



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2017

No. 204

House of Representatives

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

During these cold, early-darkening days, we ask Your special blessing upon those who labor in the Nation's Capitol.

Help the Members of the House and those of the Senate to act wisely and carefully in the important work they do. In the waning days of the session, may they continue to heed the voices of all their constituents, both those who voted for them and those who did not.

May all that is done within the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANCE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

CONGRATULATING FOOTBALL STATE CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate three State high school football champions in New Jersey's Seventh Congressional District: Westfield High School, North Hunterdon High School, and Somerville High School.

Westfield High School finished its year with its third consecutive State championship and with its 37-consecutive-game winning streak intact. The North Hunterdon Lions won their division, and Somerville High School finished as State football champions with award-winning Coach Jeff Vanderbeek at the helm.

I congratulate the communities and families supporting our student athletes. I also congratulate all of the faculty and coaches who devote themselves to cultivating and nurturing the talent of these athletes.

Each of those public schools, in addition to athletic achievement, has also been recognized for academic achievement regularly across the Nation, highlighting that New Jersey's reputation of having among the best public schools in the Nation continues.

TAX POLICY LEAVES BEHIND NATIVE AMERICANS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as Republicans continue to rush their tax plan through both Houses of Congress, they leave behind tens of millions of Americans to give deficit-exploding tax breaks to the absolute wealthiest. They are also leaving behind some really important Americans: our Native American brothers and sisters.

For years, issues of taxation and how Federal tax policy impacts Tribal gov-

ernments have been the subject of discussion, and for those years that we have talked about the need for tax reform, there have been continuous promises made to Tribal governments that we will deal with these inequities, these issues of double taxation in Tribes.

For example, a Tribal member who gets an adoption through a Tribal court doesn't qualify for an adoption tax credit. That is just one example of the many ways that Federal tax policy does not anticipate or recognize Tribal governments. But they have been left behind again.

This bill should be written in a way that actually addresses the real problems in the Tax Code. It does not.

BILL OF RIGHTS DAY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to commemorate Bill of Rights Day. Initially, this was passed by Congress in August of 1941 as a joint resolution, signed by Franklin Delano Roosevelt on November 27, 1941, where, in his words: "I . . . do hereby designate December 15, 1941, as Bill of Rights Day. And I call upon the officials of the government, and upon the people of the United States, to observe the day by displaying the flag of the United States on public buildings and by meeting together for such prayers and such ceremonies as may seem to them appropriate."

The Bill of Rights was first introduced by James Madison, who later became the fourth President. Initially, 12 amendments were proposed. Two were not ratified. One did become ratified later on in compensation of Congress in 1992.

There were 14 original copies produced of the Bill of Rights at the time,

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H9903

one for each of the 13 States and one for the National Archives. Twelve of them survive today.

When Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed that proclamation on December 15, 1941, he had no way of knowing what was coming. Just 9 days later, those who have long enjoyed such privileges as we enjoy forget in time that men have died to win them. They come in time to take these rights for granted and to assume their protection is assured. We, however, have seen these privileges lost in other continents and other countries.

Indeed, prescient words for the time.

CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, in California, wildfires have become a year-round threat. Because of these fires, communities across our great State have suffered devastating loss of life and property.

Last year, in my district on the central coast of California, we had the most expensive fire in United States history, the Soberanes fire. This year, we have had some of the deadliest and costliest fires in California history in Napa and Sonoma. This week, we watch fires burn in the hills from Los Angeles and Santa Barbara to Oakland and Big Sur.

Governor Jerry Brown calls this “the new normal.” We should call it unacceptable, and we must do something. We must fully fund the cost of fire suppression. We must include California fire relief in this year’s disaster package. We must think outside the box when it comes to fire prevention and focus our efforts to better manage our forests in the future.

TRUCKERS’ ELECTRONIC TRACKING DEVICE

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, millions of American truck drivers helped elect President Trump last November, and I am calling on him to step in and give them a hand.

President Obama left office back in January, but a \$2 billion regulation that he wrote in 2015 to require electronic tracking devices be put in every truck in America is still scheduled to go into effect this Monday. Yes, an Obama regulation that shamefully seems to remain on the books is going into effect this Monday under a Republican Congress and White House.

The Department of Transportation can give a 90-day waiver for all truckers from this mandate, giving several waivers for specific industries, including one just this week. Instead of offering fairness and relief, they are picking winners and losers.

Millions of American truckers are pleading 24/7 for relief from this mandate using the hashtag #eldorme, but it has fallen on deaf ears at the Department of Transportation.

Mr. President, you call the shots in this administration. Please issue an executive order today and instruct the Department of Transportation to give all truckers relief from this mandate for 3 months. Don’t implement this colossal Obama mandate a week before Christmas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Members are advised to direct their remarks to the Chair.

NEWTOWN ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, on this day in 2012, we watched together in horror as news broke of a shooting in Newtown, Connecticut. Twenty innocent children and six brave educators were gunned down at Sandy Hook Elementary School.

In the 5 years since, this House has paused 40 times for moments of silence to recognize the victims of mass shootings. The names are now familiar: Emanuel AME, Pulse nightclub, Las Vegas, and Sutherland Springs.

Since Newtown, there have been more than 1,700 mass shooting events, nearly one every single day.

Across the country, there have been nearly 170,000 gun deaths—let me repeat that figure—170,000 gun deaths since Newtown.

But in those 5 years, this House has taken no significant action to improve our gun safety laws. We are not debating universal background checks or restricting assault weapons or even banning the bump stock used 2 months ago in Las Vegas, the worst mass shooting in our history.

I have met some of the parents of Newtown. We all grieve for them and their loss. But our moments of silence are not enough. The 26 who lost their lives deserve more. We must honor them with action.

I urge this House to end the obstruction and finally consider legislation that would improve safety for all of our communities.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the House is in the midst of historic tax reform. Now that the House and Senate have almost reached agreement, I would like to take a moment to express a few ideals that I hope will be guiding principles as we complete this process.

The final tax bill should cut taxes for all Americans while also retaining important incentives making homeownership, raising a family, and obtaining higher education possible.

Additionally, the bill should continue to uphold American values by encouraging our people to be generous and charitable.

The lowering of our corporate tax rates is critical. As a former business owner, I know firsthand the difficulty of the tax burden.

Most importantly, the bill must help working American families keep more of their hard-earned money.

I am confident that Congress will deliver on its promise to simplify the Tax Code and to cut taxes for all Americans. I know that this historic legislation will spur economic growth and prosperity.

A PARTISAN TAX BILL

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, how do you make a bad, partisan tax bill better? For my Republican colleagues, apparently that means cutting tax rates for the wealthy even more than the original bill, as we have heard over the last couple days.

Where is the fairness for average, hardworking Americans?

Medical expenses are no longer deductible.

Student loans and tuition waivers are no longer deductible.

Interest is not deductible for families, but it is for business.

The mortgage interest deduction is reduced.

State and local taxes are not fully deductible.

Small businesses don’t get the same tax cuts that big businesses do.

No help for capital gains.

No help for dividends, advertising, or entertaining.

Other business expense is no longer deductible.

Renewable energy tax credits go away.

Private activity bonds that help veterans and many others are also gone.

Worst of all, individual tax cuts flip back and are rescinded in a few years, while corporations go on forever.

Where is the fairness for seniors, for our youth, for our families, and for small businesses? Not in this partisan tax bill.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL MISSOURI’S WOMEN’S SOCCER TEAM

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Central Missouri’s women’s soccer team on winning the NCAA Division II national championship. This is the Jennies first NCAA women’s soccer national championship in program history.

The Jennies completed the season with a perfect record of 26 and 0, making them only the third women’s Division II national champion to finish a

season with a perfect record. The team's 26 wins set a new single-season NCAA Division II women's record.

In addition to winning the national championship, the Jennies had five athletes join the Division II Conference Commissioners Association All-American teams.

The team's outstanding accomplishments mark a great milestone for the University of Central Missouri's athletics department and its head coach of 11 years, Lewis Theobald.

Please join me in congratulating the Central Missouri Jennies on this momentous achievement.

OBSERVING THE SANDY HOOK ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today on the anniversary of the tragic shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School.

On December 14, 2012, Newtown, Connecticut, lost 20 innocent children—most, 6 years old—to gun violence. We also lost six brave teachers and staff who did everything possible to protect the students in their care.

As a father, I cannot imagine anything more painful than the loss of a child. As an American, I struggle to imagine a more horrific tragedy than that which happened in Newtown.

Mr. Speaker, many of us thought this tragedy would fairly move the needle on policy. That did not happen. Just last week, the House passed major legislation loosening gun safety laws.

I want to remind my colleagues in the majority that it is not too late to act. We cannot bring back those whom we have lost, but we can and must ensure that more families do not face the pain that Newtown families faced.

I urge my colleagues in the majority to join this side of the aisle in supporting commonsense gun safety reform. Thoughts and prayers are not enough. Help us to end this scourge.

□ 0915

PRIVACY NOTIFICATION TECHNICAL CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 657, I call up the bill (H.R. 2396) to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to update the exception for certain annual notices provided by financial institutions, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 657, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2396

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 "Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act".

SEC. 2. EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL NOTICE REQUIREMENT.

Section 503 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6803) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) ADDITIONAL EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A financial institution that has not changed its policies and practices with regard to disclosing nonpublic personal information from the policies and practices that were disclosed in the most recent disclosure sent to consumers in accordance with this section shall not be required to provide an annual disclosure under this section if—

"(A) the financial institution makes its current policy available to consumers on its website and via mail upon written request sent to a designated address identified for the purpose of requesting the policy or upon telephone request made using a toll free consumer service telephone number; and

"(B) the financial institution conspicuously notifies consumers of the availability of the current policy, including—

"(i) with respect to consumers who are entitled to a periodic billing statement, a message on or with each periodic billing statement; and

"(ii) with respect to consumers who are not entitled to a periodic billing statement, through other reasonable means such as on its website or with other written communication, including electronic communication, sent to the consumer.

"(2) TREATMENT OF MULTIPLE POLICIES.—If a financial institution maintains more than one set of policies described under paragraph (1) that vary depending on the consumer's account status or State of residence, the financial institution may comply with the website posting requirement in paragraph (1)(A) by posting all of such policies to the public section of the financial institution's website, with instructions for choosing the applicable policy."

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

After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 115-462, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2396, the Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act, which is an important bill cosponsored by a bipartisan group of Members of the House and a bill that was approved by the Financial Services Committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 2-1, quite literally: 40-20. Additionally, this bill builds upon an issue that has a long track record of strong bipartisan support in Congress.

I thank Congressman TROTT, a member of the Financial Services Committee, for introducing this legislation and for leading congressional efforts to modernize the privacy notification process for consumers and to provide regulatory relief for our struggling financial institutions.

There is a serious issue, Mr. Speaker, with the sheer volume, complexity, weight, load, and cost of the regulatory burden upon, particularly, our struggling community financial institutions, our community banks, and credit unions.

It is no one specific regulation, but the totality, the combination of them all, are causing us to lose a community bank or credit union a day in America. As we lose them, our constituents lose their opportunity for credit opportunities to share in their version of the American Dream. It makes it more costly, more difficult for them to finance someone to go to college, for them to perhaps buy an auto to get them to work, or perhaps capitalize their own small business. So we frequently hear from our community financial institutions.

I heard from a community banker in Nebraska, not long ago, who explained: "I have explained about how things have changed since I started in banking 10 years ago. In efforts for our government to make things more fair or easier for consumers, it has actually become increasingly more difficult for people to obtain favorable loan terms and, not to mention, obtain loans in a timely manner."

I heard from a banker in Alabama about real estate regulations, who said: They were intended to help customers, but it is actually hurting them. As wait times increase and banks are no longer offering certain products, not all of these people can be protected from themselves, no matter how many rules and regs the banks follow to protect them.

I heard from a community banker in Utah, who said: I have been in banking for 29 years. In that time, the regulatory burden has increased dramatically. The ability to help customers and small businesses succeed in rural America has been greatly hampered by regulation intended to protect the customer from Wall Street banks, but in the process, smaller community banks, such as mine, have been caught in the fray or broad brush of regulations.

A banker in Oklahoma said that, because of Dodd-Frank regulations: "We no longer offer/purchase house loans."

The list goes on and on and on.

So this is one regulation that simply says: under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, if a financial institution doesn't change their privacy notification, they don't have to send out a piece of paper annually—a piece of paper like this that 99 percent of the time customers throw away and don't read in the first place.

Don't take my word for it. Professor Adam Levitin, who is a frequent Democrat witness before the House Financial Services Committee testified before our committee: "One thing that I think should go the way of the dodo bird are the Gramm-Leach-Bliley privacy notices. Nobody reads them."

That is a Democrat witness, Mr. Speaker. It is not a Republican witness. It is a Democrat witness.

He goes on to say: "There's no reason anyone should—even the large banks—should be spending money on giving these notices."

But that is not what this bill does. It just simply says, if a financial institution does not change their privacy notification, they don't have to send out a paper notification that creates more costs, that gets passed on to the customer, and that nobody reads in the first place.

Number one, it is important regulatory relief for our financial institutions. But it is also important when we think in terms of the sheer volume of financial disclosures that our constituents receive.

This goes back to the fact, Mr. Speaker, if you disclose everything, you effectively disclose nothing because you overwhelm the customer.

So we must vigilantly ensure that our constituents are receiving effective disclosure, not just voluminous disclosure, but effective disclosure of material items written in clear, understandable, common language. Again, not voluminous disclosure of irrelevant items written in legalese and fine print. That doesn't do anybody any good, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership. The bill that he is bringing today has earned bipartisan support because it is a simple technical correction to clarify that customers have to be physically mailed an annual privacy notice only when the privacy policies have actually changed from the previous year.

Importantly, this bill was carefully crafted to maintain and retain current privacy and opt-out policies and does not exempt any financial services provider from an initial privacy notice, nor does it allow any loopholes for an institution to avoid issuing an updated notice.

In fact, this legislation, Mr. Speaker, does not change privacy provisions at all, just how they are delivered. Let me repeat: the legislation does not change privacy provisions at all, just how they are delivered.

Again, Mr. TROTT's bill has strong bipartisan support. It provides a simple

and flexible approach that modernizes privacy notification to the benefit of our customers and to the benefit of our financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure and urge every Member to vote for it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 2396, the Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act.

Contrary to the bill's title, this bill is far from a technical clarification. So I want to be very clear about what this bill would actually do.

H.R. 2396 would reduce the meaningful and clear disclosures that financial institutions must currently provide to their customers every year, even if those companies share their customers' nonpublic personal information broadly with nonaffiliated third-party companies.

Unlike other privacy bills Congress has considered, this bill comes with no guardrails whatsoever to discourage the company from broadly sharing consumer-sensitive personal information.

While the bill provides several alternative mechanisms to deliver privacy reminders, one option would result in the customer receiving no written disclosure at all.

The current annual privacy notices serve as a reminder describing a customer's right to restrict the sharing of their nonpublic, personal information to nonaffiliated third parties and information about how to exercise this right if they so choose.

This privacy right was created in the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, which was signed into law in 1999. I served on the conference committee, so I know firsthand that the initial and annual privacy notices in the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act were enacted partly in response to public concerns about the sale of personal data for marketing purposes that were highlighted in a number of legal actions brought by State attorneys general at the time.

In 1999, for example, there was a settlement between the Minnesota attorney general and U.S. Bank resolving allegations that the bank misrepresented its practice of selling highly personal and confidential information about its customers to telemarketers.

These concerns are just as relevant today. In fact, I find the timing of the consideration of this bill very troubling, as it is being brought to the floor just months after the massive Equifax data breach.

In the Equifax breach, 145.5 million Americans had their Social Security numbers, dates of birth, and other sensitive financial and personally identifiable information exposed to thieves.

Equifax is not the only major credit bureau to experience a large data breach. About 2 years ago, Experian, one of the other three major credit bureaus in this country, had a breach

that exposed millions of T-Mobile customers' information.

These breaches are on top of a long list of other breaches we have seen at other companies where sensitive customer information was compromised. Consumers have called on their Representatives in Congress to enact tougher laws that would strengthen their control over their personal information, not weaken it.

Consumers are increasingly wary about the unfettered sharing of their personal information by financial firms to nonaffiliated third parties that can result in consumer profiling, fraud, aggressive target marketing, and identity theft.

Unfortunately, this bill goes in the opposite direction. Instead of working to strengthen consumers' privacy protections, H.R. 2396 would ease obligations on financial institutions to provide notices to their customers describing their privacy practices and policies, and importantly, fully explaining to these customers their right to restrict the sharing of their information to nonaffiliated third parties.

This is commonly referred to as a consumer's right to opt out of having a financial institution share their information to companies that are outside of their common corporate structure or organization. These nonaffiliated third-party companies are generally not ones that the consumers have an existing relationship with, meaning that they have not received a product or service from the company in the past.

The proponents of H.R. 2396 may say the bill has nothing to do with Equifax, or that Equifax would not be covered, if the amendment being offered later today is agreed to. But the bill would roll back privacy notice requirements for many financial institutions that engage in vehicle financing, including megabanks like Wells Fargo, even if they broadly share their customers' nonpublic, personal information with other companies.

□ 0930

Let's discuss Wells Fargo and their auto lending practices and their work with nonaffiliated third parties. Earlier this year, the Democratic staff of the Financial Services Committee produced a report on Wells Fargo's egregious misconduct, which has consulted in extensive consumer harm.

For example, Wells Fargo charged over 570,000 consumers for automobile insurance policies they did not need, which resulted in at least 20,000 customers, including Active Duty servicemembers, having their vehicles inappropriately repossessed. These auto insurance policies were provided through a nonaffiliated third-party company called National General Insurance.

The bank has also demonstrated a clear pattern of misusing millions of their customers' information to open accounts in their name without their permission.

So why should Congress consider relaxing the privacy requirements for a recidivist bank like Wells Fargo?

Let me also address arguments that suggest customers don't read these notices anyway. That is a quote that we hear oftentimes.

