect the human rights of all its citizens, condemn the violence and persecution, investigate these crimes in Chechnya, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses.

Furthermore, this resolution calls on the government of the Russian Federation to protect the human rights of all its citizens, condemn the violence and persecution, investigate these crimes in Chechnya, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses.

We must remember that President Kadyrov is a close ally of President Putin, and that the Russian Government has essentially sanctioned the atrocities and continued to carry out on its soil. That is why it is so important that representatives of the United States Government, at the highest levels, raise this issue with President Putin and other Russian officials.

I was extremely disappointed when Secretary of State Tillerson appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee earlier this month and admitted that neither he nor the President had raised this issue with anyone in the Russian Government. The United States must make it clear that human rights abuses will not be tolerated.

The President, the Secretary of State, and other senior officials must raise this issue consistently with the Russian Government and make it clear that they must protect the lives and safety of all Russian citizens.

Additionally, the Trump administration must take steps to ensure that any Russian officials involved in these atrocities are being sanctioned under the Sergei Magnitsky Act and the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, which we passed last year. Events like these are exactly why these bills were passed, to ensure that government officials involved in gross human rights abuses do not have the privilege of accessing American markets or traveling to the United States.

Furthermore, the administration should be working in concert with our European allies and the Russia is being held to its international obligations and treaties. The lives of vulnerable men and women are at stake, and every day that we remain silent, we condemn more to a dark fate.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a valued member of the committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

I rise to remind us that Martin Luther King once said: “Injustice anywhere threatens justice everywhere.”

We are all in this together. The idea that we can cherry-pick whose rights we advance and whose we do not is a mistaken notion. It is also un-American. So the future rights of LGBT members in Chechnya are important to Americans, and we need to stand up for their security, their safety, and their fundamental human rights.

This resolution is important. I congratulate the chairman and ranking member for bringing it before us. I congratulate my good friend, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and DAVID CICILLINE for their leadership. I am proud to support this resolution today.

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

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

Let me, first of all, again thank Representative ROS-LEHTINEN, who is always working really hard and is on top of issues that are so important. We really appreciate her leadership and everything she does in the committee; Mr. CICILLINE, who has fought for LGBT rights; and, of course, my partner on the committee, Chairman ROYCE. Things like this show the bipartisan commitment of our committee, which I think really is important.

Occasionally we hear talk about Vladimir Putin that implies some sort of moral equivalency between the way he runs Russia and American policies. If you want to know how false that comparison is, take a look at what is happening in Chechnya. Take a look at the violence that Putin’s thugs are waging against innocent civilians. That is how Putin regards the rights of his own people. That is what we are here to condemn today.

The United States should continue to make advancing and protecting human rights a foreign policy priority, including the rights of LGBT communities.
I urge a "yes" vote on this measure. I thank Chairman ROYCE, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this bill, I, again, thank Chairman Emeritus ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank Ranking Member ENGEL, as well as Representatives DARRELL ISSA, DAVID CICILLINE, CHRIS SMITH, and GERRY CONNOLLY for their important work on this resolution.

The abduction, torture, and targeted killings that we are seeing in Chechnya are an affront to the core universal values that all nation-states must strive to protect. The U.S. has a long history of speaking out on behalf of persecuted minorities, and that is what we are doing here today.

We cannot end injustice everywhere, but we can expose it. We can bring it to the world’s attention and, in so doing, give hope to its innocent victims.

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

The Speaker. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and the yeas were 423, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[NAY VOTES—6]

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 423, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[NAY VOTES—6]

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 423, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[NAY VOTES—6]

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 423, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[NAY VOTES—6]

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 423, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[NAY VOTES—6]

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 423, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[NAY VOTES—6]

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 423, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[NAY VOTES—6]
Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain non-public lands, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

**(Roll No. 329)**

**YEAS—424**

Abraham
Adams
Adams (NY)
Adcock
Aderholt
Agbayani
Ahmed
Ahmed (MA)
Ahmed (TX)
Ahmed (MO)
Ahmed (GA)
Ahmed (IL)
Ahmed (AL)
Ahmed (MI)
Ahmed (IN)
Ahmed (AI)
Ahmed (SD)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
Ahmed (NE)
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A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes Nos. 328, No. 329, and No. 330 due to my spouse’s health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on H. Res. 397—So that, in reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s principle of collective defense as enunciated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, I would have also voted “yea” on H.R. 497—Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange, and I would have also voted “yea” on H.R. 220—To authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes.

REMOTION OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor for H.R. 60.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GALLAGHER.) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

HONORING FRANK KUSH

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a legendary Arizonan, Frank Kush, who passed away last week at age 88.

Frank is best known for his career as coach of the Arizona State University Sun Devils football program. He won 176 games over 21 1/2 seasons, the most ever in Sun Devil history. He was named national Coach of the Year after the 1975 season and was elected to the College Football Hall of Fame in 1995.

Coach Kush was particularly concerned with wins and losses, he was a mentor for young men and ensured that their professional and academic development rose above their athletic prowess. Coach Kush influenced hundreds of young men during his career at Arizona State. His impact is ever-present in the lives of his former players, and his legacy will never be forgotten.

TRUMPCARE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today a number of us were able to go to the children’s hospital here in Washington, D.C., and met two miraculous children, children with complex, chronic diseases. With the love of their parents, one could not tell they were different from any other child, yet they had horrific and difficult conditions.

Those parents were middle class working families, and said that, without Medicaid, the half a million dollars of healthcare that keeps those beautiful children alive and leads them to a pathway of a life of love would not be possible.

I am glad that the Senate TrumpCare bill has been stopped in its tracks, the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GALLAGHER, is there objection to the report of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ASSOCIATION

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, also known as NATCA, on its 30th anniversary.

Since its foundation, NATCA has worked to guide aviation policies and improve working conditions for its members with one goal in mind: to ensure that passengers arrive safely to their destinations.

I would also like to recognize three remarkable individuals—Billy, Jim, and Mitch—whom I have met through NATCA’s advocacy efforts. These men are committed to public service, first through their service in our Armed Forces, and then later as air traffic controllers ensuring that Miami’s skies remain safe for all. Though Mitch has now retired, I know that his contributions to our Nation have not stopped.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating NATCA and its members on 30 years of outstanding public service.

UKRAINE MILITARY OFFICIAL KILLED

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as co-chair of the Ukrainian Caucus, and I will include in the Record an article reporting on an act of violence that has taken place in Ukraine.

Yesterday, a bomb exploded in the car of a high-ranking Ukrainian special forces official, Colonel Maksim Shapoval, in Kiev, in what Ukrainian authorities are calling an act of terrorism.

Shapoval’s heroic unit fought in eastern Ukraine, where a conflict between Ukraine and Russia has been raging since 2014, with mainly citizens being
killed, over 10,000 innocents in that country.

Shapoval’s death comes almost a year after prominent Ukraine journalist Pavel Sheremet was killed by a similar explosion in Kiev as he drove to work. The killing has never been brought to justice in that murder case.

A number of other public figures have also been killed under shady circumstances in and around Kiev in recent years.

Denis Voronenkov, a former Russian MP who fled to Ukraine, was shot dead in March 2017.

Lawyer Yuriy Grabovsky, who had represented a Russian soldier captured in Ukraine, was found dead with a gunshot wound in 2016.

This has all the fingerprints of Putin’s Russia, who will stop at nothing to blunt liberty. America must be a friend to liberty and an enemy to tyranny. I call on this administration to help Ukraine defend itself against these hostile acts of war against liberty.

[From theguardian, June 27, 2017]

Ukrainian military intelligence officer killed by car bomb in Kiev

(By Alec Luhn)

A high-ranking Ukrainian military intelligence official has been killed by a car bomb in Kiev, as law enforcement sources are calling an act of terrorism.

An explosive device destroyed the Mercedes being driven by Col Maxim Shapoval at 8.15am local time, police said.

The car’s bonnet was blown open and its roof and driver side door almost completely destroyed, video footage from the scene showed.

“The picture of the crime looks like it was a planned act of terrorism,” interior ministry spokesman Artem Shevchenko told local media. The military prosecutor said his office would lead an investigation.

Police said a female passerby with shrapnel wounds to her neck.

According to the defence ministry, Shapoval was a colonel in military intelligence. The Ukrainian Pravda newspaper quoted law enforcement sources saying he had helped to hack Russian intelligence.

Yury Butusov, editor of the Censor.net news website, said in a Facebook post that Shapoval’s unit had fought in eastern Ukraine, where a conflict with Russian-backed separatists that broke out in 2014 has killed more than 10,000 people. He claimed Russian intelligence could have killed Shapoval.