As I have discussed, I think consumers are paying closer attention now after the Equifax incident. Proponents say that a company posting a link on their website isn't so bad, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau allowed for it.

But the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau provided an alternative to the annual privacy notices for companies that do not share data in ways that trigger consumers' opt-out rights under the law. Over the last decade, Congress has heard repeatedly from banks and credit unions that if a company does not share personal information with an unaffiliated third party that allows consumers to opt out from having it shared, and if they do not change their privacy policies, they should be exempt from the annual notice requirements. In those instances, the customer does not have the ability to opt out of having the information shared.

After several years of research and debate, we made that targeted change in the last Congress. Since then, other companies, specifically captive auto finance companies, have made the case they should have more flexibility satisfying the annual notice requirement because they have a unique and close relationship with automobile dealers they work with that still requires them to send the annual notice.

This unaffiliated third-party relationship triggers a consumer's right under the law to opt out and not have their information shared. I offered an amendment in committee that would have granted this targeted relief, but it was rejected.

So, while I appreciate that H.R. 2396 provides flexibility to captive auto finance companies, the bill is not limited to them and goes much, much further. Mr. Speaker, over 30 consumer, community, privacy, and civil rights groups have publicly opposed this bill, including U.S. PIRG, and so do I. This is an area where more study is needed before policymakers craft sweeping changes.

The bottom line is that I believe we should not open the door too widely at this time to give this same degree of flexibility to all and every financial institution, including recidivist banks like Wells Fargo.

Furthermore, there needs to be more, not less, privacy protections and consumer control relating to personal information following the massive data breach at Equifax this year.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I urge opposition to H.R. 2396, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that I listened very carefully. It was a fas-

inating speech from the ranking member. Too bad it has absolutely nothing to do with the bill that is before us. Ms. WATERS was speaking of privacy policies. The bill has to do with notification.

But I do agree with the ranking member that we do need more effective disclosure. In H.R. 2396, we require financial institutions to make their current policies available on its website at all times. That actually improves disclosure. The only people who can be for the status quo are those who own paper mills so that we can waste more paper.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), the sponsor of this legislation and an outstanding, hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, for yielding me time and for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2396, the Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. CLAY, for his leadership on this bill. It has been a pleasure to work across the aisle on this commonsense measure with someone for whom I have such great respect.

This bill makes a simple technical correction to Federal law. Under the legislation, financial institutions are no longer required to mail duplicative and confusing privacy notifications every year when no changes have been made to the policy. Privacy information must be made available on the company website, and financial institutions must send paper copies to consumers upon request.

Under this legislation, companies are required to provide a toll-free number so customers can request the policy at any time.

Additionally, consumers will be reminded of their right to opt out of information-sharing when they receive their bills. If you are like me, you throw away these documents. They are confusing, dense, and full of fine-print legalese. I can never tell if anything has changed, and I am a lawyer.

This legislation will ensure that consumers are alerted of changes and will no longer be inundated with junk mail.

This measure will also help companies provide better service to their customers. Some companies spend over \$2 million annually on these mailings—money that could be put to better use making more car loans or perhaps even lowering the cost of their product.

During a recent hearing on this bill, a community banker told us about a similar provision that had passed for banks last year. He spoke about how positive it had been for his community and his customers. He took the money he would have spent on postage and paper and gave it back to the community in the form of more loans. This, in turn, helped people start new busi-

nesses, create more jobs, and even resulted in a few mortgages being made to purchase new homes.

I believe every Member should support getting rid of outdated, unnecessary regulations. This bill will allow those who lend money when we buy a new car to realize the same savings and efficiencies as banks. Not only will this legislation reduce unnecessary costs, it will improve transparency and accountability, and ensure individuals better understand when a company has actually changed its privacy policy.

A few minutes ago, the ranking member spoke in opposition to this bill. I am not sure what bill she read, but it was not H.R. 2396. The bill in no way puts consumers' privacy information at risk. It in no way denies consumers important privacy protections. It in no way has anything to do with Equifax. It has nothing to do with Wells Fargo. It has nothing to do with servicemembers having their cars improperly repossessed. It has nothing to do with consumer profiling. It has nothing to do with fraud. And—she didn't bring it up—it has nothing to do with the President's tax returns.

This bill should have been on the suspension calendar. There are only two groups that can oppose this bill: the United States Postal Service, because it is going to mean less business for them; and, as the chairman mentioned, paper mills.

The ranking member did, in fact, offer an amendment. The amendment was so convoluted that if I was a bank, a financial institution, or a car lender, I would prefer to do the mailings, because the amendment, at the end of the day, was really just a haven for class action lawyers to file frivolous lawsuits when someone didn't put something on their website exactly as outlined in the amendment.

This is a pro-consumer piece of legislation. I have letters from the American Financial Services Association, the National Bankers Association, the American Bankers Association, the Consumer Bankers Association, and the National Association of Minority Automobile Dealers. I also have a letter signed by the Ford Motor Credit Company, General Motors Financial Company, Nissan Motor Acceptance Corporation, Toyota Financial Services, and VW Credit in support of H.R. 2396.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD these letters.

AMERICAN FINANCIAL
SERVICES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, April 20, 2017.

Hon. DAVE TROTT,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. TROTT: The American Financial Services Association (AFSA) supports the "Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act," which amends the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA) to update the exception for certain annual notices provided by financial institutions.

The GLBA requires financial institutions (FIs) to issue privacy notices to consumers if the FIs share consumers' non-public personal information with affiliates or third parties.

Such disclosures are required to occur when a relationship is first established between the FI and the consumer, as well as annually in written form as long as the relationship continues, even if no changes to the disclosure policies have occurred.

Annual privacy notices without policy changes are redundant, unnecessary, and confusing. They contain several pages of small-print legalese, which have little value for consumers. In fact, they are largely discarded—unread—immediately upon receipt. However, producing and mailing these notices costs millions of dollars.

In the fall of 2014, the CFPB finalized a rule allowing FIs to post their annual privacy notices online instead of delivering them individually if they meet a series of conditions, including not sharing the consumers' nonpublic personal information with unaffiliated third parties. In December 2015, Congress went further by enacting an outright exemption from the mailing requirement for FIs that: (1) do not share non-public personal information about consumers to unaffiliated third parties, and (2) have not changed its disclosure policies and practices since the most recent disclosure was sent to consumers.

Unfortunately, certain FIs cannot take advantage of the exemption. We ask Congress to pass the Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act to level the playing field for all FIs. If a financial institution's privacy policy has not materially changed, the institution should be permitted to satisfy the intent of GLBA by delivering its privacy notice through an electronic medium, or by mail upon request.

Sincerely,

BILL HIMPLER,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, December 12, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM LACY CLAY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVID TROTT,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES CLAY AND TROTT: On behalf of the National Bankers Association (NBA), I write to express our member banks' support for H.R. 2396, the Privacy Notification Technical Corrections Act. The NBA is the nation's leading trade organization for the country's minority and women-owned depository institutions. We write in support of H.R. 2396 because our member banks believe updating the delivery of privacy notices should be modernize and reflective of the technological choices available to institutions and customers. As you are aware, the CFPB and Congress have made changes to the privacy notification process in 2014 and 2015. These changes excluded specific financial institutions and we believe a simple method for alternative delivery for these companies is warranted.

Producing and mailing privacy notices costs millions of dollars. Eliminating the requirement would reduce the cost of delivering financial services, save paper and discontinue this annual nuisance. At the same time, it would also make the mailings more significant to the consumer because they would only come after a change in policy. The primary function of the annual notice is to remind consumers of their right to opt out of information-sharing for marketing purposes, but it is not obvious that mailing a paper disclosure is the most effective or reliable medium for accomplishing this objective.

H.R. 2396 is a sensible and balanced approach that enjoys broad bipartisan support, that we believe addresses concerns shared by our bankers regarding the need for modernization in the delivery of privacy noti-

cations. We commend you for your leadership on this important issue, and we would urge your colleagues to support this legislation.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL A. GRANT,
President, National Bankers Association.

H.R. 2396, the Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act, a bipartisan bill introduced by Rep. David Trott (MI) and Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee Ranking Member William Lacy Clay Jr. (MO) and the substitute language, would simplify the notice requirements for financial institutions that have not changed their privacy policies. In addition to the relief provided by the FAST Act for financial institutions that only share information within the statutory exceptions, it would create a simple disclosure mechanism using the Internet for financial institutions that have not changed their privacy practices. The ABA supports H.R. 2396.

H.R. 2706, the Financial Institution Customer Protection Act. This legislation, as introduced by House Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee Chairman Blaine Luetkemeyer would dictate that federal banking agencies could not request nor order a financial institution to terminate a banking relationship unless the regulator has material reason. The legislation further states that account termination requests or orders would be required to be made in writing and rely on information other than reputational risk. We thank Chairman Luetkemeyer for his attention to this issue as he well knows that banks are in the business of providing financial services for law-abiding customers, and they share a common goal with law enforcement of maintaining the integrity of the payments system. If there is reasonable concern regarding a customer, it works best when banks work together with our regulatory agencies and law enforcement. This legislation supports that concept. The ABA supports H.R. 2706.

H.R. 2954, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act. This legislation, as introduced by Rep. Tom Emmer (MN), would provide community banks with relief from compliance burdens that are ill-suited and unnecessary for community banks.

Specifically, the bill exempts small banks and credit unions from new reporting requirements of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) if they are lenders that have originated 1,000 or fewer closed-end mortgages in each of the two preceding calendar years or are lenders that have originated 2,000 or fewer open-end lines of credit (such as a typical home equity loan) in each of the two preceding calendar years. Additionally, the bill repeals the HMDA amendments included in the Dodd-Frank Act and withdraws the CFPB's rule to impose the new and modified HMDA data points scheduled to take effect in January of next year.

The pending HMDA changes were imposed after the financial crisis. Although well-intentioned, the new reporting requirements were overly broad in their coverage and have the potential to add significant cost and regulatory burden, as well as privacy concerns for customers, to small institutions which have an excellent track record of fairly and honestly serving their customers' needs.

So great is the cost of compliance with these new regulations that many smaller banks may be forced to reconsider their ability to continue to make mortgage and other covered loans. H.R. 2954 provides needed relief to keep more lending options available in the markets that these banks serve. The ABA supports H.R. 2954.

H.R. 3299, THE "PROTECTING CONSUMERS' ACCESS TO CREDIT ACT OF 2017"

The decision by the Second Circuit Court in the Madden v. Midland Funding, LLC case undermined a long-standing legal principle, the "valid-when-made" doctrine, which establishes that if a loan is valid when it is made with respect to its interest rate then it cannot become invalid or unenforceable when assigned to another party. CBA strongly supports H.R. 3329 that solidifies the "valid-when-made" doctrine, which has been a cornerstone of U.S. banking law for over 100 years and prevent uncertainty for financial institutions.

H.R. 2706, THE "FINANCIAL INSTITUTION CUSTOMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017"

CBA strongly supports H.R. 2706, the "Financial Institution Customer Protection Act," that would require federal banking regulatory agencies to establish requirements for the termination of bank accounts and prohibit federal banking regulators from formally or informally suggesting, requesting, or ordering a depository institution to terminate a customer account except in circumstances affecting the security of our country or specific illegal activity.

H.R. 2396, THE "PRIVACY NOTIFICATION TECHNICAL CLARIFICATION ACT"

CBA supports H.R. 2396, the Privacy Notification Technical Correction Act, to reduce unnecessary paperwork by streamlining the reporting of bank privacy policies. Specifically, H.R. 2396 would relieve a bank of its annual privacy policy notice requirement if it has not changed its policies and practices, makes its current policy publically available, notifies customers of the availability of the notice on periodic billing statements or electronically, and posts all notices if it maintains more than one policy.

CONCLUSION

CBA stands ready to work with Congress to ensure a sound regulatory framework for financial institutions and promote competition in the financial marketplace. On behalf of the members of CBA, we appreciate the opportunity to submit this letter in support of a number of legislative proposals that would ease regulatory burdens and provide greater access to capital for consumers.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MINORITY AUTOMOBILE DEALERS,
Largo, MD, December 12, 2017.

Hon. DAVID TROTT,
Washington, DC.

Hon. WILLIAM LACY CLAY,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES TROTT AND CLAY: On behalf of the National Association of Minority Automobile Dealers (NAMAD), I write to express our members support for H.R. 2396, the Privacy Notification Technical Corrections Act. NAMAD is the nation's leading trade organization for the country's ethnic minority dealers. Our primary objective is to pursue the meaningful presence and participation of minority businesses and diverse employees across all aspects of the automotive economic sector, including:

Increasing the number of minority-owned dealerships in communities across America.

Advocating workplace and supplier diversity in the automotive manufacturing environment.

Supporting minority engagement in the automotive retail sales and service sectors.

We write in support of H.R. 2396 because it is a sensible and balanced approach that enjoys broad bipartisan support, which we believe addresses concerns related to modernizing the delivery of privacy notifications shared by the indirect auto financing companies that work with our dealers as well as

those dealers that also provide in-house financing of their own directly to consumers.

As you all know, the CFPB and Congress have made changes to the privacy notification process in 2014 and 2015. These changes excluded specific financial institutions and we believe a simple method for alternative delivery for these companies is warranted. Eliminating this requirement would reduce the cost of delivering financial services, save paper, and discontinue this annual nuisance. At the same time, it would also make the mailings more significant to the consumer because they would only come after a change in policy. The primary function of the annual notice is to remind consumers of their right to opt out of information-sharing for marketing purposes, but it is not obvious that mailing a paper disclosure is the most effective or reliable medium for accomplishing this objective.

NAMAD appreciates the commonsense solution proposed in H.R. 2396 as our members believe the delivery of privacy notices should be modernized and reflective of the current suite of technological choices available to institutions and customers. We commend you for your leadership on this important issue, and we would urge your colleagues to support this legislation.

Sincerely,

DAMON LESTER,
President.

—
DECEMBER 13, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The undersigned vehicle financial institutions (FIs), consisting of captive finance companies directly affiliated with a manufacturer and who engage in dealer facilitated financing or indirect auto financing, are pleased to express our support for H.R. 2396, the Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act. We thank Representatives David Trott (R-MI) and William Lacy Clay, Jr. (D-MO) for introducing commonsense legislation to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA) by updating the exception for certain annual notices provided by vehicle FIs to allow for an electronic delivery mechanism. We urge Members of Congress to support this important bipartisan legislation.

The GLBA requires FIs to issue privacy notices to consumers if the FIs share consumers' non-public personal information with affiliates or unaffiliated third parties. These disclosures are required to be sent annually by mail, even if no changes to the policy have occurred. Unfortunately, annual privacy notices without policy changes are redundant, unnecessary, and confusing to our consumers. They contain several pages of small-print legalese, which have little value for consumers. In fact, they are largely discarded—unread—immediately upon receipt. However, producing and mailing these notices is financially costly and time consuming.

For background, in December 2015, Congress provided for an outright exemption from the mailing requirement for FIs that: (1) do not share non-public personal information about consumers to unaffiliated third parties, and (2) have not changed disclosure policies and practices since the most recent disclosure was sent to consumers. Unfortunately, vehicle FIs remain unable to even utilize an electronic delivery mechanism for these notices.

We ask members of the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 2396 to help level the playing field. Specifically, if a vehicle FI's privacy policy has not materially changed, the company should be permitted to satisfy the intent of GLBA by delivering its privacy notice through an electronic medium, or by mail upon request. The legislation also includes a requirement that a

website address or toll-free number would be included in regular communications to consumers, such as monthly statements, as well as a description of where to locate procedures for the consumer to opt-out at any time. This would ensure that our consumers have ready access to privacy policies 365 days a year, including a paper notice if they choose to receive it.

We respectfully request your support in favor of H.R. 2396. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

FORD MOTOR CREDIT
COMPANY.
GENERAL MOTORS
FINANCIAL COMPANY, INC.
NISSAN MOTOR ACCEPTANCE
CORPORATION.
TOYOTA FINANCIAL
SERVICE.
VW CREDIT, INC.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, it will lower the costs for these companies, which will help consumers obtain more loans. This is a bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation with true community benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 2396.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee and the ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to thank Ranking Member WATERS for her extraordinary leadership on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2396, the Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act.

This bill claims to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to exempt vehicle finance companies from providing customers with annual privacy statements if the company hasn't released recently changed its policies and practices and the company makes its policy available online.

But this bill goes far beyond providing a small exemption and tailored flexibility to captives and vehicle finance companies, as the proponents of this bill will have you believe, and something I am really ready to support. This bill will exempt all financial institutions from providing customers with annual privacy notices.

As currently drafted, under the bill, financial institutions such as payday lenders, check cash servicers, and large institutions like Wells Fargo are exempted from providing annual privacy notices and are unconstrained on who they can share their customers' personal information with. This goes far beyond the original intent of the bill.

As we have seen in the growing number of data breaches at companies like Equifax, the protection of consumers' personal information is something Congress must consider carefully.

While I continue to think that it makes sense for captive auto finance companies to have some degree of flexibility, to the extent they only share customers' personal information with

the dealership, this legislation is far too broad.

Mr. Speaker, to that end, I ask my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his diligent work on this issue. I also thank Chairman HENSARLING from Texas for all of the leadership that he has given us throughout the year on this particular issue as well.

Several years ago, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and I introduced bipartisan legislation to require depository institutions to provide privacy information to their customers only if they had changed any policy or practice related to that customer's privacy. That bill was ultimately signed into law by President Obama. It has eliminated millions of confusing and often-ignored mailings that cost millions of dollars to produce each year.

While our legislation provided relief to banks and credit unions, it did not extend relief to other financial companies regulated under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act; namely, captive finance companies that operate in a manner largely similar to depository institutions.

The safeguards featured in the bill from the 114th Congress and codified into law are included in Mr. TROTT's bill. This relief will not be granted to a financial company that has changed its policies or practices with regard to disclosure of nonpublic personal information; only if it kept it the same.

There is also a requirement that the privacy notice must be made available to consumers in a variety of ways. Consumers will continue to have access to privacy notices through online resources and billing statements.

Requirements for financial institutions to release annual privacy notices to customers, even when no changes have been made, are both redundant and a waste of resources. With the passage of this bill, information included in these mailings would likely be more significant to the consumer because they would only come after a change in privacy policy.

Mr. Speaker, this is about accountability for the institution to their customer for holding that information. It is about access for the customer to their own information, with regards to privacy of it. A good example, as pointed out by the ranking member, was Equifax. But let's stop and talk about Equifax for a second.

□ 0945

What happened? They had, I believe, the largest breach in history, 150 million people.

Mr. Speaker, there is probably you and I and everybody in this room and probably the 12 people watching right

now who are affected by this, but I guarantee you that you and I and all in this room and the 12 people watching, nobody kept their privacy notices that were sent out last year, did we? They are all in file 13 somewhere, long forgotten, and all of the information in those privacy notices is forgotten about and not even probably read to begin with.

So it is important. The gentleman's bill here has in here that the privacy notice can be accessed online. And in the Equifax breach, anybody who was concerned could then go online and check for the privacy policies of Equifax and see what the policies were and whether they were adhered to by the company itself in notifying them, in taking care of their concerns, in reimbursing them. Whatever was in the notice was in that online notice as well. So it provided that access, which the consumer is not going to have in a piece of paper. That is probably going to get in file 13.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I was home last weekend, I got one of those things. You know what, I looked at it, opened the envelope, and said: "I don't want to read this." I threw it away. This is nonsense. This is a waste of time and resources.

And, in this situation with the Equifax breach, I think this bill points out the great things that can happen if you enact this legislation from the standpoint of allowing consumers to have access, 24/7, to the notifications and the privacy policies.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the gentleman from Michigan for picking up the mantle on this issue, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2396. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing the bill before us today.

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

I have heard, more than once, Members speaking for consumers, saying: These privacy notices are not that important. Nobody reads them. They throw them in the wastebasket.

Well, I don't know how Members would know that, and I don't think that we should be satisfied that consumers are being represented that way with indications that they don't really care about these notices and the opportunity to opt out so that their information won't be shared.

But let me tell you what consumers are saying to us. I have, here, letters that have been sent by consumer organizations that really do care about what is happening with this bill today, and I would like to share that information with you.

Let me just tell you who these consumer organizations are and whom they represent:

There is Americans for Financial Reform. Americans for Financial Reform is a nonpartisan and nonprofit coalition of more than 200 civil rights, consumer, labor, business, investor, faith-

based, civic, and community groups formed in the wake of the 2008 crisis, working to lay the foundation for a strong, stable, and ethical financial system, one that serves the economy and the Nation as a whole.

Then there is Allied Progress. Allied Progress is a consumer watchdog organization that uses hard-hitting research to stand up to Wall Street and powerful special interests and hold their allies in Congress and the White House accountable.

Then there is Center for Digital Democracy. The Center for Digital Democracy is recognized as one of the leading consumer protection and privacy organizations in the United States; and since its founding in 2001 and, prior to that, through its predecessor organization, the Center for Media Education, CDD has been at the forefront of research, public education, and advocacy, protecting consumers in the digital age.

Then there is Consumer Action. Through multilingual financial education materials, community outreach, and issue-focused advocacy, Consumer Action empowers underrepresented consumers, nationwide, to assert their rights in the marketplace and to financially prosper.

There is the Consumer Federation of America. The Consumer Federation of America is an association of nonprofit consumer organizations that was established way back in 1968 to advance consumer interests through research, advocacy, and education. Today, nearly 300 of these groups participate in the federation and govern it through their representatives on the organization's board of directors. CFA is a research, advocacy, education, and service organization.

Then there is Consumer Watchdog. Consumer Watchdog is a nonprofit organization dedicated to providing an effective voice for taxpayers and consumers in an era when special interests dominate public discourse, government, and politics, and they describe themselves as deploying an in-house team of public interest lawyers, policy experts, strategists, and grassroots activists to expose, confront, and change corporate and political injustice in every way, every day, saving Americans billions of dollars and improving countless lives. For decades, Consumer Watchdog has been the Nation's most aggressive consumer advocate, taking on politicians of both parties and the special interests that fund them.

Then there is the National Association of Consumer Advocates. The National Association of Consumer Advocates is a nonprofit association of more than 1,500 attorneys and consumer advocates committed to representing consumers' interests. Our members, they say, are private and public sector attorneys, legal services attorneys, law professors, and law students whose primary focus is the protection and representation of consumers. They have represented hundreds of thousands of

consumers victimized by fraudulent, abusive, and predatory business practices.

As a national organization fully committed to promoting justice for consumers, NACA's members and their clients are actively engaged in promoting a fair and open marketplace that forcefully protects the rights of consumers, particularly those of modest means. NACA also has a charitable and educational fund incorporated under 501(c)(3).

There is another very prominent consumer organization, the National Consumer Law Center, working on behalf of low-income clients. Since 1969, the nonprofit National Consumer Law Center has used its expertise in consumer law and energy policy to work for consumer justice and economic security for low-income and other disadvantaged people, including older adults in the United States. This organization's expertise includes policy analysis and advocacy, consumer law and energy publications, litigation, expert witness services, and training and advice for advocates.

This organization works with nonprofit and legal services organizations, private attorneys, policymakers, and Federal and State government and courts across the Nation to stop exploitative practices, help financially stressed families build and retain wealth, and advance economic fairness.

Then there is Privacy Times. Privacy Times is the leading subscription-only newsletter covering privacy and freedom of information law and policy. It is read largely by attorneys and professionals who must stay abreast of the legislation, litigation, and executive branch activities, as well as consumer news, technology trends, and business developments. Since 1981, Privacy Times has provided its readers with accurate reporting, objective analysis, and thoughtful insight into the events that shape the ongoing debate over privacy and freedom of information.

Then there is the Privacy Rights Clearinghouse. Privacy Rights Clearinghouse, a nonprofit consumer education and advocacy organization located in San Diego, California, their mission is to engage, educate, and empower consumers to protect their privacy. They engage in outreach, provide educational materials and services to individuals nationwide, and have an active media presence. The PRC uses the information we learn directly, they say, from consumers to form the basis of their advocacy work.

Then there is Public Citizen. Public Citizen has a team of researchers. They uncover the facts. Their staff brings their findings to the public through the media as well as one-on-one interactions. Their advocates bring the voice of the public to the halls of power on behalf of consumers.

Then there is Public Knowledge. Public Knowledge promotes freedom of expression and open internet and access to affordable communication tools and

creative works. They work to shape policy on behalf of the public interest.

Then there is Reinvestment Partners. Reinvestment Partners' mission is to advocate for economic justice and opportunity. They do this by providing direct services to people, revitalizing places, and advocating for just policies. Founded as a project of Legal Services in 1986 as the Community Reinvestment Association of North Carolina, the agency has worked to ensure fair lending to underserved communities in order to build and protect wealth. In 2012, they changed their name to recognize the expanded diversity of their programs and their local and State and national outreach.

And then there is U.S. PIRG. U.S. PIRG is an advocate for the public interest, working to win concrete results on real problems that affect millions of lives and standing up for the public against powerful interests when they push the other way. They say: "The problems we face don't care if you are liberal or conservative, if you live in a red or blue State. They affect each and every one of us." That is why, for decades, they have taken a nonpartisan, facts-driven, results-oriented approach to their work.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like hearing that our consumers don't care, that they don't need a yearly notification about their privacy rights, that they simply throw this information that describes their rights into the wastebasket; and I am so pleased that, over the years and through the history of this Nation when too many consumers have been ignored, taken advantage of, didn't know what their rights were, all of these organizations that I have taken time to share with you today work on behalf of consumers. They work not only in organizing and educating, but they send this information to their Members of Congress. All of these organizations have sent in this information not only about their backgrounds, but about this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say I hope that schoolchildren from around the Nation have been listening to this debate because they would be educated on the House version of the filibuster.

I thought that the ranking member was going to break out the Washington, D.C., phone book and begin to read from it. It was a fascinating discussion of a litany of Washington-based special interest groups. I know they appreciated the shout-out; I know it will help them in their fundraising efforts; but it has absolutely nothing—nothing—to do with the bill that we are debating, nothing to do with the bill that we are debating.

□ 1000

So the ranking member said how important it is that consumers receive an annual—an annual—notice of the privacy policies of financial institutions.

Well, under this bill, H.R. 2396, they don't get it annually, they get it monthly. They get it weekly. They get it daily. They get it hourly.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

In fact, under H.R. 2396, the privacy notification must be continuous. It has to be put on the website. This helps the consumer. The consumer has access 24/7 to the privacy notification under the gentleman from Michigan's bill, as opposed to the status quo being defended by my friends on the other side of the aisle, who say, once a year—once a year—you ought to get a piece of paper that is probably going to end up in the round file anyway.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this debate has nothing to do with the privacy policies of financial institutions. It has everything to do with the notification of such policies. What we provide for is the continuous notification; and should that policy change, then, and only then, does that necessitate the killing of trees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), an outstanding member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time so that I can speak, and not just in support of this legislation, but in strong support of the legislation by my colleague and friend from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

In the short time I have been in Congress, Mr. Speaker, one thing I have come to realize, there are some people in this Chamber who never met a regulation that they didn't like. Regardless of how effective or ineffective or misguided that regulation is, or how outdated the regulation is, they always just want to hold on to a piece of government regulation.

I, too, appreciate the ranking member for going through the litany of mission statements of special interest groups here in Washington, D.C. But this is precisely what the American people are tired of. They are tired of the Washington, D.C., swamp. They are tired of the special interests, and they want legislation that affects them personally. This piece of legislation will affect millions of Americans directly.

Now, I am not just speaking today from prepared remarks, which I have, but I am speaking from someone with experience in this area. I spent 30 years, Mr. Speaker, in the IT services business. Ten of those years I spent protecting some of our Nation's secrets, through military intelligence, and then working in the defense industry. Twenty of those years I had my own business, and we were responsible for protecting the sensitive information of businesses and their customers. So I am well versed in the idea of protection, and, as a constitutional conservative, I am very sensitive to privacy protection.

This piece of legislation is common-sense legislation. It is exactly what the American people want us to pass, and I can give you some great examples of why, because one of the aspects of security, especially data security, is being continually aware of the threat.

Now, what happens—and I remember when this happened. I was still in my IT business when the original legislation was passed; and all of a sudden, I am receiving a privacy notice of what my rights are, and, unlike most Americans, I sat down and actually read all of it.

Now, where the confusion came in is when, a year later, I receive another one, and then I receive another one, and I am literally comparing the two to see what has changed, and I find out that nothing has changed.

So what was the reaction after that? Every time I get a notice in a big envelope, instead of just a bank statement, I would just take it and throw it in the trash, not knowing if something has actually changed, which would be important.

Now, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, another colleague of mine on the Financial Services Committee, passed a bill 2 years ago to provide correction to that problem. All Mr. TROTT's bill is doing now is expanding that to other industries.

This is a consumer protection bill because now, if someone in those industries, if there is a change, they receive a notice, they know that there has been a change.

But, as the chairman has pointed out time and time again, this is actually going to give more immediate access to know what the privacy policy is of financial institutions, to identify if there have been any changes because they can go online to see it. I mean, you can get that instantaneous with these devices that almost everyone carries. It is time to bring us up into the current century and the technology that we have.

So I commend my colleague on actually bringing commonsense legislation, the type of legislation that Americans want, that consumers want. They want to know what their rights are, but they don't want to be inundated with useless information continually, over and over again, because then they would actually not be aware of what their rights are and what has changed.

Now, this is especially beneficial to Georgia because Georgia has become an auto manufacturing hub. And as we continue to grow this economy, and more people—I believe in the next few days, when we pass this tax bill, you are going to see a rise in people buying automobiles. Why? Because they are going to have more money in their back pocket. They are going to spend more money, and they are going to be taking out more loans.

So we need to make sure that they know immediately what their privacy rights are, and this bill will make it to where those will be available online.

This simply makes—it right-sizes government by making government smarter, more effective, and, actually, that the regulation is tailored toward the consumer, not toward the special interest groups and the trial lawyers in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in a favorable vote for this.

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

Again, it is interesting how my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle describe their consumers. These are people, they say, who don't want to be inundated with useless information. They are saying that the privacy information is of no use.

It is interesting that Mr. LOUDERMILK said he read his privacy notice, unlike most other Americans who don't read their privacy notice. I think that is very interesting to describe himself as someone who read his privacy notice, but able to speak for all other Americans who don't read their privacy notice.

What is very interesting also about his comments is he refers to the consumer groups as special interests, while he is representing the banks and the financial institutions, the real special interests.

Why is it Representatives who come to this Congress to represent people who vote for them somehow see their responsibility to protect the real special interests, such as the financial institutions who have lobbyists running up and down these Halls every day, who make contributions to Members of Congress, rather than the consumers who are represented by the kinds of groups that I have taken time to describe here this morning, because these individuals and the average citizen do not have paid lobbyists from financial institutions and banks representing them here.

So it is also interesting that Mr. LOUDERMILK talked about how many of these consumers are going to be buying automobiles because of the tax fraud bill that he is referring to that is being advanced by the opposite side of the aisle. The only thing that bill is going to do for consumers, which will hurt our economy, is create a \$1.5 trillion debt.

Well, he said that consumers were going to be buying more cars. Yeah, the wealthy will be, the ones who are given the breaks in this tax bill. The wealthy may be buying more automobiles, but the very people who are represented by these consumers that I have shared the information on this morning, they won't be able to buy automobiles because they are going to be harmed. It is only the wealthy, only those who are making extraordinary amounts of money, and corporations, that are going to benefit from the tax bill.

I don't even know how and why he talked about it in the same breath that

we are talking about our consumers being able to be respected with privacy information that they would get because we have laws that give them the right to have this information.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, we are having an argument here about a bill that has strong bipartisan support. When you boil it all down, the argument is pretty simple, and the question for us to consider this morning, and I would submit we have more important things to work on than that question, but that is what we are debating this morning, so let's consider it.

The question we are arguing about is: Do consumers, when they get their mail and they find an envelope filled with 30 pages of small-print legalese, boilerplate language, do they open up that envelope and pour themselves a cup of coffee and settle in—we have 9 inches of snow today back in Michigan, so they settle in next to a fire and spend the next 2 hours reading that privacy notice? That is the question.

The ranking member has been quite critical of the speeches that have been given this morning, submitting that people do read these notices, and who are we to judge whether people read these notices.

We are not making judgment, we are just submitting, on a commonsense basis, an argument that people don't read these notices; people throw these notices away. And that logic and common sense would dictate that if the privacy notice changes, and a new notice arrives, and the consumer realizes, gosh, I got a new privacy notice because the policy changed; I don't get it when the policy doesn't change; I'd better read this. If they are ever going to read it, that is the time they are going to read it.

But if the ranking member is correct in her analysis, and that millions of consumers are waiting by the mailbox each and every day so that they can study, dissect, compare, and contrast these privacy notices, then she is correct. This bill would add an extra step because, instead of going to the mailbox, they would have to click on the website or perhaps call a toll-free number and have the document mailed to them. So if that burden is more important, because people are reading these notices, then her arguments are compelling.

Now, let's examine all those groups that she spent so much time telling us about this morning, all those proconsumer watchdog groups. All those groups are interested in one thing. They are interested in making sure the laws are as complicated and convoluted as possible because all those groups, including the ranking member, believe, incorrectly, all business is bad; all banks are bad; we have

to make it as convoluted and as complicated as possible so that class action lawyers can find a reason to file frivolous lawsuits to sue them, because that is what consumers need.

That is illogical because when these class action lawsuits and all these convoluted regulations get placed on the books and the banks have to hire hundreds of lawyers to deal with compliance, who do you think pays for that? The consumer pays for it.

So this bill saves a little money, saves a few trees. Maybe we will have a few more forests for our grandchildren. It is a simple bill, and I feel bad for some of the Democrats, the 20 in our committee—

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TROTT. I feel bad for all those Democrats who support this bill because, apparently, they are against consumers, too. This bill has got nothing to do with any of the arguments that the ranking member has proffered this morning. I ask for strong support for H.R. 2396.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no other Members, so I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

It is very simple. The consumer groups that I took time to help people to understand who they are and what they do, representing the consumers, are the folks who are concerned about people knowing their rights. This is what they work at doing.

Those of us who align ourselves with consumer groups care about the average citizen. We care that the average citizen gets the kind of information that is going to make their lives much easier.

The people on the opposite side of the aisle represent banks and financial institutions. We are not opposed to business, and we work with businesses in various ways.

□ 1015

We are opposed to rip-offs. We are opposed to fraud. We are opposed to denying consumers the opportunity to know their rights.

But those Members of Congress who come here and basically mimic and mock the consumers by talking about those consumers who wait by their mailboxes for privacy information certainly are not representing the citizens of their district.

I can tell you this: When you take a look at who the real special interests are, who is representing the interests of the special interests, who in this House stands up for banks, financial institutions, and Wall Street and hedge funds, you look at the opposite side of the aisle, time and time again, and you will find them putting all of their time and their effort into representing those special interests.

For those of us who stand on the side of the average citizen, yes, we align

ourselves with consumer groups. No, we don't dismiss them as unnecessary people just messing around in the business of big business.

These are the representatives, again, of people who don't have fancy lobbyists walking these Halls and following the Members of Congress, getting into their area and influencing them.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today with our consumers. I applaud all of our consumer groups and I stand on the side of our consumers being able to know their rights and all of the work that went into providing this opportunity in law. I stand with them and I resist any effort by the opposite side of the aisle to deny the right of our citizens to be notified about their rights and their ability to opt out if they do not want their information shared with these unaffiliated groups.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud. I know that we are doing what our citizens want us to do, why they sent us to this Congress.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, there have been several surreal moments on the House floor this week, and today certainly is one more of them.

The debate today is not between regulation and deregulation, but in many respects, the debate is between smart regulation and dumb regulation. What we have today is a dumb regulation that forces a number of financial institutions annually to send out a paper notification even if they don't change their privacy policy; cut down trees, engage an expense—by the way, an expense that, my guess is, doesn't come out of executive bonuses, but probably comes out of the credit availability and the credit cost to the customer. It gets passed on to the consumer.