Shapoval’s death comes almost a year after another prominent Ukrainian journalist Pavel Sheremet was killed by a similar explosion in Kiev as he drove to work. A documentary film released last month revealed evidence suggesting that Ukraine’s spy agency may have witnessed the planting of the car bomb that killed Sheremet. No one has been brought to justice in the murder case.

A number of other public figures have also been assassinated in and around Kiev in recent years. Denis Voronenkov, a former Russian MP who fled to Ukraine, was shot dead in March 2017.

Pro-Russian journalist Oles Buzina was shot in a drive-by in 2015, and lawyer Yuriy Grabovsky, who had represented a Russian soldier captured in Ukraine, was found dead with a gunshot wound in 2016.

CONGRATULATING THE EDEN PRAIRIE EAGLES

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Eden Prairie High School girls lacrosse team for recently winning their third consecutive State title.

The Eagles showed perseverance and grit by overcoming an early deficit to The Blake School in the championship game. It was the ninth meeting between these two schools in the State’s final in a 10-year period. Eden Prairie rallied back to win 16-10, giving them the State title.

The girls’ drive for another championship led them to have a 20-1 overall record, the number one ranking in the State, finishing 19th in the country.

Senior Naomi Rogge and sophomore Abby Johnson both carried the team by scoring four and six goals, respectively. These student athletes work extremely hard, Mr. Speaker, not only on the lacrosse field in the classroom. Our community is very proud of that hard work and dedication, and I am delighted to share that these young women rose to the occasion and claimed yet another championship.

Congratulations to the Eden Prairie Eagles on their win.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HERKIMER COLLEGE

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Herkimer College. Established in 1966 as New York State’s 29th community college, Herkimer College opened its doors for classes in 1967.

The inaugural class consisted of 221 freshmen, and for the first 4 years, Herkimer College held classes on the upper floors of the old Remington Arms factory in Ilion, New York. In 1971, the college moved to its present-day location in the Village of Herkimer.

Like the Village of Herkimer and Herkimer County, Herkimer College is proud to share its name with a Revolutionary War hero, General Nicholas Herkimer. As commander of the Tryon County Militia, General Herkimer valiantly fought at the Battle of Oriskany, to honor General Herkimer and Herkimer County’s rich history, Herkimer College’s athletic teams are nicknamed the Generals.

Today, Herkimer College currently enrolls over 3,000 students and boasts more than 20,000 graduates. The college offers over 40 degree programs and is consistently ranked as a top 100 community college in the nation.

Over the course of five decades, Herkimer College’s benefit to the local community is evidenced by over $75 million in economic impact in Herkimer County, annually.

Today I recognize Herkimer College for an exceptional 50 years and offer my best wishes for many, many successful decades to come.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED FUNDING TO VETTED WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about something called congressionally directed spending when it comes to Army Corps projects.

I have a bill, which is called the REPAIR Act, which would make a limited change to the House rules definition to allow Congress to respond to the water resource infrastructure needs of their communities rather than waiting for an unelected, faceless bureaucrat in the executive branch to move on these projects.

The REPAIR Act does not authorize or appropriate any new funds for these projects, which comprises just one-half of 1 percent of our overall annual discretionary spending, and stays exclusively within the budget cap set by Congress.

After several years of divided government, almost every Member of Congress here has experienced the direct correlation between our inability to provide for these projects over the executive agencies, especially as it pertains to these essential public works projects.

The REPAIR Act is a zero-cost solution to this problem that will simply allow Congress to respond to the water resource infrastructure needs of their communities rather than waiting for an unelected, faceless bureaucrat in the executive branch to move on these projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the REPAIR Act.

RECOGNIZING CONGREGATION MICKVE ISRAEL

(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 congratulate Congregation Mickve Israel in Savannah, Georgia, as it celebrates its incredible 260th anniversary on July 11, 2017.

Just 5 months after General James Oglethorpe settled the colony, Jewish settlers fleeing persecution in Europe arrived in Georgia. They sought refuge in Savannah, where they were free to practice their beliefs. This brave group soon founded the Congregation Mickve Israel.

Predisatating our country by several decades as the first congregation in the South, Mickve Israel set an important precedent for the Jewish people. As such, wars, plagues, and religious struggles each challenged the congregation over the years, yet Mickve
Israel has withstood the test of time. It continues to be a beacon for the faithful and now welcomes 380 families inside its walls.

The story of Mickve Israel is special to the people and has been recognized for its unique architecture. For many years, President George Washington sent a personal letter to the congregation to honor its members and wish them well.

Since then, numerous Presidents over the years have made similar gestures of appreciation for the congregation’s longevity and importance to the Jewish community.

I would also like to acknowledge the congregation’s importance and congratulate Congregation Mickve Israel in reaching this impressive milestone. I know this religious community will continue to serve a caring, faithful, and integral role in Savannah, Georgia.  

OPIOD ADDICTION CRISIS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I am joined by a number of Members here to talk about one of the most insidious problems our Nation has faced in a long time. It is the problem of opioid abuse. We are in a crisis mode.

We have now reached a point where we will have more deaths from drug overdoses this year than there are homicides this year. There are names on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall in Washington. That is a frightening concept.

There is almost no county, no State in America that is not affected by this. Some areas have much more. Places in eastern Kentucky, southern West Virginia and up the Ohio Valley, Places in eastern Kentucky, southern West Virginia and up the Ohio Valley, middle Tennessee, and places in New England and out West have seen this as a growing problem as death rates rise.

There are things we can do about this. But in order to have some discussion of what we can do about this, we are going to talk about how we got to this problem and then what we can do to go beyond that.

There are things we can do about this. But in order to have some discussion of what we can do about this, we are going to talk about how we got to this problem and then what we can do to go beyond that.

I want to start off by yielding to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, to talk about what this means in one State alone, the State of Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentleman, who chairs our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee and is so passionate in not only finding a solution to the opioid epidemic, but also his great work on mental health reform as well, as was passed into law in the 21st Century Cures legislation.

As you know, the year before, the Energy and Commerce Committee also passed legislation to begin to address this issue. We will be doing a lot of work, going forward, to look at what is working on the ground and what is not. Addiction, as you well know from your clinical experience, is an equal opportunity destroyer. It is a crisis that has found no race, no age, no socioeconomic status. We all know someone impacted by the opioid epidemic. It has literally touched every corner of our country and every community in our States.

The epidemic has hit close to home in my State of Oregon, where more people now die from drug overdoses than deaths in automobile accidents. I have met with community leaders, first responders, doctors, police officers, patients, and those on the front lines of this fight against opioid addiction.

At roundtables throughout the Second District of Oregon, I have heard firsthand accounts of the impact of the opioid epidemic matter if I was in a rural eastern Oregon community or a more populated city in southern Oregon. The tragic stories were all too similar and all too familiar.

Medical professionals across Oregon told me about the acceleration of the opioid epidemic over the past 20 years. They have witnessed patient after patient fall into the necessary of addiction.

I heard from Oregonians who have struggled with the epidemic themselves. At our roundtable, a woman in Hermiston talked about how she became addicted to painkillers. After a minor foot injury, she got a prescription for an opioid-based painkiller. In her decades-long battle with this addiction—trying to get off of this addiction—she was forced to travel more than 5 hours into Washington State just to find a provider who could help her with Suboxone and get off of her addiction. There was nobody locally who could help her.

I heard from a father whose son was a high school athlete. He was prescribed opioids after a sports injury. Tragically, he became addicted. Soon, he transitioned to what we know as a cheaper and more deadly version of the drug known as heroin.

Sadly, this young man would not survive his addiction. He died from heroin.

I devastated the family and stole another American this life. This story is repeated all too often.

Combating the opioid epidemic in Oregon and every State of the union is going to require a real bipartisan team effort to continue, from elected officials with the input from healthcare experts and those on the front line of this fight in our local communities.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we stand shoulder-to-shoulder, all of us together, saying: What can we do more to help in this crisis; to seize the opportunity before us; to look at the legislation that was enacted in the last Congress to make sure that the grants are getting to the ground, as they are in my State; and that we are getting the help and that it is actually working?

It is one thing to pass a bill. It is another to make sure it is implemented correctly and that it actually works effectively.

I commend my colleague from Pennsylvania, Chairman MURPHY, for the work that he is doing on this and the compassion he has for those families who are tragically caught up in this addiction. Together, we are going to find our way through it.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman for his passion and hard work on the Energy and Commerce Committee. We know this is a life-and-death issue. This is one of those things where Members are coming together from both sides of the aisle to deal with.

Let me lay out the background here. How did we get here?

About 80 percent of addictions begin with a prescription. When we see what has happened here on this chart of heroin increased use and prescription opioids, there is something that occurred at the beginning of this millennium where things really began to take over.

On this next poster, seeing here how this is increasing at such a rate—about 9 or 10 percent—it is understandable you are looking at some of these rates increasing generally just in the last decade. But here, we are dealing with fentanyl that has not gotten here, it is even worse.

Back in 1980, Dr. Hershel Jick, a Boston doctor, wrote a letter in The New England Journal of Medicine, and he said this: “Out of nearly 40,000 patients given powerful pain drugs in a Boston hospital, only four addictions were documented.” Since he published that letter, it has been cited again about 600 times. Doctors, academics, pharmaceutical companies and others use it as evidence of the unlikeliness of developing addiction.

But it has been criticized soundly, saying that never should have been said. In fact, The New England Journal of Medicine took the unusual step of posting a one-sentence warning over the so-called Porter and Jick letter to the editor that the Journal published in 1980, and it says: “For reasons of public health, readers should be aware that this letter has been heavily and uncritically cited as evidence that addiction is rare with opioid therapy.”

Accompanying this note was an analysis from Canadian researchers exploring the frequency the letter had been cited, which was almost 600 times. Here is the tragedy of this. Many physicians and many pharmaceutical companies said: See, prescribe these opioids; people will be okay. That was found not to be the case.

Jump ahead to 2001, when The Joint Commission released their pain management standards, and then shortly after that the American Medical Association said: let’s make pain one of the
vital signs. The other vital signs being blood pressure, heart rate, respiratory rate, and temperature. But when pain was also made one of those as well, doctors began asking questions about that, and basically screening people along the lines of: On a scale of 1 to 10, what is your pain rating?

Everything else is measured with an instrument objectively, but pain is subjective. In fact, it is so subjective that it was found that 51 percent of people who are on an opioid have a mood disorder such as depression or anxiety. There is a huge amount there.

The thing about this, if a person fails to screen for presence of a mood disorder, along with other aspects, you really increase their risk for addiction. About 50 million Americans, for example, have low back pain. Twenty-five million of those are on an opioid. Of that group, about 40 percent have been found to have depression. If you combine depression and opioid use, you could triple or quadruple your risk for misuse, abuse, and addiction. It would make sense that before a doctor prescribes in these cases, concurrently they would also be screening for mood disorders. That does not appear to be the case.

Here is another part of the problem. Under the Affordable Care Act, hospital payments are tied to patient pain satisfaction surveys, which reward hospitals financially when patients give them a high rating for managing pain. In turn, the hospitals get less money if the patient says: my pain was not handled.

That is actually question 14 of the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems survey. It asks the question: How often did the hospital or provider do everything in their power to control your pain? Doctors feared negative responses, as did many hospitals, and it was probably had an impact on increasing prescriptions.

Another part of the problem is treatment access. Quite frankly, if you want to get help, you can’t find it. Unfortunately, getting access to high-quality treatment is unlikely in the United States. Of the 27 million Americans suffering from addiction, less than 1 percent receive evidence-based treatment.

We have a shortage of trained providers. Currently half the counties in America have no psychologists, no psychiatrists, and no clinical social workers.

Let me add to this also that medication-assisted treatment is one of those things put up here as a treatment method. If I show you here, medication-assisted treatment is when a person is replacing their illegal drug with something like methadone or Suboxone, which Chairman WALDEN just referred to.

But here is part of the problem. It is supposed to be the doctor writing the prescription and then the patient is getting other treatment. But as is found with medication-assisted treatment, just in Pennsylvania alone, nearly 60 percent had no counseling in the year they received the buprenorphine. Forty percent were not drug-tested in the year they received the buprenorphine.

This is important because a person may be taking a prescription but still remain on heroin or another drug. Thirty-three percent have been found to have more than one opioid in their body. The same goes with that, and that is the person may be on other opioids, in treatment for that, or taking buprenorphine or methadone.

So what happened? Someone shows up in the emergency room, they are in pain, perhaps a doctor looks into the record and doesn’t see anything there, and writes a prescription. If that person was in treatment and was recovering from an addiction, and at that point not taking other drugs, look at what just happened. The doctor may prescribe some opioids for that patient who was used to taking quite a few at any given time to have an effect. Now they have this, and they are no longer thinking: I will take just one or two. They may take more. So you risk overdose.

The second thing you do is risk a relapse. That person was perhaps clean for months or years. Now they have OxyContin or some other opioid, they take it, and they have a relapse.

But there is a third problem that goes with that, and that is the person may be on other drugs, such as benzodiazepines or other respiratory suppressants, and that becomes a problem because then the doctor doesn’t know about drugs in place. So depending on the case in which it is in place which prohibits sharing of information about substance abuse treatment between doctors. Doctors unknowingly prescribe for these people. It causes more problems. We need to deal with this.

Another level here is fentanyl. Fentanyl is a synthetic opioid which is a staggering 50 times more potent than heroin and 100 times more potent than morphine. It has a high potential for abuse and dependence. A single packet of sweetener for your coffee is 1,000 milligrams. Take two of those and that is enough to kill you.

Since last 2013, fentanyl has contributed to at least 5,000 overdose deaths in the U.S., and that is not accounting for fentanyl found in the illegal market. Due to gaps in the data collections, it is likely the number of overdose deaths in the U.S. is actually much higher.

A low-cost, high-profit, hard-to-detect profile of fentanyl is increasingly more trafficked to traffickers and relatively easy to manufacture. China is a major part of this, in that the illegally manufactured fentanyl shipped to the U.S. via labs in Mexico, smuggled across the border, then hits our streets.

One other thing I want to point out here, in terms of this problem. If we look at what some have analyzed in terms of areas that are hotspots for substance abuse, you can see in here for persons on disability, look at the sections in Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia, along the Mississippi Valley, up the Ohio Valley, and parts out West. This isn’t the only causal factor. Many times you have people on disability and pain, and what happens is they may be prescribed opioids as part of that.

When you look at places, where age-adjusted death rates occur for drug poisoning—those overdose deaths—look at the hotspots in America. It is just about the same out here in the Mississippi-Ohio Valley, portions out West, where you have these problems.

All of these come together in terms of crime, in terms of drug cartels, in terms of fentanyl, in terms of poor access to treatment.

I mentioned the hospital beds. By the way, over half the counties in America have no psychiatrist, no psychologist, no social worker, and no licensed drug treatment providers.

It is no wonder we are in this mess. We will talk more about some solutions here, but I wanted to recognize a number of Members who might want to talk about this.

Let me first go to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER). Representative CARTER is also a pharmacist. Let’s hear some of his perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for hosting this Special Order.

This is certainly a very important subject, one that I am very familiar with. It is indeed an epidemic in our country. There is no place, for a district that hasn’t been touched by this problem. Countless people have succumbed to this issue. That issue is the
use of opioids and the devastating impact on our communities.

Recent data showed that overdose deaths have jumped by over 50 percent in the decade leading up to 2015. In addition, nearly 1,300 people died in Georgia in 2015 from opioid overdoses—a number that is far too high. Just earlier this month, four people in central Georgia died in a matter of 2 days due to opioid overdoses from falsely labeled drugs. That instance is not only troubling because it reflects growing painkiller use in the rural parts of my State, but because it also represents another problem: counterfeit and fake drugs.

An issue that I have been working on is the growing trend of drugs and drug ingredients being ordered abroad and delivered through the mail to addresses around the county.

A recent Wall Street Journal article mentioned the synthetic opioids that are being brought into this country and the methods by which they are doing it.

An example of one of those drugs is fentanyl, a synthetic opioid that is wreaking havoc across the country.

We must not only look at the types of drugs that are being used, but also how people are acquiring them and how to effectively limit that. Our enforcement personnel are working diligently with the Postal Service to find ways to curb this trend, such as using advanced data. But it is a topic that needs more work. By cutting off their ability to purchase these dangerous synthetic opioids, we can help to limit this epidemic.

As a lifelong pharmacist, I have seen firsthand the dangers and problems associated with opioid abuse and its impact on our communities. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to counter this trend in hopes of saving lives.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman for hosting this tonight. It is so very vital to our country. Thank you for allowing me to speak on this.

Representative Murphy, one of those people who want to testify on this very important topic. And you mention that my district borders the State of Pennsylvania, and it does. And I have had so many incidents of engagement with my constituents on the opioid addiction issue. Several of those is going to require a cultural change, simply throwing money at this problem. It is going to require a cultural change within our country.

I have so many other stories, but I don't want to take up more time because I know I have other colleagues here who want to testify on this very important issue.