What we are also having a debate about—and I would encourage all my friends on the other side of the aisle, if in doubt, read the bill.

In this particular case, guess what, Mr. Speaker. It is a 2-page bill. It really doesn't take that long to read. If you read it, what you will find out is that this is a bill that is pro-consumer because we go from a notification that happens once a year to a continuous notification. We improve the consumer notification by ensuring that it is consistently on the website of the financial institution.

What we hear from the ranking member is: No. I want to stay in the 20th century. Gramm-Leach-Bliley is a law from the 20th century.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are in the 21st century. Why don't we ensure that the privacy notification for the consumer is actually on the website?

This is what is truly pro-consumer, not forcing people to go and subsidize

the paper mills and the U.S. Postal Service by sending out a notification on paper that doesn't change anything and merely confuses consumers. If you are really pro-consumer, then try to respect their markets and try not to pass additional cost on to them.

Again, regardless of what you have heard from the other side of the aisle, this is everything to do with how we notify people of privacy policies, not the underlying privacy policy itself. It is 21st century. It is not 20th century. It is pro-consumer, regardless of all the special interests and Washington, D.C.-based lobbyists that the ranking member has cited.

The gentleman from Michigan brings us pro-consumer legislation, the Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act. I am kind of embarrassed that we are having to spend this much time debating something that should have been on our expedited suspension calendar. It is almost like there is just simply a knee-jerk reaction anytime we attempt to modify any government regulation.

This is pro-consumer. Frankly, it is pro-environment. Every Member of the House should embrace H.R. 2396. I am sorry we have had to take up so much time for it, but there are thousands and thousands of regulations that hurt our financial institutions, that hurt our consumers. We are trying to get rid of every dumb one, one at a time.

Again, this should be passing unanimously. I don't understand it, but I am glad the American people could see this debate for what it is.

Mr. Speaker, again, let's be pro-consumer, let's be pro-community financial institution, let's be pro-environment, and let's enact H.R. 2396.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CLAY

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, strike "financial institution" and insert "vehicle financial company".

Page 3, line 18, strike "financial institution" and insert "vehicle financial company".

Page 3, line 24, strike "and".

Page 4, line 1, strike "financial institution" and insert "vehicle financial company".

Page 4, line 6, strike "or with" and insert "the front page of".

Page 4, beginning on line 10, strike "on its" and insert "through a link on the landing page of the company's".

Page 4, line 13, strike the period and insert "and".

Page 4, after line 13, insert the following:

"(C) the vehicle financial company—

"(i) provides consumers with the ability to opt out, subject to any exemption or exception provided under subsection (b)(2) or (e) of section 502 or under regulations prescribed under section 504(b), of having the con-

sumer's nonpublic personal information disclosed to a nonaffiliated third party; and

"(ii) includes a description about where to locate the procedures for a consumer to select such opt out in each periodic billing statement sent to the consumer."

Page 4, line 15, strike "financial institution" and insert "vehicle financial company".

Page 4, line 18, strike "financial institution" and insert "vehicle financial company".

Page 4, line 21, strike "financial institution" and insert "vehicle financial company".

Add at the end the following:

"(3) VEHICLE FINANCIAL COMPANY DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'vehicle financial company' means—

"(A) a financial institution that—

"(i) is regularly engaged in the business of extending credit for the purchase of vehicles;

"(ii) is affiliated with a vehicle manufacturer; and

"(iii) only shares nonpublic personal information of consumers with nonaffiliated third parties that are vehicle dealers; or

"(B) a financial institution that—

"(i) regularly engages in the business of extending credit for the purchase or lease of vehicles from vehicle dealers; or

"(ii) purchases vehicle installment sales contracts or leases from vehicle dealers."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 657, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered makes important changes to our bill, H.R. 2396, which is a straightforward, commonsense measure that seeks to streamline the privacy information consumers get from financial institutions and makes the information available much more frequently via electronic delivery.

We have been working on what I consider to be a simple but necessary fix to a 20-year-old law throughout this year, and I believe the amendment we have presented for your consideration will undoubtedly benefit consumers. We have worked with our colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to modify and strengthen the underlying bill, and I appreciate everyone's efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank the committee's ranking member, Ms. WATERS, for her and her staff's efforts to improve our bill. I consider this amendment to be an effort to improve the underlying legislation. While Ms. WATERS still has some outstanding concerns, I do appreciate her working with us.

The amendment clarifies the process by which consumers can opt out of having their information shared with unaffiliated third parties. It limits the application of the alternative delivery mechanism to vehicle financial companies—that is simply what the amendment does—rather than all financial institutions, as defined under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act and other technical and conforming changes.

Mr. Speaker, we believe these changes make our bill stronger and we urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. CLAY's effort to make the bill better. He is absolutely correct, we have been attempting to work together to see if there was a way that we could deal with the issue at hand and absolutely ensure that our consumers not only have a right to information that explains to them what their rights are and how they can opt out when their information is being sold, really, to unaffiliated organizations.

Mr. Speaker, just in case people are not following exactly what we are talking about when we talk about opt-out rights, let me draw your attention to the fact that you oftentimes are receiving loads of mail in your mailbox, everything from somebody who is selling pet food to clothing, to services, to all kinds of products, and you don't know why they are sending you all this junk. Well, they are sending you this junk because somebody sold your information to all of these organizations because you didn't know that you had not opted out. You maybe didn't know what your rights are. But citizens have a right to have that information, and they have a right to be respected and not thought to be simply throwing it into the wastebasket.

It doesn't matter whether it is for all businesses in the United States or just for automobile dealers. It is about every citizen having the right to have their privacy protected and not having people sell their information to unaffiliated organizations that will cause them to be pressured or solicited over and over again and their mailboxes filled with information because their privacy information has been sold to one of those unaffiliated organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr. CLAY is attempting to streamline the bill. I appreciate the efforts that he has put into attempting to do this, but this does not correct the problem. This undermines the efforts of all of these consumer groups that worked for years to get these notices sent to our consumers.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that we have tried and we have worked and we have listened to each other, I would ask for a "no" vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, just in closing, let me offer some clarification.

In the fall of 2014, the CFPB finalized a rule allowing financial institutions to post their annual privacy notices online instead of delivering them individually if they met a series of conditions, including not sharing the customer's nonpublic information with unaffiliated third parties.

In December of 2015, Congress went further by enacting an outright exemp-

tion from the mailing requirement for financial institutions that, one, do not share nonpublic personal information about a consumer with unaffiliated third parties; and, two, have not changed its disclosure policy and practices since the most recent disclosure was sent to consumers.

□ 1030

Institutions that provide financing for vehicle purchases or leases do not meet the criteria set forth by Congress and are, therefore, required to continue issuing paper privacy notices to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment helps to improve this bill. It modernizes this requirement. I just urge the body to adopt the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Maxine Waters of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2396 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In subsection (g)(3) of the matter proposed to be inserted by section 2 of the bill, insert after subparagraph (B) the following flush-left text: "For purposes of this subsection, the term 'vehicle financial company' does not include a financial institution that is engaging or has engaged in a pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other violations related to consumer harm."

Add at the end the following:

"(4) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(A) FEDERAL CONSUMER FINANCIAL LAW.—The term 'Federal consumer financial law' has the meaning given that term under section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

"(B) PATTERN OR PRACTICE OF UNSAFE OR UNSOUND BANKING PRACTICES AND OTHER VIOLATIONS RELATED TO CONSUMER HARM.—The term 'pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other violations related to consumer harm' means engaging in all of the following activities, to the extent each activity was discovered or occurred at least once in the 10 years preceding the date of the enactment of this Act:

"(i) Having unsafe or unsound practices in the institution's risk management and oversight of the institution's sales practices, as evidenced by—

"(I) an institution lacking an enterprise-wide sales practices oversight program that enables the institution to adequately monitor sales practices to prevent and detect unsafe or unsound sales practices and mitigate risks that may result from such unsafe and unsound sales practices; and

"(II) an institution lacking a comprehensive customer complaint monitoring process that—

"(aa) enables the institution to assess customer complaint activity across the institution;

"(bb) adequately monitors, manages, and reports on customer complaints; and

"(cc) analyzes and understands the potential risks posed by the institution's sales practices.

"(ii) Engaging in unsafe and unsound sales practices, as evidenced by the institution—

"(I) opening more than one million unauthorized deposit, credit card, or other accounts;

"(II) performing unauthorized transfers of customer funds; and

"(III) performing unauthorized credit inquiries for purposes of the conduct described in subclass (I) or (II).

"(iii) Lacking adequate oversight of third-party vendors for purposes of risk-mitigation, to prevent abusive and deceptive practices in the vendor's provision of consumer products or services.

"(iv) Having deficient policies and procedures for sharing customers' personal identifiable information with third-party vendors for litigation purposes that led to inadvertent disclosure of such information to unintended parties.

"(v) Violating Federal consumer financial laws with respect to mortgage loans, including charges of hidden fees and unauthorized or improper disclosures tied to home mortgage loan modifications.

"(vi) Engaging in unsafe or unsound banking practices related to residential mortgage loan servicing and foreclosure processing.

"(vii) Violating the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act."

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My motion would prevent institutions that have engaged in a pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other violations related to consumer harm from being able to evade important consumer protections.

When companies repeatedly exhibit indifference to consumer protection and demonstrate that they are incapable of complying or are unwilling to comply with U.S. laws and regulations, they should not be allowed to benefit from those bad actions.

As I have already mentioned, under this bill, as amended, companies like Wells Fargo would be free to share or sell customer information with any company, with minimal reminders to their customers.

We all know that Wells Fargo has engaged in illegal student loan servicing practices, inappropriate checking accounts, overdraft fees, unlawful mortgage lending practices, overcharging veterans for refinanced loans, enrolled customers in life insurance policies without their consent, delayed mortgage closing dates until after the expiration of the borrower's interest rate lock to levy additional fees, and charged over 570,000 customers with auto insurance policies they did not need, which resulted in at least 20,000 customers, including Active-Duty servicemembers, having their vehicles inappropriately repossessed.

Companies like Wells Fargo are why I introduced H.R. 3937, the Megabank Accountability and Consequences Act, to make sure that lenders that have engaged in abusive practices face real consequences for their wrongdoing. It is time we truly hold companies that demonstrate a pattern of harming consumers accountable. These institutions must no longer be allowed to abuse hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of my motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, again, I would encourage the ranking member and all Members on the other side of the aisle to read the underlying bill. It is 2 pages long. It has now been amended by perhaps a 1-page amendment. This has nothing to do with Wells Fargo. It has nothing to do with Equifax. It is limited to the annual paper notification from auto finance companies, pure and simple.

Again, for those who listened to the earlier debate, the question is whether or not these auto finance companies are going to be forced to spend money that comes out of their customers' pockets to send out a paper notification of privacy policies even when the policy doesn't change, or whether or not we should modernize into the 21st century and ensure that there is continuous notification on a website and that a paper notification only goes out upon a change, an actual change.

What the ranking member is doing with the motion to recommit is once again empowering the unconstitutional and unaccountable CFPB to engage in even more activities that harm consumers. It ought to be rejected, and we ought to ensure that we adopt H.R. 2396 and simplify and modernize one regulation that is harming consumers and harming financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS 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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 2396, if ordered;

The motion to recommit on H.R. 4324; and

Passage of H.R. 4324, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 235, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 681]

YEAS—185

Adams	Foster	McNerney
Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	Meeks
Barragán	Fudge	Meng
Bass	Gabbard	Moulton
Beatty	Gallego	Murphy (FL)
Bera	Garamendi	Nadler
Beyer	Gomez	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Neal
Blunt Rochester	Gottheimer	Nolan
Bonamici	Green, Al	Norcross
Boyle, Brendan	Green, Gene	O'Halleran
F.	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Brody (PA)	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Brown (MD)	Hanabusa	Panetta
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	Pascrell
Bustos	Heck	Payne
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Pelosi
Capuano	Himes	Perlmutter
Carballo	Hoyer	Peters
Cárdenas	Huffman	Pingree
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Polis
Cartwright	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Quigley
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Kaptur	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rosen
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Khanna	Ruiz
Clyburn	Kihuen	Ruppersberger
Cohen	Kildee	Rush
Connolly	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Kind	Sánchez
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Schakowsky
Courtney	Langevin	Schiff
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Cuellar	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Lawson (FL)	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Lee	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sewell (AL)
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Delaney	Lipinski	Sinema
DeLauro	Loeb	Sires
DelBene	Lofgren	Slaughter
Demings	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Lowe	Soto
Deutch	Lujan Grisham,	Speier
Dingell	M.	Suozi
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Takano
F.	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Eshoo	Matsui	Tonko
Espallat	McCollum	Torres
Esty (CT)	McEachin	Tsongas
Evans	McGovern	Vargas

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Clay
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Constock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert

Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Barletta
Blumenauer
Bridenstine
Katko

Kennedy
Knight
Marchant
Moore

Pocan
Visclosky
Walz

□ 1101

Messrs. FITZPATRICK, BACON, MARSHALL, GROTHMAN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. YOHO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, GRIJALVA, DOGGETT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Messrs. GUTIERREZ, and CLEAVER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 275, nays 146, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 682]

YEAS—275

Abraham	Dent	Kind
Aderholt	DeSantis	King (IA)
Allen	DesJarlais	King (NY)
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger
Arrington	Donovan	Knight
Babin	Duffy	Krishnamoorthi
Bacon	Duncan (SC)	Kustoff (TN)
Banks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Labrador
Barr	Dunn	LaHood
Barragan	Emmer	LaMalfa
Barton	Estes (KS)	Lamborn
Beatty	Farenthold	Lance
Bera	Faso	Latta
Bergman	Ferguson	Lawrence
Biggs	Fitzpatrick	Lewis (MN)
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Lipinski
Bishop (GA)	Flores	LoBiondo
Bishop (MI)	Fortenberry	Loeb
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Long
Black	Frelinghuysen	Loudermilk
Blackburn	Gaetz	Love
Blum	Gallagher	Lucas
Bost	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX)	Gianforte	MacArthur
Brat	Gibbs	Maloney, Sean
Brooks (AL)	Gohmert	Marino
Brooks (IN)	Gomez	Marshall
Brownley (CA)	Gomlatte	Masse
Buchanan	Gosar	Mast
Buck	Gowdy	McCarthy
Bueshon	Granger	McCaul
Budd	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Burgess	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Bustos	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Butterfield	Griffith	McMorris
Byrne	Grothman	Rodgers
Calvert	Guthrie	McSally
Carbajal	Hanabusa	Meadows
Carson (IN)	Handel	Meehan
Carter (GA)	Harper	Meeks
Carter (TX)	Harris	Messer
Cartwright	Hartzler	Mitchell
Chabot	Hensarling	Moolenaar
Cheney	Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)
Clay	Hice, Jody B.	Mullin
Cleaver	Higgins (LA)	Murphy (FL)
Coffman	Hill	Newhouse
Cole	Holding	Noem
Collins (GA)	Hollingsworth	Norman
Collins (NY)	Hudson	Nunes
Comer	Huizenga	O'Rourke
Comstock	Hultgren	Olson
Conaway	Hunter	Palazzo
Cook	Hurd	Palmer
Cooper	Issa	Paulsen
Correa	Jenkins (KS)	Pearce
Costa	Jenkins (WV)	Perlmutter
Costello (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Perry
Cramer	Johnson (LA)	Peterson
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Poe (TX)
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Poliquin
Curbeo (FL)	Jordan	Posey
Curtis	Joyce (OH)	Ratcliffe
Davidson	Keating	Reed
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (MS)	Reichert
Delaney	Kelly (PA)	Renacci
Denham	Kildee	Rice (SC)

Roby	Scott, David
Roe (TN)	Sensenbrenner
Rogers (AL)	Sessions
Rogers (KY)	Sherman
Rohrabacher	Shimkus
Rokita	Shuster
Rooney, Francis	Simpson
Rooney, Thomas	Sinema
J.	Smith (MO)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)
Rosen	Smith (NJ)
Roskam	Smith (TX)
Ross	Smucker
Rothfus	Stefanik
Rouzer	Stewart
Royce (CA)	Stivers
Ruiz	Suozi
Russell	Taylor
Rutherford	Tenney
Sanford	Thompson (PA)
Scalise	Thornberry
Schneider	Tiberi
Schrader	Tipton
Schweikert	Torres
Scott, Austin	Turner

NAYS—146

Adams	Gonzalez (TX)
Aguilar	Gottheimer
Amash	Green, Al
Bass	Green, Gene
Beyer	Grijalva
Blunt Rochester	Gutierrez
Bonamici	Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan	Heck
F.	Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA)	Himes
Brown (MD)	Hoyer
Capuano	Huffman
Cardenas	Jackson Lee
Castor (FL)	Jayapal
Castro (TX)	Jeffries
Chu, Judy	Jones
Cicilline	Kaptur
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Khanna
Clyburn	Kihuen
Cohen	Kilmer
Connolly	Kuster (NH)
Courtney	Langevin
Crist	Larsen (WA)
Crowley	Larson (CT)
Cummings	Lawson (FL)
Davis (CA)	Lee
Davis, Danny	Levin
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)
DeGette	Lieu, Ted
DeLauro	Lofgren
DelBene	Lowenthal
Demings	Lowe
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham,
Deutch	M.
Dingell	Lujan, Ben Ray
Doggett	Lynch
Doyle, Michael	Maloney,
F.	Carolyn B.
Ellison	Matsui
Engel	McCollum
Eshoo	McEachin
Espallat	McGovern
Esty (CT)	McNerney
Evans	Meng
Foster	Moore
Frankel (FL)	Moulton
Fudge	Nadler
Gabbard	Napolitano
Gallego	Neal
Garamendi	Nolan

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta	Kennedy	Visclosky
Blumenauer	Marchant	Walz
Bridenstine	Pocan	
Katko	Trott	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1109