I want to next recognize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Bucshon). Certainly he sees this issue, too. As I mentioned before, one of the problems physicians have, if they do not know what kind of prescriptions that person is on, for example, a medical record may show if a person has an allergy to penicillin or something, but you may have no idea that that patient may, for example, be taking buprenorphine or methadone unless they tell you or you test for it. And as a surgeon, what happens when they go to get anesthesia and the complications come from that, but it is part of the reasons why we have to make sure that you as a physician have access to these records, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Bucshon).
abuse overdose. Unfortunately, drug overdoses in Indiana have increased fivefold over the past decade, and southern Indiana and the Wabash Valley, the area I represent, are bearing the brunt of this devastation.

Vanderburgh County, Indiana, population around 108,000 citizens, authorities have responded to over 16 opioid- or heroin-induced overdoses already this year.

Vanderburgh County, Indiana, 182,000 citizens, saw 29 deaths from overdose in 2016, which is a fourfold increase from the prior year. This year, the county has seen 25 confirmed heroin- or fentanyl-related overdoses already, but the coroner thinks it may be more.

Just this month, we have seen reports of instances of an opioid-based drug called gray death in Evansville, Indiana.

We are working here in Congress with our States and local communities to find solutions to these families, but a lot of work has to be done. While we still have much to do, over the past couple of years, we have actually made significant progress to bring hope to our communities and expand access to treatment for those who need it.

I was part of our efforts that we put into law, the landmark legislation, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, and I had the opportunity to author a portion of CARA that expanded access to medication-assisted treatment, ensure patients have wider access to more comprehensive-based treatment options, and helped minimize the potential for diversion.

As Congressman MURPHY mentioned, the key here is ongoing therapy, counseling, and monitoring. Medication-assisted treatment is not a panacea, but it is a component of a more comprehensive treatment plan for each individual.

Through our work in implementing the 21st Century Cures Act, Congress has provided significant funding for the States. In fact, Indiana recently was granted nearly $11 million from the Department of Health and Human Services to help us with this epidemic.

Again, most of us know someone, a family member, a friend, a neighbor, who has been impacted by this epidemic in some way. As a physician, I have seen the power of addiction up close, but we have focused on sharing policy solutions here in Washington, D.C., to improve access to treatment for patients who are battling their problem every day. We all share in this fight, and we can’t end this epidemic through policy changes alone. It is ongoing, and it is going to take all of us working together as a community to meet this challenge.

In that respect, I have met with and have been working with people who represent medical schools and have programs in one country to help better educate the physician on prescribing habits as it relates to pain, whether that is surgical pain or chronic pain. It is a multifaceted approach, and I commend Congressman MURPHY for his dedication to helping end this crisis in our country, and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for his impassioned words and dedication here.

I want to refer back to my map here a moment. Dr. BUCSHON was referring to his district in southern Indiana here, which, on this 2014 map, was already showing high mortality rates for those who have overdoses.

Look here in the State of Washington, also an area that, on this 2014 map, showed a lot of problems, and now the problem is getting worse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) to speak on this issue.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this important issue and for the opportunity to address the House on this very important topic.

Mr. Speaker, as you have heard, our Nation is facing an epidemic. Over the past two decades, opioid overdoses have quadrupled. Think about that. They have quadrupled in the United States. My home state, as Dr. Murphy has just mentioned, has faced significant increase in drug death rates, including a 70 percent increase in synthetic opioid overdose deaths in just the last 10 years. It is clear that this is a crisis, which is why we in Congress are committed to combating this growing epidemic.

Late last year, Congress passed sweeping legislation, called the 21st Century Cures Act. It was bipartisan legislation that authorized $6.3 billion in funding to bring our healthcare innovation infrastructure into the 21st century. This legislation included $1 billion for opioid intervention and prevention treatment programs throughout all 50 States. Earlier this spring, the Federal Government began awarding grants in order to confront this crisis, including $11.7 million to the State of Washington.

While these funds will help expand treatment options, there is still much more work to be done at the Federal level, which is why I cosponsored legislation like H.R. 1057, the Synthetics Trafficking and Overdose Prevention, or STOP, Act. Designed to stop dangerous synthetic drugs like fentanyl, which you heard about, and carfentanil from being shipped through our borders, this legislation will combat bad actors from China and India who have been taking advantage of weaknesses in international mail security standards to break U.S. customs laws and really wreak havoc on our communities.

This is just one step of the opioid crisis that we must address. We need to combat the illicit drugs coming into this country as well as equip doctors, nurses, and first responders with the resources they need to treat pain appropriately.

We also need to support better access to care for individuals suffering from psychiatric and substance abuse disorders, which we must ensure these drugs are not falling into the hands of our Nation’s children.

My colleagues in Congress and I are committed to combating this epidemic to keep it from causing further harm to our Nation’s families and communities.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s comments and his dedication to helping his State of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), whose district is just north of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to talk about some of the problems, in his experience, and his thoughts about what we should be doing about substance abuse.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his long work in this field, not just the last 2 years, but a lifetime in this space. I commend him for that work. Also, with mental health issues, he has been helping educate Congress about moving toward solutions.

My colleague has outlined the scope of the national problem we have, and each of us can talk about our respective districts and what has been going on there.

In my district, just over the border from my colleague’s, western Pennsylvania has been especially hard hit. In Beaver County, we saw 102 overdose deaths related to opioids in 2016, up from 30 in 2013. In Cambria County, we lost 94 people to overdose deaths in 2016, a startling 62 percent increase from 2015.

The stories just keep coming. A story of the mother who lost her 10th child, her youngest child, to this epidemic, who insisted that the words “damn heroin” be put in her son’s obituary. Or the couple we learned about before, who later their infant died from neglect, all of the national problem we have, and each of us can talk about our respective districts and what has been going on there.

In my district, just over the border from my colleague’s, western Pennsylvania has been especially hard hit. In Beaver County, we saw 102 overdose deaths related to opioids in 2016, up from 30 in 2013. In Cambria County, we lost 94 people to overdose deaths in 2016, a startling 62 percent increase from 2015.

The stories just keep coming. A story of the mother who lost her 10th child, her youngest child, to this epidemic, who insisted that the words “damn heroin” be put in her son’s obituary. Or the couple we learned about before, who later their infant died from neglect, all of the national problem we have, and each of us can talk about our respective districts and what has been going on there.

In my district, just over the border from my colleague’s, western Pennsylvania has been especially hard hit. In Beaver County, we saw 102 overdose deaths related to opioids in 2016, up from 30 in 2013. In Cambria County, we lost 94 people to overdose deaths in 2016, a startling 62 percent increase from 2015.

The stories just keep coming. A story of the mother who lost her 10th child, her youngest child, to this epidemic, who insisted that the words “damn heroin” be put in her son’s obituary. Or the couple we learned about before, who later their infant died from neglect, all of the national problem we have, and each of us can talk about our respective districts and what has been going on there.

In my district, just over the border from my colleague’s, western Pennsylvania has been especially hard hit. In Beaver County, we saw 102 overdose deaths related to opioids in 2016, up from 30 in 2013. In Cambria County, we lost 94 people to overdose deaths in 2016, a startling 62 percent increase from 2015.
Drug Control Policy and its Director have played, and should continue to play, a central role in this effort.

The Office was created in 1988 with the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. Its mission is to fight the Nation's drug problem through three areas: prevention, addiction and treatment, and enforcement.

The Office’s Director, commonly referred to as the “drug czar,” was elevated to the Cabinet in 1993 by President Clinton, who wanted to raise the Office’s profile and coordinate efforts on the Hill. More importantly, he wanted to focus and emphasize efforts within the administration for the antidrug efforts of the Department of Justice, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Department of Education, and the Department of Health and Human Services. The Obama administration removed the Office from the position it had in the Cabinet.

When it comes to drug addiction as well as the illicit drug trade occurring across our southern border, the challenges have never been greater. This is no time to retreat in our efforts, and it is time to restore the Office of National Drug Control Policy to the Cabinet.

The Office is a very important part of the fight against the opioid epidemic, particularly because it plays a crucial role in coordinating efforts at various levels of government. In addition to the law enforcement we are passing here in Congress, the administration has a crucial role to play, as do leaders at the State and local level.

We all want to end this crisis, and this common cause unites us, perhaps more than any other issue, across party and partisan lines. Again, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for giving me this opportunity, and I thank him for his work in this area.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for his dedication on this issue. And, yes, he is right: we have to cross party lines and work on this together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), another friend, who has seen these problems, as well, in his district and knows full well how these problems have merged well into the Ohio area, as it is an insidious problem.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in this most important area.

Mr. Speaker, the heroin and opioid scourge is running this country into the ground, and, unfortunately, the problem appears to be getting worse, not better. That grim reality is particularly true in my district in Cincinnati, where, during a single week last summer, city health officials reported 174 overdoses in 1 week.

Drug addiction to opioids have doubled in my district, where, during the first 4 months in 2017, the Hamilton County Coroner’s Office had already logged in hundreds and hundreds of opioid overdoses—heartbreaking numbers. But numbers only tell part of the story. The circumstances surrounding the spike in overdoses can, at times, be horrifying.

A couple of months ago, in Cincinnati, Ohio, a 9-year-old girl called 911 about both of her parents, who overdosed on heroin in their SUV. She told the dispatcher she was scared and that her parents wouldn’t wake up. The girl didn’t know where she was or what was wrong with her parents, but she, fortunately, knew how to call 911. That call saved her parents’ lives.

But no little girl—or little boy, for that matter—should ever be placed in that situation by their parents, or by anyone.

These types of stories are becoming all too common. Opioids don’t discriminate based on age or race or socioeconomic class. Opioids can kill anyone, any day, any time. Every day, there are more headlines about how heroin and other opioids are basically taking over the country.

The simple fact is that nearly every Member of Congress could come to the floor today and share a similar story about someone they know. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we work together to find new and more successful ways to combat the opioid epidemic. We need to put politics aside and help people in need.

Last year, we came together in a bipartisan manner to pass the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, and I think there is a good chance that the expanded treatment and recovery options that legislation created will help some of those suffering from addiction to turn their lives around.

While CARA will give local law enforcement and healthcare officials more resources to fight opioid addiction, they cannot do it alone. Congress must act to help combat the importation into the United States of extremely dangerous synthetic drugs like fentanyl and carfentanil, which many have blamed for the spike of heroin overdoses. According to the DEA, much of the supply of these two dangerous drugs on our streets originates overseas, particularly from China and India.

Bipartisan legislation is being led by Representative Tim Ryan and Senator Portman, theSynthetics Trafficking Enforcement Act, and also Buddie Carter of Georgia mentioned this, too—where a pharmacist or a physician can say, “Is this person on any other opioids? Have they jumped across the border? Have they seen four, five, or more physicians for some opioids?”

By having a better PDMP, prescription drug monitoring program, or National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting program, we have to make sure that all States use the same system and that it collects data from across borders so doctors can easily see this.

But part of this, too, in dealing with the 42 C.F.R., is understanding Federal...
law prohibits including buprenorphine and methadone in the PDMP. How absurd and how cruel that is that a doctor would not even be able to know that a patient is taking one of those prescriptions.

Also, some of these drugs can end up being an inspiratory suppressant, and when the patient takes another drug such as benzodiazepine, it can add to that effect and add to further complications.

Another aspect, too, which we must be fully engaged with is vigorous public education programs across all age groups, beginning with early elementary school.

When schools have some of these programs—and we will bring forth some models that talk about these programs in a future hearing I will be holding in the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee—these are very, very important to help students, early on, understand the dangers of this.

This is not just recreation, but it is so easy to slip into addiction. Given that 80 percent of drug abuse begins within the family, whether it is a student, athlete, perhaps a football player who injures a leg or something and he is given some of these drugs, it is essential the whole family be counseled from the onset, understanding the concerns and dangers of continuing to take these drugs.

We also have to have drug take-back programs and public education programs stressing the importance of proper disposal of unused opiates and pain prescriptions to prevent them from being stolen or misused. For example, if a family is selling their home and they are having an open house and strangers come into the house and while they are there they say, “Can I use your restroom?” and the family lets them do that, don’t be surprised if that person has no intention of buying a house but does have an intention of going into the bathrooms and checking the medicine cabinets and finding any medication and taking it.

Also, when teens come over to the house for parties or socializing, don’t be surprised if they also go into medicine cabinets, look in drawers in the bathrooms or drawers in other places of the house looking for some of those drugs which they, themselves, will take or sell.

We have to make sure we have vigorous patient education programs about doctor-prescribed opioids to make sure people know about that before the addiction takes foot. And taking one of these prescriptions may only take 3 or 4 weeks before it begins to kick in and cause problems.

I know myself, back in 2005, I was in a rollover accident in Iraq with a couple of other Members of Congress. Our vehicle, I believed as a result of the accident, I ended up having a mild concussion, snapping my neck, having some temporary paralysis, and a great deal of pain. Well, battlefield medicine is one that gets you out of the area, stops the bleeding, stops the pain, and ships you off to some other hospital, and that was the case for me.

But I know what happens. Everywhere I landed in a helicopter or an ambulance, appropriately so, the physicians would ask me a number of orienting questions, but also say: “Are you in pain? On a scale of 1 to 10, how much pain are you in?” And when I proceeded to number, immediately, as they would do for many other people in the battlefield, they would administer morphine or some other pain reliever and move you on from there.

What happened, though, returning to the United States, where pain continued for me, I was prescribed some pills for that pain, but I was also prescribed fentanyl. Never once was it ever described to me, “Be careful with this. This is highly addictive. This is a problem.”

Now, after a few weeks on this and recognizing it was hard to even do my job because I couldn’t keep my head down, I called my doctor and said, “I am not taking this anymore.” But at that point, my body had already begun to develop some tolerance for this, and when I stopped taking it, I had some reaction.

Granted, it was not as severe as some of those who have been taking these drugs at a higher dosage and longer, but I could feel myself actually saying I understand what people mean when they say this is addictive and it is a lethal drug. And they feel a sense of nausea and other problems as well.

Now, I can’t even imagine what it is like for someone who is taking higher doses for longer periods of time. But it is extremely important that, every time a prescription is written, pharmacists have an opportunity to counsel patients and doctors are also doing more than simply passing out a prescription.

Pharmacists should do what BUDDY CARTER was saying before: make sure they have the person showing a photo ID. Is this, indeed, a prescription they are picking up for themselves or claiming they have it for someone else? Perhaps that prescription was stolen from someone.

We have to make sure that we also understand, for those out there trying to legalize marijuana, I caution you, because the marijuana that is out there on the streets or presented in many areas can cause tremendous psychiatric problems for those who are already at risk. The longer you are on some of the types of marijuana, the greater risk you have for things like delusional behavior.

We have to make sure that we also eliminate Medicaid payments for those questions 14 responses I made reference to before when you are in the hospital to ask if the hospital adequately addressed your pain.

In the area of treatment and recovery, we have to expand the mental health workforce. As I said before, half the counties in America have no psychiatrists, no psychologists, no drug and alcohol counselors, and those who are out there likely have their schedule so filled, they don’t even have room to treat someone. Not all of them even know how to treat addictive disorders.

The fact that a majority of people who may have an addiction disorder also have a concurrent mental health disorder is another reason why we have to increase this workforce by tens of thousands.

Also, just to underscore how much we are having some of these problems are at risk. The longer you are on marijuana, which is killing more people every year than the entire war in Vietnam, but we do not have the soldiers to fight this.

We also have to make sure that, with regard to the government-sponsored medication-assisted treatment which I referred to before, we cannot simply rely on synthetic opioid maintenance alone. We have to make sure there are requirements to have that person in counseling and treatment.

I have heard from some persons that go to those treatment programs that they have no counseling at all, and some have great counseling. In some cases, sitting in the waiting room, perhaps a nurse or someone simply checks on you and says, “What are you doing? How are you doing?” That is considered and written down as group therapy. That is not acceptable in any way, shape, or form.

We need 100,000 more inpatient psychiatric beds, and we have to make sure insurance companies recognize that an addictive disorder is a chronic disorder. Simply giving someone a weekend or a few days for withdrawal and then putting them back on the street is not an answer.

That is why we have to encourage private insurance companies and Medicaid and Medicare. And I say Medicare because a large number of people who are having some of these problems are also the elderly. We have to make sure that we increase the availability of fast-acting opiate blockers for first responders, such as Narcan. But let’s keep this in mind: In some cases, we hear of some of those pushers of those drugs who also have an accompanying disorder, but without Narcan, recognizing that the drug will bring that person to a near-death experience.
We have heard from first responders and others, law enforcement, where someone may actually have a party where someone will remain there expecting that someone will actually have an overdose and die in order to bring them back to life. That is how some of these people are seeking some of those experiences.

We have to make sure that States review their laws, as some are doing, that if you take one of these opiates and you sober up that near-death experience, perhaps that should be treated the same as a suicide attempt, that person is in imminent danger of harming themselves or someone else and perhaps determine if they need an inpatient psychiatric stay.

We have to make sure we have support of employment for those in recovery to break the cycle of recovery and reexposure. Many times, persons who are trying to stay clean, they can’t get a job, they can’t pass these drug tests, so they may end up in a job and have exposure to other people who still end up with substance abuse.

We have to make sure they have higher standards and increased accountability for payment models that require evidence-based treatment in halfway houses, three-quarter houses, and residential treatment facilities.

We have to deploy certified addiction counselors to emergency rooms because we know that, when a person comes to an emergency room, if they see an addiction counselor there, they are not just simply given a business card and told, "Someone next week and we hope you get treatment." But if they see an addiction counselor in the emergency room, they increase their chances of follow-up by 50 percent according to a Michigan study.