Mrs. MOORE and WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. DELANEY and KEATING changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”
So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING OVERSIGHT OF IRAN'S ACCESS TO FINANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 4324) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to make certifications with respect to United States and foreign financial institutions' aircraft-related transactions involving Iran, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 233, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 683]

YEAS—188

Adams	Evans	McGovern
Aguilar	Foster	McNerney
Barragan	Frankel (FL)	Meeks
Bass	Fudge	Meng
Beatty	Gabbard	Moore
Bera	Gallego	Moulton
Beyer	Garamendi	Murphy (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Gomez	Nadler
Blunt Rochester	Gonzalez (TX)	Napolitano
Bonamici	Gottheimer	Neal
Boyle, Brendan	Green, Al	Nolan
F.	Green, Gene	Norcross
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	O'Halleran
Brown (MD)	Gutierrez	O'Rourke
Brownley (CA)	Hanabusa	Pallone
Bustos	Hastings	Panetta
Butterfield	Heck	Pascrell
Capuano	Higgins (NY)	Payne
Carbajal	Himes	Pelosi
Cardenas	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Peters
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Pingree
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Polis
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Raskin
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Rice (NY)
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Cleaver	Khanna	Rosen
Clyburn	Kihuen	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kildee	Ruiz
Connolly	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Kind	Rush
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan (OH)
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Sanchez
Courtney	Langevin	Sarbanes
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Cuellar	Lawrence	Schneider
Cummings	Lawson (FL)	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Lee	Scott (VA)
Davis, Danny	Levin	Scott, David
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
Delaney	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
DeLauro	Loeb	Sherman
DelBene	Loeb	Sinema
Demings	Lofgren	Sires
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Deutch	Lujan Grisham,	Smith (WA)
Dingell	M.	Soto
Doggett	Lujan, Ben Ray	Speier
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Suozi
F.	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	Carolyn B.	Takano
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Espallat	McCollum	Titus
Esty (CT)	McEachin	Tonko

Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela

Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1115

Messrs. GAETZ, JORDAN, and GROTHMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 167, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 684]

YEAS—252

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta
Blumenauer
Bridenstine
Katko

Kennedy
Marchant
Pocan
Viscosky

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Hill
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick

Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Meng
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin

Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Ming
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozy
Taylor

Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi

NAYS—167

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)

Evans
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Neal
Gomez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Loeb sack
DeLauro
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Blumenauer
Bridenstine
Crist

Katko
Kennedy
Marchant
Moore

Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

McNerney
Meeks
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1126

Mr. FASO changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today for family reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 681,

"yea" on rollcall No. 682, "nay" on rollcall No. 683, and "yea" on rollcall No. 684.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE
CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR
OF H.R. 3771

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 3771, a bill originally introduced by Representative Conyers of Michigan, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO
MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-
GROSSMENT OF H.R. 4324,
STRENGTHENING OVERSIGHT OF
IRAN'S ACCESS TO FINANCE ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 4324, the Clerk be directed to insert the word "and" after the semicolon in section 3(b)(1) of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

CORRECTION TO ENGROSSMENT
OF H.R. 2396, PRIVACY NOTIFICA-
TION TECHNICAL CLARIFICATION
ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 2396, the Clerk be directed to make the correction I have placed at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

In amendment number 1, the instruction relating to page 4, line 21 is modified to read as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike "financial institution's" and insert "vehicle financial company's".

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

There was no objection.

BORINQUEENERS POST OFFICE
BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4042) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the "Borinqueneers Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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.

□ 1130

SERGEANT JOHN BASILONE POST
OFFICE

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill (H.R. 2815) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the "Sergeant John Basilone Post Office", as proposed to be passed under suspension of the rules, be modified by the amendment I have placed at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GIANFORTE
Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. GUNNERY SERGEANT JOHN
BASILONE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office".

Mr. GIANFORTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, as amended.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the 'Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and the balance of the week, the House will meet as early as 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

This list will include several bills from the Science Committee that are part of the House Innovation Initiative. These bills support Americans pursuing careers in science, technology, engineering, and math, with a focus on veterans and individuals historically underrepresented in those fields.

Mr. Speaker, my friend and I recently cohosted the third Congressional Hackathon, and I think he and I would agree that STEM education is an issue of national competitiveness, and I look forward to the House passing these bills next week.

In addition, the House will consider two measures from the Financial Services Committee. First, H.R. 4015, the Corporate Governance Reform and Transparency Act sponsored by Representative SEAN DUFFY. This bill will improve the quality of the proxy research while increasing transparency for public companies and their investors.

Second, H.R. 3312, the Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act sponsored by Representative BLAINE LUETKEMEYER. This bill replaces Dodd-Frank's arbitrary thresholds with a process that analyzes each institution of its individual risk factors.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider the conference report to accompany H.R. 1, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act sponsored by Representative KEVIN BRADY. This historic legislation will cap off a 31-year journey to reform America's broken Tax Code. We will double the standard deduction, making the first \$12,000 of income for an individual and \$24,000 for a family tax free.

We will increase the child tax credit because investing in families is among the most important investments we make. We will reduce the tax rate on small businesses to the lowest rates that have been seen in 40 years. And we do all this while simplifying the Tax Code so Americans can file in minutes on a form the size of a postcard.

Republicans have championed cutting taxes and growing our economy for years, and I am excited to deliver this important promise.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are expected, including legislation related to government funding and a number of other end-of-the-year priorities. I will be sure to inform all Members if additional items are added to our schedule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the majority leader and I, as well as his predecessor, Mr. Cantor, have worked together on what we call a Hackathon, which is a meeting annually of individuals involved in the high-tech community in how better to communicate, how better to process information, how better to make transparent the work of this body and make the actions of this body accessible to the general public as they happen.

I want to thank the majority leader for continuing to cosponsor this effort with me and to be a leader on this effort. We just had the President sign—I think yesterday, maybe the day before—a piece of legislation, which will try to make the government more facile in bringing its technology up to date so that it can operate more efficiently and more effectively.

So I thank the majority leader for working together in a positive way to make this institution work better and to make it more accessible and better known to the American people. I thank him also for the schedule that he has put forward.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader mentioned a number of things that the tax bill that is going to be coming before us will do. I don't believe that the conference report is available for review at this point in time.

Can the majority leader perhaps enlighten me as to whether or not the conference report is available now to be reviewed? Or, if not, when it will be available?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I expect the report to be filed online tomorrow. As you know, you have got to go through and make sure, from joint tax, filling in the dollar figures, and all anticipation is it will be online tomorrow for all of America to read.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is my understanding that that will be on the floor as early as Tuesday of next week. Is that accurate?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes, that is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply observe that what the majority leader did not mention—again, I have not seen the conference report, so this is not based upon a review of the conference report, but this is based upon the Senate bill and the House bills that were passed by both bodies—was that it will increase the debt of our country by some \$1.5 trillion and a minimum of \$1

trillion. It will raise taxes on some 78 million Americans between \$50,000 of income and \$150,000 of income.

I am assuming that the elimination of the mandate is still in the conference report. I am not sure, but the information I have is that it is still in the report. Mr. Speaker, that will cost 13 million people to be uninsured as a result.

I have information, Mr. Speaker, that what the conference report does is reduce taxes on some of the wealthiest people in America. I am not sure how they offset that—maybe with a mandate, maybe with something else—but 62 percent of the bill's resources go to the top 1 percent in America.

Mr. Speaker, Speaker RYAN spoke on this floor about the average family making \$59,000 a year. He mentioned that that family will get, under the House bill—again, I haven't seen the conference report—\$1,182 per year in a tax cut.

What the Speaker did not mention is that the family in the top 1 percent will get a tax cut of \$1,198 per week. Per week, Mr. Speaker. In other words, 52 times what the struggling American will get, what the American who Speaker RYAN said may not be able to come up with \$500 if they have a crisis with a refrigerator or their heating unit, something of that nature, or their car breaks down will get.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the aisle do not believe that this bill addresses relief for the struggling working men and women of this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear, in all of the polling, that the average working American shares that view. They believe correctly that this is a tax cut for the rich and a few sprinkles to the middle class. I am sure the leader will have something to say on that.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that what will happen in this tax bill is we will phase out. We will—again, I have not seen the conference report, so I don't know exactly whether that is true or not, but in both the House and Senate bills, we phased out—we didn't phase out, we proposed to be phased out. The benefits to those middle-income, hardworking Americans will see their benefits phased out. That will not be true of corporations. It will not be true of the wealthiest in our country.

So it is troubling, Mr. Speaker, that a bill of this magnitude is being rushed to judgment. In 1986, the gentleman, in making his announcement, said we have been working on this for 31 years. Now, I presume he was talking about from 1986 to 2017.

What he did not say, Mr. Speaker, is, in 1986, we had 30 days of public hearings on a bill. Thirty days of public hearings. What he did not say is that we had 450 witnesses during those public hearings testifying about the taxes. What he did not say is that there were nearly 4 months of hearings on the 1986 reform bill. And what he did not say is that the Ways and Means Committee conducted 26 days of markup.

This bill has received less than 7 days of markup in both bodies and in the conference. This is being rushed to judgment. The American people, by substantial numbers, believe this bill is not good for them.

Now, Mr. COLLINS said that he talked to a donor and the donor said: Don't call me again if you don't pass this tax bill.

I get that. I don't know who the donor was and I don't know how rich the donor was, but obviously the donor thought that he had a real stake or she had a real stake in this tax bill.

We regret that we are not doing as we did in 1986, because what the majority leader did not mention either was that the 1986 bill was a bipartisan bill with President Reagan and Speaker O'Neill supporting it, and with Chairman Rostenkowski, a Democratic chair of the House Ways and Means Committee; and a Republican chair of the Senate Finance Committee, Bob Packwood from Oregon, supporting the bill. It was a bipartisan bill. And what the majority leader did not mention is the 1986 bill did not add a single cent to the deficit. It was paid for.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a much lesser product than it could have been. We on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, think we need tax reform. We are prepared to support tax reform. We believe we need to bring down the corporate rate. We believe we need to make sure that small businesses can prosper and grow into large businesses.

What we don't believe in, Mr. Speaker, is simply having a bill that advantages the best-off in our country and says that the advantages we give to the middle class will be phased out in a little bit, about 5 years.

□ 1145

So, Mr. Speaker, we will, according to the majority leader, consider this bill next week. It will not be bipartisan, and that is a shame. It will not be positive for the country because it will put us even more deeply into debt, and the people who pay that bill, ultimately, will be our children.

And on both sides of the aisle—we don't have a lot of Members on the floor, but I say to every Member on the floor, every Member on this floor, I am sure, at some point in time you have given a speech somewhere that said: "We care about the debt. We are going to bring down the debt." This bill does not do it. This bill exacerbates the debt.

Anybody who believes that this bill is going to pay for itself through dynamic scoring and economic growth is kidding themselves. It is a rationalization to vote for a bill for which the main imperative is political, not policy, because my Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, believe that, if they don't pass this bill, they will lose the next election.

I have heard that argument over and over and over again. That is not a reason to vote for this bill. It is a reason

to say: Let's go back to the table. Let's include Mr. NEAL in the consideration, the ranking member. Let's include Mr. WYDEN, the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee. Let's include Mr. MCCARTHY and me to try to see if we can reach a bipartisan, positive, constructive piece of legislation which will, like the 1986 legislation, enjoy the support of a wide range of the American people and their Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we had an election yesterday in Alabama. Mr. Jones won that election. Mr. STRANGE, the incumbent Republican representing Alabama right now, lost the primary. He has no mandate.

Why rush this bill through? This bill, if it were passed on December 31 of next year, would affect the 2018 taxes that would be filed in April of 2019. The need to rush this bill, Mr. Speaker, seems to be that, and the reason for having no hearings, the reason for having no witnesses, is because this bill, on its merit, cannot sustain itself.

Now, let me read you a quote, Mr. Speaker: "I think the message of the moment is that the American people, all across the country, are asking us, even in the most liberal State, Massachusetts, to stop this healthcare bill. I think that means there will be no more healthcare votes in the Senate prior to the swearing in of Scott Brown, whenever that may be."

That statement was made on January 20, 2010, by the present majority leader who was then, of course, the minority leader. And his proposition was: You ought to wait until Scott Brown is here so that Massachusetts can have its vote counted. But hypocritically, he has changed his tune today when Alabama, a very conservative State, the opposite of Massachusetts, has voted to elect Doug Jones to the Senate.

I don't hear Mr. MCCONNELL or anybody else saying: Let's wait for the duly elected Member of the United States Senate from Alabama to be seated so that he will have an opportunity to vote on this extraordinarily consequential vote and, in my opinion, negative consequences to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the majority leader might have some comments he wants to make in response, and, therefore, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

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

There were a lot of questions about the schedule. I took notes because there were a lot of things said, but let me first make sure I can try to get through all of them.

You first mentioned many times, what I did not mention. Now, I was asked a question, when would we vote on the tax bill, so I want to be very clear. I answered the question. I said, yes, we will vote on it Tuesday. You said you have heard that it could be Tuesday, so I just said yes, and I didn't mention others because I wasn't asked other questions. But now that you have, let's walk through this.

One of your first arguments was debt. Do you realize, in this progrowth, tax-cutting, job creation bill, if it just grows four-tenths of 1 percent, it pays for all of it?

But what is interesting here is—don't take my word for it—what happens every day to the market when they realize Congress and the Senate is 1 day closer to passing the tax bill? Everybody with a 401(k) gets a pay raise.

The market has set more than 59 records since the election and our movement to passing a tax bill, and that is for all Americans who invested. Everybody's retirement is getting a little better because of it.

Now, what about on the jobs perspective? Well, Broadcom, which was created in America but left America based upon the current Tax Code, on the day of the announcement of our tax bill, said: We are coming back. It is not just that we are bringing so many jobs back. We are going to spend \$3 billion a year in R&D. We are going to spend \$6 billion in manufacturing.

And that is \$20 billion a year in revenue for that company that is going to pay taxes now in America.

But I wonder, that is a big company. Do you know what I just read the other day? A company announcing they are going to Syracuse, New York, based upon our tax bill.

Yes, things are changing in America. People are excited about it.

But it is not just those that are going to hire these thousands of Americans to work. I want to make sure it happens in Maryland as well, so I wanted to look at your district, so here we go. My good friend represents Maryland's Fifth. He has done it for quite some time. Here are a few facts.

Currently, you have 47 percent of filers in Maryland Five that take the standard deduction, so they will be better off because they will get a doubling the day the President signs it.

Another 11 percent have itemized deductions that are less than our new higher standard deduction, so they, too, will save. Not only are they going to save money, they are going to save time. Instead of spending weeks trying to fill out a tax form, it is going to be done in minutes. And you know when they fill out their tax form, they are going to get money.

But they don't have to wait until April 15. Not only in your district, but across this country, check your check come February, because you know what is going to be in that check? More money because the standard deduction goes up.

So that is 58 percent of my friend's district is better off on day one. But from what you tell me, you don't think that is good enough to vote for. A majority of your district is better off on day one. That is not even talking about the small businesses.

Do you know, the small businesses in your district, those that are earning \$400,000, they are going to save \$19,000. I know we are dear friends, but I am

not sure if I have ever known that you have owned a business.

You know my background. When I was 20, I started my first business. There were three lessons I learned that have never left me: I was the first one to work; I was the last one to leave; and I was the last one to be paid.

This is going to create more entrepreneurship, more opportunity, and more people are going to be hired.

Now, I know you are worried about the debt, but it just strikes me, this year, you voted for a budget just a couple of months ago—I am not going to go back to another Congress—that increased the deficit by \$6.8 trillion. So we are only worried about the debt at certain times?

Well, this bill is actually going to grow the economy, as we have watched quarter after quarter after quarter of the administration.

Now, I have got to make sure I got all of it.

You talked about hearings. We have had 59 public hearings. We printed out, before we even ran to continue the majority, about what we would do on tax.

But let's get to the core. That was your district. Let's say to all Americans, it doesn't matter where you live. So anybody, it doesn't matter if you sit on that side of the aisle, on this side of the aisle. It doesn't matter if you are Democrat, Republican, or you are a Socialist. It doesn't matter what you are. You are an American first.

And you know what your constituents are going to see? Let's take the average family, the average family of four, making \$55,000. You can write this down. You know how much tax they are going to pay? Zero. Zero. But that still is not good enough for you.

It is very interesting, in my social science studies, what the party on the other side of the aisle used to say they were for. I believe, back in the day, if you would have stood up here and said, "I have got a tax bill that is going to make sure the average family of four, on the first \$55,000, is going to pay zero," they not only would be excited, they would vote for it.

And you talk to me about bipartisanship. I really think that is a question for you, bipartisanship.

Is it bipartisanship when we reach out to you about CHIP, about healthcare for children, a place not to play politics?

We even stopped a hearing and a markup that we had scheduled well in the future because you came to us, your side of the aisle, and asked us to because you thought you could come to an agreement. Then we were told by your leadership, no, nobody could vote for it. We put things in the bill that we thought you would even want, but, no, you still voted "no."

And how many times have you told me on this floor, I think it was just a few months ago—and I will quote you, if I may—about government funding, because I was concerned because I had read some articles in The New York

Times that suggested, “as a minority party struggling to show resistance in an era of President Trump, the Democrats are now ready to let the lights of government go dark.” I read that to you because I wanted to know was that true or was that false.

Well, you said to me, when I asked my friend whether that rumor was true, he replied: “. . . nobody on my side is talking about wanting to shut down the government. We don’t want to shut down the government” was your quote.

You continued to say: “I would assure my friend that it is neither our intent nor our desire. As a matter of fact, we want to work quickly to avoid that happening. That is not good for, obviously, the American people; it is not good for managers trying to plan on how to deliver services; and it is certainly not good for our Federal employees. So I would want to work with you to make sure that doesn’t happen.”