We must make sure the FDA is working with companies to find alternatives to opioids and that, again, Medicaid and other physicians are educated on some of those aspects.

Physician training has to also be ramped up to require them to have training in opioid prescribing practices on risk for addiction and abuse and prescribing limited dosages. Instead of prescribing dosages for a month, perhaps just a couple of days. In many cases, they are not adequately trained in alternatives to opioids and the potential harm of overprescribing.

We have to increase training requirements for healthcare providers who deliver addiction and treatment. Right now, in many cases, they only have a few hours of training, and then they can go and prescribe this and have very little, if any, training at all in drug addiction counseling. Before doctors can prescribe, we can make sure they are looking at the NAPSAR list or other lists as well.

In the area of law enforcement, it is critical that what is called the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program is made more available, with greater access across the country.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left in our segment here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. We have to make sure we have more border security so that we are intercepting these drugs as they come across the border.

We need funding for the post offices because, in many cases, unwittingly, the letter carriers are the ones who are delivering to people's homes fentanyl and other drugs.

In the incarceration system, we have to make sure we are testing inmates for the presence of drugs in their system during their incarceration. We can offer them medications which, upon discharge, actually block any effects of some of these drugs.

We need to also make sure that Medicaid and other insurance companies' payments resume immediately upon release from their incarceration to prevent them from relapsing or returning to the drug culture.

We also have to make sure we have solid data collection. In many cases, when we show the charts about death rates around the country, the charts may be grossly inaccurate. In many cases first responders, paramedics, and coroners do not keep accurate data on these rates. The persons themselves may not even be tested to see if they died from a drug overdose.

There are several items in here listing what we do here as a nation, and there are many more. The point is we have fallen short and we have seen some problems with this. There is more that we can do and we must do in order to save lives.

I know I just have about 3 minutes left, Mr. Speaker, am I correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to talk about some of the issues dealing with substance abuse.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MURPHY for his incredible leadership on this important topic and for holding this Special Order this evening.

I can tell you, the citizens of the state are paying attention. The opioid epidemic continues to intensify with over 2 million people addicted to prescription opioids and more than half a million addicted to heroin in 2015, alone.

According to an estimate from The New York Times, drug overdoses are now the leading cause of death for Americans under 50. And drug overdoses are the leading cause of accidental death in our country, with prescription opioids responsible for more than 20,000 deaths in the United States just in 2015, according to the American Society of Addiction Medicine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KAPITO. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move the RECORD to the side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Speaker, according to the American Society of Addiction Medicine, 650,000 non-elderly adults with opioid addiction and covering a range of treatment services.

Ohio, tragically, leads the nation in opioid overdoses in 2014. Sadly, deaths have continued to rise with increased use of heroin and fentanyl. Many States have expanded Medicaid, including Ohio, to cover adults who make a modest $16,500 a year per individual. By broadening coverage of adults with opioid addiction who were previously ineligible for coverage and facilitates access to treatment.

The opioid epidemic is so bad that even librarians are learning how to treat overdoses for individuals who come into libraries.

Mental health can be comorbid with opioid abuse, and those suffering from that duality are truly an American tragedy. For an addict to complete rehab and recovery successfully, they have to work on conquering that. And over half of uninsured non-elderly adults with an opioid addiction had a mental illness in the past year, with over one in five operating with a serious mental illness, such as depression, bipolar disorder, or schizophrenia.

To address the gravity of the challenge, I want to put on the RECORD the work that Lucas County, my home county, is doing with their DART program, which engages hospitals, mental health counselors, and businesses in the community.

Believe it or not, according to Sheriff Sharp, the DART program has helped nearly 2,300 overdose victims and has a 74 percent success rate of getting people into detox and treatment programs at a total cost of about $370 per individual. This is truly an amazing record, and I wish to include in the RECORD the information about other counties in the district that I represent.

The opioid epidemic does not just affect the addicted. Lucas County Children Services is struggling to help children displaced by the opioid epidemic.

The agency has been repeatedly forced to do the unimaginable tasks of comforting children as first responders work to save their parents from a heroin or fentanyl overdoses. On several occasions, it has had to break the terrible news to these children that their parents succumbed to their addiction.

LCCS is also coping with a dramatic increase in the number of children placed in protective custody because their families have been blinded by substance dependence. The State's current budget proposes no increase for this program, which is a shame. This is no time to short change children.

Finally, I submit for the RECORD a story of the Guest family of Lorain, Ohio, whose daughter Tera died of a heroin overdose at the age of 24.

According to the Cleveland Plain Dealer: "Tera Guest, 24, died Jan. 29, 2014, shortly after she and her sister used painkillers and a heroin-fentanyl mix. Her death marked the end of a two-year period that included stints in treatment and losing custody of her two children to her mother."
“Tera is among the hundreds who have died of overdoses within the last three years in Lorain County. The county coroner’s office said a record 67 people died in 2013, followed by 60 in 2014 and 62 in 2015.”

Lori took her tragedy and turned it into action when she founded the Lorain County Task Force, which is a group that raises awareness and provides assistance to addicts and their families.

Lori stepped up, and now Congress must do the same. We cannot turn our back on these people. We must all work together, we must put politics aside. Only then can we begin to heal our Nation from this crisis.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER),

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this critical issue.

As was laid out, communities across this country, communities like mine in northeast Wisconsin, are in the midst of a public health crisis. It is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. It is an American issue, one that should bring us all together.

Opioid abuse is wreaking havoc on our homes, our schools, our churches. Its direct effects are destroying our families and the lives of our loved ones.

As was pointed out, more Americans will have died from drug overdoses in 2017 than there are names on the Vietnam Wall to bring people together. That should put it into sharp relief.

As a Marine veteran, I am acutely aware that servicemembers are more susceptible than the average person to addiction. In fact, veterans die from accidental drug overdoses at a 33 percent higher rate than the rest of the population, and something must be done to reverse this awful trend.

I commend our State lawmakers in Wisconsin who are doing aggressive work here, and I commend the gentleman and everyone who has spoken out for doing the same thing at the national level, and I look forward to working with him.

Because headline after headline reminds us of the tragic loss of life that has resulted from our Nation’s opioid and addictions risk, we have to step up. We have to act.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the gentleman convening this Special Order this evening. It has been fun working with him in the past on creative, bipartisan efforts to try and make sure the Federal Government is better partners on this.

I look forward to working with him on legislation that will make it easier to be able to have the information available that people need for integrated treatment and his commitment to trying to bring people together to understand the problem and the fact that we are agreed more than we are divided on these things. I look forward to working with him on some progress in the months ahead.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Oregon, and I thank all the Members speaking here tonight. I want to say, as you saw, this was a bipartisan coalition of Members. We are much better off working hand in hand to pass legislation that changes issues than standing next to each other as pallbearers for another 60,000 people in our Nation next week.

Mr. Speaker, with that and with some hope that we can pass this legislation and save some lives, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3003, NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the Special Order of Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–195) on the resolution (H. Res. 414) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3004, KATE’S LAW, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 3, 2017, THROUGH JULY 10, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the Special Order of Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–196) on the resolution (H. Res. 415) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens, and providing for proceedings during the period from July 3, 2017, through July 10, 2017, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank all my fellow Members who are speaking up on this very important issue. I appreciate Dr. Murphy taking the lead. It is not gotten enough attention. We continue to have people dying, and we need to deal with the issue.

It is interesting: some people find great hope in their religious beliefs. Throughout America’s history, Christianity has been an important foundation. No, you didn’t have to be a Christian to participate in government, to be a founder, but, as Ben Franklin said, we know because he wrote out the speech in his own handwriting immediately afterwards, as requested.

So often, teachers teach that he is a Deist, as so many of the Founders, we were told, were Deists in his own words, in his own handwriting, at the Constitutional Convention in 1787, at 80 years old, 2 to 3 years away from meeting his Judge, his Maker—severe gout, arthritis, overweight, trouble getting up and down—he said these words:

“I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?”

Franklin said, we have been—by the way, that is obviously a reference to Jesus’ comment about the sparrow, and God seeing the sparrow, watching the sparrow.

But he goes on and he makes it very clear, as his own words indicate, that unless—he said: “We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writ, that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.”

Again, referencing Scripture. Those are not the words—any of them—they are not the words of a Deist. So teachers that have been miseducating people for so long, I know they are just passing on what they were taught, but there has been so much miseducation for so long.

Regardless of what else, we don’t try to force our religious beliefs on anyone. That is not what the House of Representatives is for. But since it formed such an important part of our founding and a part of the discussion for most of our Nation’s history, it is important to point out that those Scriptures that Ben Franklin referenced at the Constitutional Convention, the Scriptures that have been quoted so often—

We know the Bible is the number one, far and away, most quoted book in the House of Representatives and the Senate. Nothing else anywhere even close. It has brought hope to people that had no hope.

It is interesting that, as our Nation moves further and further away from the source of so much hope for so much of our Nation’s history, and for those who lived through that part of our Nation’s history, the hope that Franklin Roosevelt brought to the microphone when he read the famous prayer on D-Day as American soldiers were fighting, as he said, against those forces of evil, drawn from a country that was used to peace that were fighting forces of evil.

They had hope. That hope and prayer that Franklin Roosevelt gave over the microphone for several minutes now is condemned by so many.
That hope that served as the foundation, the building blocks for the beliefs of Sam Adams, that so many around in those days gave credit as being an important foundational building block for the revolution, for the new Nation.

We are arriving at a time when record numbers of people are dying, we heard today in our Judiciary hearing. I believe it was 144 Americans each day are dying of drug overdoses.

Who dies of a drug overdose?

People without hope, people who are drawn to drugs to provide a good, warm feeling.

We have more military members killing themselves than at any time probably in any nation’s history. I don’t know that for sure, but it is just hard to imagine a time in any nation’s history when so many of its veterans are taking their own lives, a time when so many of our active military have taken their own lives.

Obviously, as people have said over the years, that is a permanent solution to a temporary problem, and it is the act of someone without hope.

So we know, regardless of whether people accepted Christian beliefs or not, Christianity, throughout our Nation’s history, provided hope. The Bible provided hope for those who were slaves through the 1700s and 1800s. So many were Christians, and it was the Bible, it was those wonderful spirituals, it was Scripture that gave them hope and endurance and get through the horrors of slavery.

Though Abraham Lincoln bragged in his early twenties about being an infidel and not believing in God, Steve Mansfield, in his book in the last 5 years or so about Lincoln’s struggle with God, documents his going from being an infidel to a point where, as President, he read Scripture constantly.

Dr. Rufus Fears, a brilliant history professor at the University of Oklahoma, asked me once: You know why Lincoln’s speeches are so good and touch our hearts?

And I said: I don’t know. They are just really well-worded. They are great speeches.

He said: No. He was reading so much Scripture by that point in his life, like the Gettysburg Address, he wrote his speeches as if they were Scripture. His words provided hope because he referenced them much.

And whether atheistic, agnostic, Muslim, Buddhist, whatever, so many have a general knowledge of what Christians believe, and it is very basic. God, according to Genesis, the Old Testament, He created the world, created the universe, created man and woman. Basically, we got the Bible as an owner’s manual, giving us important history so that we could get a good look at what works and what doesn’t, and what the owner expects, and how we can live the most joyful and hopeful life even through terrible, perilous times.

Christianity goes on and, in the New Testament, points to the belief that the Old Testament, as we refer to it, points to the Messiah coming to be born in Bethlehem. So many of the prophecies about the Messiah to come. Even if one believes Jesus was not the Messiah, incredible that He could fulfill those prophecies the way He did.

And Christians, as people of most religions understand, believe what John 3:16 says: “For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”

So, clearly, Christian religion is based completely on love; that God so loved the world, that He gave His only Son, who was perfect, unblemished with sins of the Earth. And only something—someone unblemished could take away the sins of the world.

And the additional exclamation point that makes clear that Christianity is a religion based on love: It was made clear when Jesus was asked by the lawyer, naturally: What’s the greatest commandment?

He said: love God, and the others like it. Love each other. And on those two commands hang all the law and the Prophets.

If you were to go about outlining the Ten Commandments, they easily fall under those two headings: Love God, love each other.

But then Jesus also made clear: Greater love hath no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

And Jesus knew, because whether you believe he was the fulfillment of all the prophecies from the Old Testament or not, He could have escaped. He made no effort. He gave himself out of love.

It is easy to say He is either a liar, or He is a lunatic, or He is exactly what He said. But his message was based on love. He gave his life for a world that needed an unblemished lamb.

□ 1800

With that background, Mr. Speaker—and, of course, the Supreme Court outlined it much more thoroughly in the late 1800s as it came to the conclusion well after the horrid case of Dred Scott, when the court analyzed and made clear, determined, pronounced: Even though everyone in the United States is not a Christian, this is a Christian Nation.

And everything that the Court called into view framed their decision testified to that fact, as the Court pronounced.

Now, so why am I going into this?

It is because we have hit what may be as low a point as we have ever hit in Congress. When Russell Vought was being questioned, on the same day, another person named Comey was testifying here on Capitol Hill. Russell Vought was being questioned by Senators so they could determine how they wanted to vote on whether or not he would fill a role in the administration. This low point in our Nation’s history has to rank down there as one of our low points.

When so much throughout our history has testified to the fact that Christianity was such an important part of our foundation, of everything that has been good in America, the ending of slavery, driven and guided by churches. Sure, there were some atheists involved. There were those who authored The Great Awakening, 1730s and 1740s, ended up yielding a revolution that produced the greatest country in the history of the world by virtue of the opportunities, by virtue of the protection freedoms—freedoms for freedom-loving people around the world, by virtue of, you know, the opportunities and the assets, and that a country would ultimately arise where the number one health problem for the Nation’s poor was obesity. With more opportunities, more assets, more freedoms, even then Solomon’s Israel—incredible country with many religions—celebrated here in the United States.

But as General Jay Garner was told when he was in Iraq after Saddam Hussein was driven out and me twice—actually, three times has said it when I heard him speaking back in 2004, I called him. He reiterated it. He told me again in last September. Yes, I remember it correctly. He talked to a direct descendant of Mohammed in Iraq about what kind of government the U.S. should help Iraq have. I will contend we shouldn’t be about nation building, but that was his order and that is what he was doing.

And he said that to a direct descendant of Mohammed with a black turban said he was going to explain in his native tongue, because they were recording it. And then after he finished, he said: Now, let me just give you, in a nutshell, what I told you we need here for a government in Iraq. We need a government formed by Iraqis, a government composed of Iraqis, and a government based on a constitution which is based on the teachings of Jesus.

A descendant of Mohammed told Jay Garner that the best hope for a country was a constitution based on the teachings of Jesus, because basically those teachings of Jesus are the only way in which a nation can allow freedom of religion.

No matter which religion or agnosticism, atheism, whatever religion, it is not going to be able to truly allow freedom of religion unless it is based on the teachings of Jesus. And that is what this insightful descendant of Mohammed told retired General Jay Garner.

So we get to 2017, a hearing on the same day Comey testified, this appointee nominee by President Trump, Russell Vought, a great man, a fine man, had his Christian beliefs perverted, twisted into something that was represented to be hateful. It is a religion based on the love of God and the love of His Son that would give his life for others.

Speaker SANDERS said: “Let me get to this issue that has bothered me and bothered many other people. And that is in the piece that I referred to that
Mr. Vought replied: "Absolutely not, Senator. I am a Christian, and I believe in a Christian set of principles based on my faith. That post, as I stated in the questionnaire to this committee, was to defend my alma mater, Wheaton College, a Christian school that has a statement of faith that includes the centrality of Jesus Christ for salvation, and . . ."

Senator Sanders interrupts: "I apologize. Forgive me, we just don't have a lot of time. Do you believe people in the Muslim religion stand condemned? Is that your view?"

Mr. Vought replied: "Again, Senator. I am a Christian, and I wrote that piece in accordance with the statement of faith at Wheaton College."

Senator Sanders said: "I understand that. I don't know how many Muslims there are in America. Maybe a couple million. And I wrote that all those people stand condemned? What about Jew? Do they stand condemned, too?"

Mr. Vought replied: "Senator, I'm a Christian. . . ."

Senator Sanders at this point is shouting: "I understand you are a Christian, but this country are made of people who are not just—I understand that Christianity is the majority religion, but there are other people of different religions in this country and around the world. In your judgment, do you think that people who are not Christians are going to be condemned?"

Mr. Vought replied: "Thank you for the question. As a Christian, I believe that all individuals are made in the image of God and are worthy of dignity and respect regardless of their religious beliefs. I believe that, as a Christian, that is how I should treat all individuals . . . ."

Senator Sanders responded: "You think your statement that you put into that publication, they do not know God because they rejected Jesus Christ, His Son, and they stand condemned, do you think that is respectful of other religious views?"

Mr. Vought said: "Senator, I wrote a post based on being a Christian and attending a Christian school that has a statement of faith that speaks clearly in regard to the centrality of Jesus Christ in salvation."

Senator Sanders said: "I would simply say, Mr. Chairman, that this nominee is really not someone who this country is supposed to be about."

And that came from—the quotes came from an article in the National Review quoting from the hearing itself.