Mr. Speaker, that was in March, just 9 months ago. I wonder what changed in those 9 months because just last week—and I tell my friend, there was no partisanship in putting a continuing resolution on the floor for 2 weeks. There was no poison pill on this side of the aisle. It was a clean one. And I watched, sitting at this desk, how the vote was going, and I watched the other side, Mr. Speaker. I watched people, not that they just voted “no.” They were whipped into the position to vote “no.” I watched the tally. And once that tally got past the magic number of 218, I watched my good friend put his thumb up, because he gave the okay to those 14 Democrats in his conference that were sitting there, that were told not to vote until it passed. I just wonder what happened to bipartisanship on something that is so bipartisan.

I know the thousands of Federal employees you have in your district, but that is just—I listened, Mr. Speaker, to the leader of the Democratic Party on the other side who said, just 2 days prior, the only person talking about the shutdown is President Trump. Well, the only person taking action and whipping to get to a shutdown was on this floor.

We have had open hearings, Republican and Democrats. We have had an open, bipartisan, bicameral conference. They have walked through an entire bill. We have made sure Americans are going to get a tax cut and jobs are going to be created. It is already happening before the bill is even signed.

I am not sure if I didn’t mention something else, because you try to correct if something was not mentioned. But I want to make sure I answered all those questions for you because I know, not just in your district, that every family of four making \$55,000 will pay nothing, that all the small businesses that are going to hire new people—and I differ from you.

Maybe you will whip strongly against it like you whipped strongly against

the CR and keeping government open, But I still think, when I look upon that tally on the tax bill, I think there will be some on your side. And why do I think that? Because they told me so.

□ 1200

But I still think, when I look upon that tally on the tax bill, I think there will be some on your side. And why do I think that? Because they told me so.

The only difference will be, at the end of the day, if they don’t, if you keep the strong arm, and instead of releasing the thumb up once it passes and put it down, that is the only reason we won’t have bipartisanship on the floor that day.

But I believe in America. I believe in this floor, and I believe in the individuals who fight so strongly to get here to represent their constituents; that they know the new jobs in their district, they know how much those families will save, and they will not let politics get the best of them. They will go against the tide to stop it. They believe that it will even be better. I look forward to that day.

I also look forward to my friend coming back to the quote he told me 9 months ago, because you know what? It is close to Christmas. We have military men and women defending us. The gentleman talked about that bill the President recently signed that, yes, he worked to strong-arm with me, that is going to make government more effective, efficient, and accountable. It also had a pay raise for our men and women. And when he voted “no,” he told them they weren’t getting their raise. But worse, he went even further.

The gentleman questioned whether they could actually have the funds to continue the battle where they needed to be. We have been through shutdowns. We know nobody wins. I believe what he told me 9 months ago. I just want him to come back.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. He made a number of points.

First, generally, I have been here long enough to have heard the debate for the 1981 bill, the so-called supply side, Jack Kemp. Vice President Bush referred to it as “voodoo economics.” And point of fact, as the gentleman knows, because I am sure he knows the record, we increased the debt under Ronald Reagan 189 percent. Larger than any other President with whom I have served over the last 37 years; 189 percent. Stockman said: We knew it wasn’t going to balance the budget. We just said that for political purposes. Stockman said that. He was Director of the OMB under Ronald Reagan.

Then in 2001 and 2003, we had tax cuts. We heard the same arguments, how it was going to grow robustly the economy. It brought in the deepest recession anybody in this Chamber, other than perhaps SAM JOHNSON, who I think is probably our oldest Member, because the rest of us didn’t experience the depression, it ushered in not the

biggest growth rate in America, but the least job-producing 8 years of any American President whom I have served with, and the deepest recession that anybody in this body has experienced, and a hemorrhaging of jobs.

In fact, the stock market, which the gentleman refers to, had a 25 percent decline in value over the 8 years of the Bush administration, with two tax cuts where exactly the same argument for growth was made, and it didn’t happen.

On the other hand, I was here in 1993, when we raised taxes, not much, but a little bit, particularly for infrastructure, and the prediction, Mr. Leader, on your side of the aisle: we would tank as an economy; we would have a terrible recession.

Exactly the opposite happened. You were dead, not you personally, but those who made that representation were 180 degrees wrong.

First of all, we balanced the budget 4 years in a row. Nobody has done that other than President Clinton. Now, you can say you were in charge of the Congress, you were, and I would respond to you: Why couldn’t you do it under George Bush when you had everything? There is no answer to that.

In terms of the experience that we have had when we had tax cuts, the debt did, in fact, explode; 189 percent increase in the national debt. That was approximately 2½ times the increase under Obama and the increase under George Bush. But we continue to argue there is going to be great growth. No reputable economist agrees with that proposition. Well, you read them out to me. I will be glad to hear them.

The stock market increase under this President has gone up. It went up 300 percent under Barack Obama. Three hundred percent. Three hundred percent, from 6,500 to over 18,000.

He had the largest job production, and I told my friend, in 2016, as opposed to 2017, hear, my friends, there were 279,000 more jobs created in 2016, under Barack Obama, than have been created under this President. Mr. Speaker, 279,000 more. Now, that is not a great deal, but in terms of growth, there was more growth of jobs in 2016, when Obama was President of the United States, than has occurred under Donald Trump. Check the records. I am sure you will review and say: Let’s see if HOYER is just giving us some malarkey.

The gentleman talks about this great tax benefit. What he didn’t mention, and what I was referring to, by the way, was when you were giving the schedule, not in response to the question, but that aside, doesn’t mention the State and local taxes.

Now, I am not exactly sure what has happened to State and local taxes, but in my State, it will have a very substantial negative effect. Why? Because we have a significant income tax. Why? Because it is a progressive tax, and it puts the burden on those who have more.

Now, you may disagree with that. Just have a flat tax no matter what

you have, and you pay the same thing. I am not sure exactly what you have done.

The shutdown you talk about. You had 90 people vote against a CR that you recommended they vote for in September, which was a clean CR. You would not have passed that CR. You would have shut down government. You are responsible for keeping government open, “you” being your party. You are in the majority. The only reason that CR passed was because we voted for it. You had 90 of your people vote against it; 90, who apparently didn’t want to pay the military, apparently didn’t want to protect them overseas. That proposition, like they say, won’t hunt, because the chairman of the Armed Services Committee voted against that CR. Why? Because he thought it was harmful to the national security of our country. Secretary Mattis believes the CR is damaging.

It is inappropriate, in my view, when we do something and say: We don’t like this bill, and the only party with whom I have served who would consciously, purposely shut down the government, I tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, is the Republican Party. They did it in 1995, under Newt Gingrich, and they did it last year with Mr. CRUZ coming over here and saying: Shut down the government unless they repeal the ACA. Shut it down, consciously.

We have never done that. Have we had to shut down because we couldn’t get agreement? We have done that for a few days. But for 16 days you shut it down consciously. And guess what? When you voted to open up the government, guess who voted against it? Mr. Mulvaney, the Director of the OMB. He voted against opening up the government. I guess he was against the Armed Forces. I guess he was against defending our country, if that’s your proposition.

CHIP. You are right. You waited. We didn’t get an agreement. But we waited long after September 30, when the gentleman says he is very concerned about funding it. The authorization expired. Now, you passed, ultimately, a bill that we didn’t vote for. You passed it on your own. If you really were that concerned, you would have passed it before the authorization expired on September 30. We passed it some weeks later, and we passed it with a piece of funding in there that is going to undermine, for instance, just as one example, vaccinations for children, because you funded it, in part, by reducing substantially the Prevention Fund, which seeks to prevent illness.

On bipartisanship, very frankly, we had a 2-week CR, you are right, a 2-week CR. You got a 2-week CR. The only thing you have worked on, from our perspective, is the tax bill, and you did not include us in those discussions. You had closed hearings.

We had a conference hearing yesterday. Mr. NEAL tried to move an amendment out of order. It wasn’t accepted. It was a done deal. Done deal in secret.

I tell my friend, I reread a little bit of “Young Guns” last night. It talked about transparency. It talked about openness. It talked about doing things one at a time, not packaging a lot of bills.

The reason we all hate CRs is because nobody knows what is in a CR. We lard it down, and this CR is larded down with numerous bills. We are talking about the tax bill, but the CR that the gentleman talked about is five or six major pieces of legislation put in one package. Take it or leave it.

That is not the way to run this organization, and that is what you guys said in “Young Guns.” And I agree with you, but it is not what you have done. It is what you said, but it is not what you have done.

Let me just close on this. Frankly, I am going to talk about the CR, but I am talking about it now.

We don’t have a budget caps deal. Today is the 14th; so we are essentially 17 days from the end of the year. We don’t have a caps deal. We don’t have a disaster supplemental for Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands that is proposed to be in this CR, as I understand it, and the fires in California. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and we are going to support helping the folks of California who have been devastated by these fires. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

We don’t have anything on DREAMers. We think that is critically important. I said to the majority leader 4 months ago that we felt this was critically important and we needed to get this done. I think, as I have said to the gentleman, we have over 300 votes on this floor for a bill to get this done.

Alexander-Murray. I don’t think, I don’t know, I haven’t seen the conference report, but Alexander-Murray, which tries to stabilize the availability of healthcare at a reasonable price to the American people, I don’t think that is in the tax bill, as I understand it.

VA Choice funding, I think, is in the CR. I haven’t seen exactly what it says.

Opioids funding. I have a crisis in my district. In every district in America, opioids is a critical issue. There is no funding in the CR, as I understand it, for that.

The fire grants program for our emergency responders, no money for that.

Perkins loans, nothing for that. The debt limit is going to come later.

National Flood Insurance Program, nothing for that, as I understand it.

Medicare and other health extenders, 702 of FISA to keep America secure and strong and safe. As I understand it, none of that is being dealt with.

The reason we voted against the last CR is because we are tired of kicking things down the road. We are tired of kicking the can down the road. We want to get to an agreement on a bipartisan basis to pass legislation that is positive for our country, and that is why we may vote against this next CR, because we ought to stop just kicking

the can down the road. And we are going to kick the can, as I understand it, down the road to some point in time to January 19, is the discussion.

Mr. Leader, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to sit down to try to reach agreement on these issues that have got to be reached. If we don’t reach them, America will be less safe, less secure, less healthy as an economy and less healthy, literally, in terms of making sure that the healthcare available to America is on a stable path.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the majority leader and then make a few comments, and then we will close. I yield to my friend.

□ 1215

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

I do look forward to these colloquies, and I first want to make sure history has it right. 137 economists sent a letter to Congress supporting our tax reform effort and saying it will accelerate growth. I don’t know if the gentleman dislikes these 137, but these are economists. I don’t judge the difference.

History says President Obama added more than \$8 trillion to the national debt.

Now, how does that measure against all of the others?

Well, that is more than 43 prior Presidents combined. That is what history shows.

My friend is correct. He has been here much longer than I have. He actually had the majority for 40 years. He didn’t balance the budget during that time. There was a common denominator that got the budget balanced in those 4 years, and that was the Republican majority who had to fight for it to get there.

The gentleman raised some other issues. He brought an issue up with a number of days. I don’t think we should waste any time. He brought an issue up of we don’t have a cap agreement to be able to work forward. It wasn’t the gentleman, but it was his leader on the other side who decided not to go to the meeting at the White House.

The gentleman says that we should not waste our time on the floor. It wasn’t this side, but we did have to take time up on this floor to make a motion to impeach the President. We took that time up on the floor. We didn’t take the time up for CHIP and for the others.

I do remember the quote from my friend. We differ, sometimes philosophically, but we are friends and we are friends because I admire him. I admire principles. There are times when I have watched the gentleman stand for what he has said for years, and maybe his party has a different position. He doesn’t hide from it. It is what he told the American public he would do, and he voted that way. And he will stand and oppose me because it is what he said in the past and what he said he would do.

But this is not something new. He has always said: "Funding our government is not a game. When one side wins and the other side loses, a shut-down is not a political football to be tossed around so casually." I was personally shocked last week.

I wondered what would have happened as I watched your operation whip people to a "no;" as we watched the time click; as you watched, you held those who stood by the voting booth who wanted to vote "yes" but could not.

Had we not gotten enough votes to keep government open, would your side of the aisle have applauded? Would your side of the aisle thought they won victory?

And you do go back and it is correct, there were 90 Members on this side of the aisle who didn't vote for a CR, but you, like myself, understand a CR is usually a responsibility of both because it is bipartisan. No one is getting anything, and no one wants to end in that position.

We don't want to be in a CR and we don't want to vote for a CR. That is why we came to you so many times in the past when it came to CHIP. But, yes, I understand sometimes people can use it for politics. Let's push it all to the end so maybe we get an advantage with something else.

We wanted an agreement. That is why staff of those four leaders have been meeting, and actually came to a pretty close agreement.

So what do they do next?

Take it to the next level. Let's go to the White House because the White House has been in those meetings at the same time because the President has to sign the bill, the Senate, the House, and leaders on both sides. But when that meeting came just a few short weeks ago, your leaders wouldn't show up. And I take you at your word that you are willing to sit down. The rest of your leadership has to be willing to sit down, too.

But this idea that we want to hold government hostage, so many times I have heard the gentleman in the past say that was wrong. He asked about the things that haven't been done.

The thing I love the most—I believe in metrics. They have to be honest metrics. I will share them with you because I share them with our side of the aisle because I want us to be judged. I want us to know exactly where we are. And if we are not where we said we are going to be, we should actually work harder.

So I took the first Congress of every new President since George H.W. Bush. I wanted to see how many bills came through committee. Because the gentleman is right. When he read the "Young Guns" book—and I am not saying to buy it in any shape or form because I don't want to cause any ethics issues, but I don't get any money from it anyway. I give it to the veterans.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I keep pushing it for you.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I don't even know if it is in print. I want the bills to come through committee because that is where the expertise is; that is where the open public process is; that is where amendments get to be offered, won or lost. More bills in a first Congress since George H.W. Bush have gone through committee.

Now, let's measure how many bills have gotten off this floor.

Does the gentleman realize that more bills have been passed out of this Congress than any Congress in the first term of a President in modern history back to George H.W. Bush?

And we did it by going through a transparent, open process; exactly what we pledged we would do in that book. So, yes, I am glad you read it and I am glad you took the words, and I would love to show you the graphs.

But let's walk back to this: government funding is important. Let's talk about it. Here are the facts: By mid-July, all 12 appropriations bills passed both subcommittee and full committee. That was July. On July 27, we passed the four appropriations bills off the House floor, which provided for critical national security. Now, my friend and nearly all of the Democrats voted "no."

On September 14, we passed the remaining eight appropriations bills off this floor. Now, my friend and nearly all of the Democrats voted "no."

But the most disappointing vote, as I mentioned, was last week on December 7 to fund the government. My friend and the Democrats all voted "no."

When I was young and I didn't always get my way, I would go to my parents and I would complain. But it is really odd that we got to this floor in a different nature, that someone would complain about something not getting done and never vote for anything.

Mr. Speaker, I like my friend. I want my friend, who, for decades, has talked about not playing games with the funding of government. I don't know where you have gone, but I want you to come back. I think America needs you back. I think that leadership will be important for both sides. And I will tell you, I would have been disappointed in you if I watched you applaud if you were successful in shutting down the government. Because I know that is not the man you are. I know that is not the person and the principles of what you stand for.

All of those votes that you said this side of the aisle didn't vote for, I stood and voted for those because leadership is different. We do take votes that are tougher than others. We do have to put politics aside, and we do have to look out for the best of this country. It may not be the mood of the politics on TV that maybe wants to fight more, or throw another motion on the floor to impeach, but there is a time that we should rise above.

I think going into the end of this year, we should think anew and act anew. I think America should not see a

bad Christmas because one side of the aisle wanted to shut it down, and not for any other reason than they voted "no" on all of the bills that would have kept it open. If you had a cause, if you had a desire, and if you had a big desire, you would have shown up to the meeting to actually get the answer.

We could have a cap agreement. We could be done with it. We could make sure our men and women get the raises they deserve. We could make sure that those in battle theater have every opportunity so they are able to carry out their mission that we asked them to do in the safest manner possible. That is what I want to see.

Mr. HOYER. "Come back, Shane." Maybe many of you are not old enough to remember that wonderful movie. Shane rode off and the little boy intoned, "Come back, Shane."

I haven't gone anywhere. Democrats have no ability to shut down the government on the floor of this House. Hear me: We don't have the votes to shut down government and we don't want to shut down government.

Maybe the leader also wants those 90 of his—he is not our leader. He is the leader of the majority party, and 90 of his people did not follow him. I presume he must be much more concerned about that.

With all due respect, he is my friend, but not my leader. We voted to give 90 days and nothing was accomplished in that 90 days other than working on a tax bill that we think is a disaster for this country. Nothing.

The gentleman talks about passing these appropriations bills. We knew they wouldn't pass the Senate and we told him so. We said: Let's do it on a bipartisan basis.

But, no. By the way, Mr. Speaker, it was the least regular order prior to an omnibus at the end of a year in dealing with appropriations bills that I have ever seen. They packaged, I think it was four or five the first time—four, I think, and then the balance of eight.

We didn't consider them individually. We didn't have an opportunity to consider them thoughtfully, no. It was one big package, for or against. I said I read that book. It was anything but regular order.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, the majority party that passed them is the majority in the United States Senate; and not a single one of those bills, not a single one, has passed out of the Senate. Not a single one has gone to the President of the United States. Not one. The Republicans are in charge of the House and the Senate. Not a single bill has gone to the President of the United States.

Harry Reid is no longer there just to beat on: Oh, it is Harry Reid.

Now, what it would have taken to pass some of those appropriations bills in the Senate is some compromise, but that didn't happen. So don't wring your hands about how bad it is that we haven't had bipartisanship on the appropriations bills—we haven't—or bipartisanship on the CR when you lose

90 of your people. Ninety Republicans voted against a simple CR. You say simple CR, nothing to be partisan about, et cetera. Ninety of your people voted “no.”

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Let's make sure we are comparing apples to apples. That had a debt ceiling in it.

Mr. HOYER. Let me reclaim my time just so the gentleman can further explain.

Does that mean 90 of your people did not want to pay the bills of the United States and default on our debt?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

But if you are going to compare a CR that you said was simple, it is not simple. We all know that. If you are going to compare it to the CR that you voted against last week, that had no debt ceiling on it. You explained to me numerous times of how many CRs you voted for in the past in this body and how Democrats came over with Republicans. Because, you know what, you and I both know that is normally how it works.

A CR is not an advantage for one or the other. And this is what I am most upset with. Our Founding Fathers created a body that could have compromise. But for some reason, in today's society, it is not just that you want one side to win. You want to try to crush the other side. That is not crushing one side or the other. That is actually hurting the American public.

So in a situation where we know that a continuing resolution is going to be short term, in 2 weeks, yes, I would expect half of the votes to come from your side and half of the votes to come from ours. That is what has happened in the past. I am just wondering where that went.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, let me say to the gentleman very respectfully: Do not expect cooperation from our side if we don't get cooperation from your side, if we don't get some inclusion in making decisions.

□ 1230

We are, after all, 194 Members of this body. From time to time, you and I do work together. When we work together, we get majorities and we pass pieces of legislation.

You have not passed a single controversial fiscal bill on this floor without our substantial help until last week. You got about 230 on that last bill. But let me tell you, the reason we voted against it is because we knew exactly what was going to happen: nothing. There would be no agreement to CHIP; there is no agreement on CHIP. There would be no agreement on FISA; there has been no agreement on FISA. There would be no agreement on flood control; there has been no agreement on flood control. So we knew that we

were not going to get any bipartisan buy-in, so all we were doing is delaying the inevitable.

Let me tell you, when we did defeat the homeland security bill—you remember that, I am sure; we did, and you were in the majority—you came back to the floor and said that we are going to meet tomorrow. We reached an agreement, and we passed it.

Very frankly, you have never heard us say that, as a policy, in order to get the ACA repealed or Gingrich wanted to get some fiscal thing done, that we would shut down the government. Three times you shut it down in 1995 and 1996. Three times, intentionally. That was your policy.

Yes, if you are going to take the government hostage and force us to do something that we think is inimical to the best interests of this country, yes, Mr. Leader, you will leave us with no other option: to pretend that we are keeping government moving but not getting any agreement.

I talked to you very sincerely 4 months ago about one of the things that we wanted to get done before the end of this year is getting DREAMers protected who are now vulnerable and very scared that they are going to be sent back to someplace they do not know, have not lived in, brought here as children through no fault of their own, gone to elementary school, junior high school, high school, college, served in the military, working at jobs, and vetted to make sure that they haven't done anything wrong. They are afraid of being sent back home—not back home. Excuse me. I say that. That is not their home. This is their home.

Nothing has been done on that. I know you have a task force and talked about it, but we haven't done anything. There is no reason why we can't. I think we have 300 votes on this floor to get that done.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The gentleman is correct. There are many times we have worked together, on sanctions, on homeland and others. We work very well together.

The gentleman knows I came to you about CHIP when the committee was directed, on your side of the aisle, not to do anything with the majority party, so I came to you because of our history.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I don't know who the gentleman is relying on for that information, but I will tell you I have talked to Mr. PALLONE. That is not correct.

I don't know who you think directed him not to reach an agreement, but I will tell you, after you made that assertion, I think last week or the week before, I went to Mr. PALLONE. I asked him that, and he said absolutely not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I came to the gentleman. I was under the impression. A

Member came to me and said that. Maybe that is not true. Maybe that is not what Mr. PALLONE wants.

But I came to you and said: Let's get together and work this out. I don't want to make CHIP partisan in any shape or form. We met, and we tried to work.

You came back to me and said: You have to go alone.

I said: That is not how I want to do it.

So what we did was we took everything we heard from the hearings. In good faith, the chairman of that committee, GREG WALDEN, stopped a markup because you requested—not you, but your ranking member. They weren't prepared. They wanted more time.

So we want to do everything in our power; but, at the end of the day, you couldn't be there. Twice, your side of the aisle voted against CHIP. You can't argue against it now. You voted against it.

When you talk about appropriations, I am very proud of what we did on appropriations. We haven't been able to do that in quite some time. But there were, in those first four bills—every single one of those 12 bills went through subcommittee and full committee. There were 126 amendments on the first four and 342 on the second.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time for just a second, and then I will yield back to the gentleman.

Is the gentleman proud that you control the House, you control the Senate, and you haven't sent a single appropriations bill to the President? Not a single one. Not one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

No. That is why I want you to join with me and get the Senate to move, because, as the gentleman knows, you don't control the Senate when you have 51 or 52 Members. Do you know what happens? It takes 60.

Now, I don't firmly believe in that, but that is the way they play it over in the Senate. That is why, when you don't have a cap agreement, that you need all four leaders to go to the White House. But when the two won't show up, the best thing to do is, is you don't show up, then don't complain I don't have an agreement.

The best way to complain is get all 12 bills off this floor with a simple majority. If that is good enough for America inside Congress, it should be good enough on the Senate side. But, unfortunately, that is not the case. So your side is able to hold it up, and I'm ashamed of that as well.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what it would have meant, you would have had to compromise. That is why the Senate has that 60-vote rule. I am not crazy about it myself, but that is why they have the 60-vote rule. They think it is good because that is why they kept it. They think it is good because it requires

compromise; it requires agreement; it requires moving ahead on a piece of legislation.

I will tell you, I served on the Appropriations Committee for 23 years, and we reached agreement between Republicans and Democrats on almost every bill. And when we had the bills, they weren't partisan bills, and they got a lot of Republican votes, almost always, when we were in charge—not all the time, almost always.

If you are a party of no compromise, then you can't move things in the United States Senate. I get that. But that is the reason. That is the reason, because you couldn't reach compromise.

Very frankly, a lot of the bills have come out of the committee. Do you know why they came out of committee? Because they were bipartisan. But they haven't been brought to the floor by Mr. McCONNELL, and they haven't been sent to the President of the United States, so somewhat crocodile tears.

Yes, you passed those 12 bills just like you can pass the CRs, on your own, without any help from us. If the government shuts down, it is because you can't get the majority of your party to pass bills.

Mr. MCCARTHY. No. No. No.

Mr. HOYER. You are in charge. There is no doubt when we were in charge and you didn't support us, we passed every piece of legislation we wanted to pass on this floor with 218 Democrats. We were united as a party. Now, we lost some, but never enough to make it so that we didn't get 218. You lost 90. You can say it was on the debt; you can say it was on national security; you can say whatever you want on it; but you brought a bill to the floor, and 90 of your people voted against it to keep government open and to keep government operating.

Very frankly, we voted with you so that we could get some work done, and we haven't gotten work done. That is what frustrates us. That is what frustrates the American people.

I will tell my friend, at the end of the day, after this Congress is gone, historians are not going to be kind, notwithstanding the fact you say you passed so many bills. You passed so many bills on a partisan basis, and you used, essentially, the 51 vote because you didn't want to compromise. We get it. You don't want to compromise. You don't want to work with us. You didn't have any hearing on this tax bill. We were not included in any phase of the marking up and fashioning of this tax bill.

Now, I am about ready to yield back the balance of my time. I am sure that everybody who wants to give a 1-minute or a Special Order is very happy to hear that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

The gentleman is correct about compromise, but there is a real big dif-

ference between compromise and obstruction, to obstruct, when you talked about the Senate. It takes 60 votes to even get on to a bill. I know as well as my friend that you can utilize the Senate and the leadership of the House to stop something if you want to.

I will tell my friend that I am disappointed. What will you say to the 62,000? What will you say to the 62,000 Federal employees who live in your district? What will you say to them about every quote you made in the past that you should not play games with funding and shutting down the government?

You may think you can make that statement here. Your leader may think that she can say that only the President was talking about a shutdown. The President never whipped one vote to shut it down. He whipped it to stay open. History won't be kind.

Yes, we will come to a conclusion next week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, in reclaiming my time, does the gentleman remember President Trump saying that a good shutdown will be good for government? Do you remember him saying that, when you tell me about how he has been down here lobbying? He said: A "good shutdown" may be good for government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I understand what his words said. I also watched his actions. I also watched what he did last week to get Members to vote to keep it open because things did change. There was not compromise even though the bill was a compromise because there was no poison pill in it.

If we are going to carry everything ourselves, maybe we should put something in it. It was a compromise, but, unfortunately, you changed on the other side. You decided now is the time to shut the government down, try to blame somebody else.

The American people will see through that, and I will guarantee you that 62,000 people who work for the Federal Government in the Maryland Fifth District will not take that as an answer.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I would, again, reiterate: the majority party can do whatever it wants on this floor. It could have kept government open. It could have kept policies moving with its votes. Time after time after time on critical issues confronting this country, they couldn't come up with a majority.

As a matter of fact, on one occasion, Mr. MCCARTHY was the whip, Mr. Cantor was the majority leader, and Mr. Boehner was the Speaker. They offered a bill to keep government moving. They only got 84 of their colleagues, approximately one-third of their colleagues on their side of the aisle, to vote with them.

I don't want to hear about us shutting down government. We can't shut down government. They are in charge. The majority has the votes. You can do whatever you want. We get it. We may not like it any more than you liked it, but we get it.

But we voted on the hope that we would get some work done. We haven't moved anyplace except on the tax bill, which we think is bad for this country, in the last 90 days since we passed—and we passed. The CR would not have passed without us.

And, yes, we will not be held hostage. Yes, we will oppose what we think is a very, very bad tax bill and we think is an effort to avoid getting the work of this House done.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

—

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 5:30 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

—

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2017, TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, December 15, 2017, it adjourn to meet on Monday, December 18, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

—

PAYING TRIBUTE TO TIM FRABLE

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, America lost a hero this week, and I lost a friend.

Tim Frable trained at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana and flew missions in a P-51 over Japan during World War II. During one mission, he had to ditch into the Pacific. He and a wing mate floated for days before being rescued.

Tim was my science teacher in junior high school. He told his ocean rescue story in 5-minute installments at the end of class each day. Because of his storytelling, no one missed class.

Tim loved Montana. In 1976, he brought me and 17 other classmates from Pennsylvania to Red Lodge to

hike into the back country. We hiked to Black Canyon Lake, Grasshopper Glacier, Froze-to-Death Plateau, and onto the Absaroka Lake Plateau.

Tim had a tremendous impact on many lives in his 93 years, including my own. I will always be grateful for his service to our country and for his dedication as a teacher. I will miss my friend Tim Frable.

□ 1245

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MAYOR ED LEE

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I rise to pay tribute to a dear friend and an extraordinary leader, Mayor Ed Lee of San Francisco.

All who knew Mayor Lee understood him to be a true gentleman of great warmth, positivity, and kindness. His passing is not only a tragic official loss for our city, but an immense personal loss for all who were fortunate to call him friend.

Mayor Lee's first priority was always the people. His strong moral compass was rooted in his identity as the hard-working son of an immigrant family of modest means and was guided by his years as a community organizer and civil rights lawyer.

Ed fundamentally understood that the strength of a community is measured by its success in meeting the needs of all its people. He knew the rhythms and the workings of San Francisco at the most granular level, and dedicated decades to improving the lives of all San Franciscans.

As mayor, Ed Lee served with exceptional dignity and great effectiveness. His values-based, pragmatic leadership helped drive the city into a strong economic expansion.

His firm commitment to equality made immense progress toward securing affordable housing and a living wage for all. His unwavering belief in justice helped combat the moral crisis of homelessness in San Francisco, particularly for our veterans. His bold, hopeful vision for the future further secured San Francisco's role as a model city for the Nation.

Mayor Ed Lee's public service leaves an enduring, inspiring legacy that generations of San Franciscans will enjoy. As Ecclesiasticus says: The people will tell of His wisdom and the congregation will continue to sing His praise.

Mayor Lee never had an unkind word for anyone, and no one ever had an unkind word for him. Even though our hearts are broken, we think of the person Ed Lee was, and we smile.

Mayor Lee took deep pride in serving as the first Asian-American mayor of San Francisco. But his greatest source of joy was his beloved family. Our city owes a debt of gratitude to his wife, Anita; and his daughters, Brianna and

Tania, for sharing this exceptional person with us.

My deepest love and prayers are with his family. May it bring them some measure of comfort that so many people throughout the world mourn with them and continue to be inspired by him.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are joined by so many Members of Congress from the California delegation and from the Asian Pacific American Caucus as well.

TAX CUTS BILL

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am excited.

For the first time in decades, I can dare to hope that we will not crush our children's future with debt.

As our House and Senate colleagues work hard to shape the details of a final bill, we can see the goal line:

We will lower rates across the board for hardworking taxpayers in all brackets;

We will provide relief to small businesses and farms throughout our Nation so that America can compete and win; and

We will simplify the Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, you shouldn't need an army of lawyers and accountants to do your taxes. Americans deserve a Tax Code where everyone plays by the same rules and a code that projects a lifetime of savings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to work together, give America the healthy economy it deserves, and support the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

REAUTHORIZE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, children's health is not a partisan issue. It is a human issue.

Nevertheless, the majority party let the Children's Health Insurance Program expire months ago. As a result, States across the country are going to be forced to terminate millions of underserved children's only lifeline to a doctor.

Rather than working with Democrats, the Republican leadership passed a bill that would extend CHIP, but strip health coverage from as many as 668,000 American children. Partisanship has poisoned this well.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 231,000 children in New Jersey rely on CHIP to get them to the doctor. Many more people in my State rely on community health centers, Medicare, and the Affordable Care Act's prevention fund to stay healthy.

Congress must protect these programs. I urge my colleagues to pass a

bill before the end of the year to extend the funding for these critically important healthcare programs, including CHIP and community health centers, without taking healthcare away from more than half a million Americans.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues in Congress to quickly pass a 5-year extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

In Iowa, around 85,000 children rely on CHIP for their health. This is very important to so many families in our Third District. I am grateful a short-term solution was included as part of the continuing resolution passed last week; however, we must do more.

On November 3, the House passed legislation to extend funding for CHIP for 5 years, with the support of every Iowa Representative. However, since that time, we have been waiting for our colleagues in the Senate to act. They need to act now.

We must work together to fund this critical program which has bipartisan support and bicameral support. The health of our children is at stake. Children in low- and middle-income families will be those hit the hardest if we do not fully fund CHIP. With Iowa families left without coverage and access to needed medical services for their children, we must act.

I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to include an extension of CHIP in the important bills we will be considering in the weeks ahead, because families shouldn't be worrying about losing coverage for their children.

As Congress continues to work on the many important issues facing our country, I know I, and other colleagues, will continue to support this.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TIMOTHY "TIM" BRADFORD

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Timothy "Tim" Bradford passed away last week.

Tim was a commissioner of the Cook County Metropolitan Water Reclamation District, but he was much more than that. Tim grew up on the west side of the city of Chicago, moved to the south suburbs, and became known as the godfather of politics in south suburban Cook County.

He was in love with everybody he met, involved in everything that existed, and I simply express condolences to his wife and family on his passing.

MEDIA HELPED ELECT A SENATOR

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the liberal media helped elect a U.S. Senator from Alabama. Their alliance with the Democratic Party is now so close, we should call them mediacrats. Admittedly, the mediacrats got an assist from some Republicans, as well as the candidate himself.

The primary lesson to be learned from the election is that Republicans must confront media bias. They must constantly point it out and remind the American people of this corrosive effect on our election process. Republicans should join the President exposing fake news.

The media should trust the American people with the facts, not tell them what to think. Because the media is so biased, their credibility with the American people is at an all-time low.

For the sake of our country and for the sake of fair elections, I hope the media will return to their paramount responsibility: providing the American people with unbiased news.

MOMENT OF TRUTH

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump claims he has “nothing to do with Russia,” but we have seen damning revelations: secret meetings, business and financial entanglements, and elaborate attempts to conceal information.

In any other era, these would be bombshells, but our nonstop media cycle, fueled by Trump’s constant infusions of drama, make it hard to connect the dots. It is not that we lack evidence of Trump-Russia ties, it is that there is so much, it makes your head spin.

So today, I am beginning a “moment of truth” series of speeches to point out facts that show an administration that is compromised and that not only colluded with Russia, but has obstructed justice to keep us from knowing the truth.

One of many smoking guns is from 2015, when Trump’s associate, Felix Sater, was seeking financing from a Russian bank facing American sanctions to build a Trump Tower in Moscow. This email from Sater to Trump’s personal attorney speaks for itself: “I’ll get Putin on this program, and we’ll get Donald elected.”

There is a lot more to come.

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

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SANDY HOOK SHOOTING

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and commemorate the sad fifth anniversary of the Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting, which took the lives of 20 innocent children and six brave educators.

Last night, I stood on the floor of the House and indicated how breathless I felt when the news came in: One child, 2 children, 3 children, 4 children, 5 children, 6 children, 7 children, 8 children, 9 children, 10 children, 11 children, 12 children, 13 children, 14 children, 15 children, 16 children, 17 children, 18 children, 19 children, 20 children, and the brave adults who tried to save their lives, including the mother of the perpetrator.

I rise today to join in the call for acts of kindness. Tomorrow, I will be giving out books at the Blackshear Elementary School. I will be giving out shoes in my district to the Forest Brook Middle School.

I hope that we understand what it is not about: guns don’t kill; people do. Guns kill.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we have real gun safety legislation. At the same time, I hope that, as we look toward the needs of our Nation, the Children’s Health Insurance Program and those who are suffering from hurricanes will be part of our kindness.

I take a moment for these children. I honor the Sandy Hook children and the brave adults who tried to save their lives. May God bless them all.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to join my colleagues in honoring and remembering all of the victims of the tragic shootings at the Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, CT five years ago.

Nearly five years after a mass shooter murdered 20 children and six adults at Sandy Hook elementary school, Republican politicians are still blocking any attempt to pass tougher federal gun control laws.

The lack of congressional action has prompted outrage, despair, and a sense that the gun debate is intractable.

As the Founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children’s Caucus and a senior Member of the Judiciary Committee, I have listened to the tragic testimony of individuals who have survived or lost loved ones as a result of gun violence.

It is still painful for those who recall the news from Newtown, Connecticut on that day five years ago.

The story of Sandy Hook was particularly frightening for those of us who are parents or grandparents.

The community and the families directly impacted continue to reel from the inconceivable tragedy that took place at Sandy Hook Elementary on December 14, 2012.