That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, this may be the low point for hope in America when a sitting Senator condemns someone who is simply quoting from the teachings of Jesus, teachings that even a descendant of Mohammed knew was helpful in creating a great nation. We have come a long way from the hope that abound within the founders of this Republic that those who fought to bring about the end of the horrendous, hideous practice of slavery, where human beings treated brother and sister human beings with chains in bondage. And that we come to a point that I feared—and I brought it up when hate crime legislation was discussed—that the day would come when the religion of the world based on the love of God and the love of Jesus Christ would be twisted to the point that it would be called hateful.

Jesus said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me."

He is either a liar or a lunatic or he is exactly who he said he was. But that is not hateful. It is not hateful to believe in a religion where you want to share the joy and the hope that comes from it.

One of the results, maybe it is a—not a result, but more of an unfortunate situation that exists. When you take away the hope of the Christian religion, condemn people for believing Jesus is the hope, as he said he was, or as our friend, the late Chuck Colson, pointed out: "Our hope is not going to arrive on Air Force One."

He believed the hope was in Jesus.

And now we have someone who is declared totally inappropriate to be a government official because he believes the teachings of Jesus. In fact, someone—I know I have Jewish friends who have said: I thought Christians blamed Jews for killing Jesus. Well, the truth is that anyone who is a true Christian, if they blame Jews or anyone else for the death of Jesus, they are not Christian. They don't understand the belief that Jesus died for me and for anyone who has done wrong in this life.

So it is a sad day, it is a sad week, and it is a sad month to look how far we have come from the hope that was once so prevalent. Now we are in a society where suicide is rampant—144 drug overdoses a day, and that doesn't count all of the suicides by veterans and Active Duty military.

Christianity is a religion of love. May God grant wisdom to any Senator who thinks otherwise.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STIVERs (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today through June 29 on account of his duties with the Ohio National Guard.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow.

Wednesday, June 28, 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:

H. Res. 3003. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Selected Acquisition Reports for the Chemical Demilitarization-Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives and Ballistic Missile Defense System programs, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432(b)(1); Public Law 97-252, Sec 1107(a)(1); (96 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 3004. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting an additional legislative proposal for the proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Natural Resources, and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 414. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-195). Referred to the House Calendar.
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

H.R. 3064. A bill to develop an antiterrorism strategy, establish Offices for Anticorruption in the Department of Defense, Department of State, and United States Agency for International Development, 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.

H.R. 3065. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to Congress a report on the national security implications of sourcing of industrial and manufacturing capacities to locations outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3066. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program to protect United States assets against foreign agents; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. WEBSTER, Ms. BUCKS of Indiana, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 3067. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish certain criminal violations for various aspects of harassment using the interstate telecommunications system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the research credit for domestic manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. WEINEN, Mr. LOEHRACK, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3069. A bill to provide for guidance relating to the management of Department of Defense extramural funding to ensure affordability and competence in critical capabilities areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 3070. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to clarify the definition of a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. REESE, Ms. ROSE, and Mr. GUTTELMAN):

H.R. 3071. A bill to require executive agencies to consider equipment rental in any cost-effectiveness analysis for equipment acquisition and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. STIVER):

H.R. 3072. A bill to increase from $10,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000 the threshold figures for current Armed Services authorizations; the increased penalties for cocaine offenses where the cocaine involved is cocaine base, to reinstate reentry requirements and fines for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CURBelo of Florida (for himself, Ms. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GELALVA, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SUOZI, Mr. O’ROURKE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHMAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

H.R. 3073. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Mental Health Awareness Semipostal Stamp, to the Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3074. A bill to reclassify certain low-level felonies as misdemeanors, to eliminate the increased penalties for cocaine offenses where the cocaine involved is cocaine base, to reinstate reentry requirements and fines for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGOS (for himself, Mr. O’HALLERAN, and Ms. ROSEN):

H.R. 3075. A bill to transfer $4.7 billion, United States Code, to increase adjustments of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 3076. A bill to amend section 502a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Privacy Act) to require agencies to accept electronic release forms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. WALORSKI):

H.R. 3077. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve the retirement earnings test, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIHUEN (for himself, Mr. MOUTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. GOTTMAN):

H.R. 3078. A bill to extend quarterly reports on confirmed ballistic missile launches from Iran and imposition of sanctions in connection with the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONVERSE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GELALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. RICE of Mississippi, Mr. JAYAFAL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOUTON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHENBERG, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GORAR, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LABRAF, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 3079. A bill to reduce by one-half of one percent the discretionary budget authority of the Department of Defense for a fiscal year if the financial statement of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year does not receive a qualified or unqualified audit opinion by an external independent auditor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 3080. A bill to provide installation reutilization authority for arsenals, depots, and plants; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUIJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3081. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period in the disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (for himself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. LANGMEIR, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 3082. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide the Secretary of Education to translate the FAFSA into foreign languages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3083. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the preparation of career and technical education teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PERACCHI (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. LUIJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. RAY LUIJAN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3084. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to American military personnel who fought in defense of Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, Wake Island, and the Philippine Archipelago from December 7, 1941, and May 10, 1942, and who died or were imprisoned by the Japanese military in the Philippines, Japan, Korea, Manchuria, Wake Island, and Guam from April 9, 1942, until September 2, 1945, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service to their country; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. BRUNETTA, and Ms. EDDIE Bazzoc H-JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3086. A bill to improve understanding and forecasting of space weather events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Foreign Affairs, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provision as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENIBRENNER (for himself and Mr. LOPUREN):

H.R. 3087. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain Tibet- ans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

71. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13, affirming the desirability of the designation of the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument under the Antiquities Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

72. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7, urging the Congress to fully preserve the beneficial effects which many older Nevadans have come to rely upon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 3088. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to require one-stop delivery systems under such Act to offer services through internet websites and to direct the Secretary of Labor to develop standards and best practices for such websites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 411. A resolution adjusting the amount of the Members' Representational Allowance; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 412. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BRUTLER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. PINKEE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BUMFFMAN, and Mr. ISA):

H. Res. 413. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July as "American Grown Flower Month"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 416. A resolution recognizing the Muslim holy month of Ramadan, commending a month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and extending best wishes to Muslims in the United States and across the globe for a joyful and thoughtful observance of Eid al-Fitr; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Res. 417. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of civic education and civic involvement programs in the elementary and secondary schools of the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3064. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8. By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H. R. 3065. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8. By Mrs. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3067. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3068. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H. R. 3069. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Mr. McHENRY:

H. R. 3070. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CUSTER of Georgia:

H. R. 3071. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 which grants to the Congress power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department of officer thereof.

By Mr. CLAY:

H. R. 3072. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. By Mr. CURRELO of Florida:

H. R. 3073. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H. R. 3074. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Mr. GALLEGOS:

H. R. 3075. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H. R. 3076. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H. R. 3077. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Mr. LEE:

H. R. 3078. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Mr. LOEBBACH:

H. R. 3080. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H. R. 3081. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H. R. 3082. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H. R. 3083. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Ms. PAULSEN:

H. R. 3084. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H. R. 3085. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, clause 8, section 6, Congress in empowered “to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard or Weights and Measures”

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H. R. 3086. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. SENSENBRINNER:

H. R. 3087. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H. R. 3088. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H. R. 22: Mrs. NEXUM.
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. 60: Mr. Meadows.
H.R. 15: Mr. Ellison and Mr. Gene Green of Texas.
H.R. 31: Ms. Schakowsky and Mrs. Demings.
H.R. 43: Ms. Stefanik, Mr. Newhouse, and Mrs. Comstock.
H.R. 135: Mr. Lamborn and Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia.
H.R. 161: Ms. Bass, Mr. Allen, Mr. Young of Iowa, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Cole, Ms. McCollum, and Mr. Stivers.
H.R. 185: Mr. Schneider, Mrs. Torres, Mr. Merks, and Mr. Suozzi.
H.R. 218: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina.
H.R. 257: Mr. Ellison and Mr. Evans.
H.R. 265: Ms. Lofgren.
H.R. 282: Mr. Garamendi.
H.R. 307: Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 313: Mr. Allen.
H.R. 318: Mr. Trott.
H.R. 346: Mr. Bost.
H.R. 349: Mr. Ellison.
H.R. 351: Mr. Zeldin.
H.R. 359: Mr. Donovan, Mr. Cartwright, and Mr. Cook.
H.R. 397: Mr. Cohen and Mr. Bacon.
H.R. 400: Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Delaney, Mr. Fortenberry, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mrs. Dingell, and Mr. Lipinski.
H.R. 405: Mr. Costa, Mr. Nadler, and Mr. Evans.
H.R. 407: Mr. Bilirakis.