Our hearts still ache with sadness and disbelief for the families and loved ones of the children and women who lost their lives in this senseless act of violence.

I also recognize and applaud the heroic efforts made by the teachers, administrators,

and law enforcement officials who acted quickly to secure and protect the lives of the children who survived this deadly encounter.

I, along with other parents in America, know that the healing process continues for the parents, siblings, and friends of the 20 children who died on December 14, 2012.

Our prayers go to the families and colleagues of the teachers, councilor, and principle of the school who were also killed in defense of the children in their charge.

This tragedy unlike any other in recent memory touched so many hearts and minds both in the United States and around the world that this weekend is particularly poignant.

The parents and grandparents who dropped off their children and grandchildren in the early morning hours of December 14, 2012, could never have imagined that by 10 a.m. on that morning they would have to face this tragedy.

The deaths at Sandy Hook as well as those at Aurora and Columbine will be etched in our collective memories.

These are moments when lives were needlessly lost due to gun violence.

The nation united in grief one year ago, and many of us who strong support sensible gun safety laws thought the moment had finally arrived when the policy makers, parents, teachers, and law enforcement could join efforts to make our schools, parks, sidewalks, and homes safer from gun violence.

We could all agree that the tragedy should not have occurred, but we could not find the common ground that would take any meaningful step to reduce gun violence in the United States.

We must join together in recognizing that this tragedy can happen in any community and we must immediately begin to address the underlying problems that would lead a young man to take up arms against defenseless women and children.

The tragedy of Sandy Hook took us all by surprise, but there are hundreds of other tragedies around the nation that involve children falling victim to gun violence.

Annually in the United States there are over 30,000 gun related deaths.

The total number of deaths associated with 13 years of war in both Afghanistan and Iraq is 6,778 service men and women.

No other nation had the level of gun violence per-capita as the United States unless they were actively engaged in a civil war or conflict with another nation.

There are some things that cannot be rationalized by any means—one of the things that we as policy makers have to face is the threat of gun violence to our nation, communities, and families.

I read with heartache the September 28, 2013, New York Times article, “Children and Guns: The Hidden Toll,” published in September of this year.

Some of the stories were tragic as they are familiar to those of us who work to reduce gun violence.

Lucas Heagren, 3 years old, killed by a gun he found where his father temporarily hid it under a couch.

Days later, Cassie Culpepper, age 11, who was shot and killed by her brother who thought a gun his father gave him to scare coyotes was unloaded.

A few weeks later, Alex Whitfield, age 11 was killed by a Glock pistol found in a closet by a 15 year old.

These children are the hidden victims of a nation obsessed with guns at almost any cost. The children of gun violence may be any child or grandchild—including your own.

They may be from any home found in any neighborhood or rural community in this nation.

The tragedies of gun deaths of children are not just what your child knows about gun safety, but more often what another child with access to a firearm does not know.

More important—is the lack of adults' knowledge regarding gun safety that can lead to preventable gun related child deaths.

Some parents are the source of their own children becoming victims of gun violence because they mistakenly attempted to clean a loaded gun or handled a loaded gun improperly.

Many of these deaths are not part of official records.

The New York Times conducted research in Georgia, Minnesota, North Carolina, and Ohio going back to 1999.

They collected data from medical examiners in Florida, Illinois and Texas.

They found over 259 accidental firearm deaths of children under the age of 15.

These numbers are about twice as many as were reported in federal statistics.

Homicide is the second leading cause of death for young people ages 15 to 24.

Homicide is the leading cause of death for many minorities in this country.

82.8 percent of young people who are killed, are victims of a killing through a firearm.

Every 30 minutes, a child or teenager in America is injured by a gun.

Every 3 hours and 15 minutes, a child or a teenager loses their life to a firearm.

And in 2010, 82 children under 5 years of age lost their lives due to guns.

Less than 20 states have laws that hold adults criminally responsible if they act negligently in the storage of firearms that may lead to children having access to them.

National data is needed on all forms of firearm related deaths for policy makers, the public and media to fully comprehend the scope of the problem of gun violence in the United States.

The challenge to gaining access to this information is state laws that do not consider death certificate information as public information and who may not voluntarily report numbers to the Department of Justice.

At around the same time that the children in Newtown, CT faced a deranged gun man, thousands of miles away in China, another man also attacked a group of school children.

Again, a tragedy that no one in the community could have anticipated; however, because the man in China was armed only with a knife, he wounded instead of killed 20 children.

The lives of 20 children in China were spared because their attacker did not have in his possession a gun.

I believe the solution to these acts of violence can be found by taking a multifaceted approach.

There are those who will say that “guns don't kill people, people kill people.”

The statistics for the harm that people are capable of doing with guns to themselves and others is alarming.

People are indeed killing people, with guns.

We need to reform how we view guns in this country and also how we address mental health challenges in our communities.

We must act now.

This is the right moment to demonstrate that the safety of our children is one of our most sacred priorities.

It is imperative that this Congress brings to the House for immediate consideration the following gun safety laws.

First, there must be an immediate ban on all assault weapons.

Second, we must close gun show loopholes which allow for the sale of weapons without a background check.

Third, we must reform our current mental health system to provide support for families to enable them to get immediate assistance for mental health issues.

In addition, there should be pathways for families who are facing these challenges to gain emergency access to publicly funded or private counseling services.

Fourth, we must look at the design of primary and secondary schools in which these schools may need to have reinforced bullet proof window and reinforced secure entrances.

Lastly, we must expand current state laws to hold adults accountable and responsible for the security of their weapons.

We can help to prevent tragedies like this one from happening again.

According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, gun violence claims the lives of over 30,000 people.

For every person who dies from a gunshot wound, two others are wounded.

Every year, approximately 100,000 Americans are victims of gun violence.

In addition to those who are killed or injured, there are countless others whose lives are forever changed by the deaths of and injuries to their loved ones.

In 2010, guns took the lives of 31,076 Americans in homicides, suicides and unintentional shootings.

This is the equivalent of more than 85 deaths each day and more than three deaths each hour.

There were 73,505 Americans treated in hospital emergency departments for non-fatal gunshot wounds in 2010.

Firearms were the third-leading cause of injury-related deaths nationwide in 2010, following poisoning and motor vehicle accidents.

Between 1955 and 1975, the Vietnam War killed over 58,000 American soldiers—less than the number of civilians killed with guns in the U.S. in an average two-year period.

In the first seven years of the U.S.-Iraq War, over 4,400 American soldiers were killed. Almost as many civilians are killed with guns here in the U.S. over the course of 7 weeks rather than 7 years.

U.S. homicide rates are 6.9 times higher than rates in 22 other populous high-income countries combined, despite similar non-lethal crime and violence rates.

The firearm homicide rate in the U.S. is 19.5 times higher. Guns were used in 11,078 homicides in the U.S. in 2010, comprising almost 35% of all gun deaths, and over 68% of all homicides.

Over a million people have been killed with guns in the United States since 1968, when Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy were assassinated.

On average, 33 gun homicides were committed each day for the years 2005–2010.

Regions and states with higher rates of gun ownership have significantly higher rates of

homicide than states with lower rates of gun ownership.

Where guns are prevalent, there are significantly more homicides, particularly gun homicides.

For years, I have introduced and reintroduced gun safety legislation and supported the efforts of my colleagues who have also worked diligently to protect the lives of our nation's children through adequate gun safety.

I reintroduced H.R. 277, the Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2011.

This legislation would prevent anyone under the age of 21 from being eligible to own a handgun and would prohibit youth from possessing semiautomatic assault weapons.

Under this legislation parents and supervising adults will be held accountable if a juvenile is able to gain possession of dangerous firearms that are located in their household.

The statistics are clear, firearms in a household must be properly and adequately stored.

A gun in the home is 22 times more likely to be used in a completed or attempted suicide (11x), criminal assault or homicide (7x), or unintentional shooting death or injury (4x) than to be used in a self-defense shooting.

Higher household gun ownership correlates with higher rates of homicides, suicides, and unintentional shootings.

Keeping a firearm in the home increases the risk of suicide by a factor of 3 to 5 and increases the risk of suicide with a firearm by a factor of 17.

Keeping a firearm in the home increases the risk of homicide by a factor of 3.

A 2009 study found that people in possession of a gun are 4.5 times more likely to be shot in an assault.

My legislation also requires a parent to accompany a minor when attending a gun show.

Our focus should also be on the owners of guns. Parents need to keep guns and ammunition out of the reach of teenagers.

Parents should be responsible for securing from their minor children access to dangerous firearms.

Further, my bill is a preventative measure, my legislation encourages school districts to prove or participate in firearm safety programs.

It also addresses the underlying concerns related to violence and suicide.

It amends the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to support programs to promote mental health services among all children and their families and to provide early intervention services to ameliorate identified mental health problems in children and adolescents.

This is a multifaceted approach to address this multifaceted issue.

In the 113th Congress I introduced H.R. 65, the Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2013, which amends the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act by raising the age of handgun eligibility to 21 and prohibits persons under age 21 from possessing semiautomatic assault weapons or large capacity ammunition feeding devices, with some exceptions.

The bill places limitations and obligations on the transfer of firearms regarding juvenile violations of Brady Act provisions and the transfer of a handgun, ammunition, semiautomatic assault weapon, or large capacity ammunition feeding device to a person who is under age 21.

Prohibits any licensed importer, manufacturer, or dealer from transferring a firearm to any person (other than a licensed importer, manufacturer, or dealer) unless the transferee is provided with a secure gun storage or safety device.

Authorizes the Attorney General to suspend or revoke any firearms license, or to subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to \$10,000, if the licensee has knowingly violated this prohibition.

The bill also places prohibitions on keeping a loaded firearm or an unloaded firearm and ammunition within any premises knowing or recklessly disregarding the risk that a child: is capable of gaining access to it, and may use the firearm to cause death or serious bodily injury.

Finally, the bill authorizes the Attorney General to provide grants to enable local law enforcement agencies to develop and sponsor gun safety classes for parents and children.

I also introduced H.R. 2665, a bill to ensure secure gun storage and gun safety devices.

The bill amends the federal criminal code to repeal provisions that create exceptions to the prohibition against a licensed importer, manufacturer, or dealer transfer of a firearm to any person other than a licensed importer, manufacturer, or dealer unless the person receiving the firearm is provided with a secure gun storage or safety device; and grants immunity from a qualified civil liability action to a person who has lawful possession and control of a handgun and who uses such a device.

This Congress, I introduced H.R. 4268, the Gun Safety: Not Sorry Act which imposes a seven-day waiting period on the purchase of certain weaponry including bump stocks in response to more recent mass shootings.

Recent U.S. mass shootings include:

1. Las Vegas, 2017: 50+ killed
2. Orlando, 2016: 50 killed
3. Virginia Tech, 2007: 32 killed
4. Sandy Hook, 2012: 27 killed
5. San Ysidro, 1984: 21 killed
6. San Bernardino, 2015: 14 killed
7. Edmond, 1986: 14 killed
8. Fort Hood, 2009: 13 killed
9. Columbine, 1999: 13 killed

I also join in support of the families and survivors of the Community of Newtown, Connecticut who lost loved ones to give them space so that they can heal.

Events such as the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School touch all of us as compassionate, caring people which was demonstrated through the wave of support expressed by this nation.

To keep the memory of the 20 children and six adults killed on that tragic day vibrant—a website has been created by the families—mysandyhookfamily.org.

I encourage you to visit this memorial website and learn more about Charlotte, Josephine, Daniel, Avielle, Rachel, Jessica, Victoria, Benjamin, Anne Marie, Dawn, Carline, Ana, Madeleine, Catherine, Noah, James, Mary, Emilie, Lauren, Allison, Chase, Dylan, Jesse, Olivia, Jack and Grace.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to do all that we can do to reverse this level of gun violence. We must pass commonsense gun safety.

AN AMERICAN HERO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2017, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago, August 11, a baby boy was born to a mother and father in Detroit, Michigan, named Brian Terry.

Some 18 years after that, Brian made a commitment to serve his country by enlisting in the United States Marine Corps, where he served 3 years honorably, including a tour of duty in harm's way in Iraq.

Discharged from the Marine Corps honorably in 1994, Brian Terry followed his calling to serve by becoming a police officer. He then made another commitment not to serve just his community, but our Nation. In 2007, he joined the Customs and Border Protection.

But this wasn't good enough for what his mother characterized as a brave, strong defender of people. Brian decided to join the elite Border Tactical Team of the Border Patrol unit.

Seven years ago today, Brian was part of a four-person team tasked with pursuing and apprehending a "rip" crew. This rip crew has been alleged to be affiliated with the Mexican drug cartels. What they did was exploit those who took advantage of the unwillingness of those in leadership in this country to perform that basic, principled responsibility, which is to secure our borders.

□ 1300

The rip crew would rob drug mules as they carried drugs across the border, but would also routinely detain and shake down those who snuck through our porous borders. This cartel-affiliated rip crew had weapons, and they used those weapons to rob, terrorize, and exploit in the worst possible ways people who were essentially invited here by our failure to do our jobs.

Seven years ago today, Brian Terry and three of his colleagues set out not just to protect our border, but to protect innocent people, who came with their entire life savings, because we chose to leave that border porous.

Yesterday, the House Homeland Security Committee took up H.R. 4433, H.R. 4433 is entitled Securing DHS Firearms Act of 2017. We learned during testimony on this bill that in a 2-year period, just over 200 firearms were stolen from people who worked for the Department of Homeland Security, or lost. At least one person was killed by these firearms. I would concur that that is unacceptable.

I certainly support the bill, but having served in the United States Army as a leader of soldiers on deployment, all of whom were issued at least one weapon, I wonder if it literally requires an act of Congress to suggest that the DHS promulgate regulations to oversee the loss or theft of DHS supplied weapons.

Yes, over 200 weapons is horrible. Yes, one life lost is horrible. But should there be an act of Congress?

Because, as I recall, as a leader in the army while deployed overseas, we had protocol for dealing with lost weapons, with lost sensible items, and with lost COMSEC. We didn't need an act of Congress to tell us to promulgate it.

While I support this bill, it began to make me wonder and then think of a Bible verse, Matthew 7:3:

"Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye?"

Certainly it is unacceptable that over 200 weapons should be lost or stolen from DHS employees in a period of 2 years. But it is, quite literally, one-tenth of the scale of the weaponry that our government intentionally put into the stream of commerce to be used by those who would visit harm not only on their neighbors and family members south of our border, but right here on our own soil.

So, weapons like this, to the quantity of over 200, were lost or stolen from members of DHS. Meanwhile, 7 years ago, weapons like this were put into the stream of commerce by our very government. Weapons like this took the lives of at least one person. Weapons like this, put into the stream of commerce by our very government, have taken, at the very least, 70 times as many lives.

Yesterday, the Committee on Homeland Security promulgated a bill—an act of Congress—to address 200-some weapons like this that have cost at least one human life. And 7 years after Brian Terry set out on patrol that fateful night in Arizona, days before he was to fly home to Michigan to see his family for Christmas, nobody is talking about the weapons like this that our government intentionally placed into the stream of commerce, where we knew, to a metaphysical certainty, they would go to those who would do harm to their neighbors and their families and Americans.

Seven years later, we have seen justice. The killers of Brian Terry have been arrested. The first man arrested for having shot Mr. Terry in the back with a military-style rifle, leaving him to bleed to death in the medical chopper that flew him out in an effort to save his life, had, I think, ironically, already been deported from this country seven times.

The night that Brian Terry set out to protect not only the borders of this Nation, but the people who seek to enter it because we will not uphold our responsibility, the man who killed him was about robbing the very people who were coming here because we allowed it by not doing our jobs, and he had already been deported seven times.

Now, we know that close to 70 people have died because we intentionally, as a nation, put into the stream of commerce military-style weapons. In fact, we have lost track of over 1,400 of the over 2,000 weapons that the Obama administration thought it would be a good idea to intentionally let go to Mexico.

The weapon pictured next to me is a Barrett M-82 .50-caliber anti-personnel and -materiel rifle. There are Members of this body who have spoken on how this weapon should be illegal because, conceivably, it can take down an airplane.

Why do I digress?

Because that weapon was recovered in the hideout known to be used by the most notorious murderer in North America in the last 100 years: El Chapo Guzman.

The United States Government watched while a weapon that some Members of this body would suggest can take down an airplane was trafficked to a man who is trafficked in death to the point where the next slide I show will blow any thinking person's mind.

Many of the 160,000, roughly, deaths of civilians in Mexico can be traced directly back to this man. And we know, because it was recovered, that at least one of the military-style weapons that he received came from us.

So, 7 years ago today, an American hero named Brian Terry, who had served as a law enforcement professional, as a marine in Iraq, and on the elite border tactical squadron, set out to protect America, but to also protect those who sought to enter it, whether legally or illegally. And, when he did so, he did so understanding fully, as those who take an oath to defend this Nation do, that some things in this world are worth standing, fighting, and dying for. And, tragically, 7 years ago tonight, Brian Terry made that sacrifice.

I had no intention of standing and speaking on this today until H.R. 4433, the Securing DHS Firearms Act of 2017, came before the Homeland Security Committee yesterday, but it struck me as ironic. Not only did I serve in uniform as a combat arms officer for nearly 6 years, but I spent just under 10 years as a prosecutor, and I have a passion for a number of things, but foremost among these is justice.

So while it gives my heart some condolence, I can't begin to imagine the feelings on the 7th anniversary of the family members of this American hero, knowing that, while the people who pulled the trigger have been convicted, the weapons that they used were provided to them by the very Nation that he died to protect.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would submit this: I have faith that in life or after life, there will always ultimately be justice.

I will tell you this: In the case of those who, with intent, put the firearms into the hands of the individuals who took the life of this American hero, I hope that justice comes in this life and not the next.

So, while we move about our business of promulgating laws to dictate to the DHS that they should have a policy to address the loss of firearms, I hope we don't take our eye off the ball of the very firearms that we intentionally

trafficked, like the two that were recovered from the scene of the murder of Brian Terry, and that we will continue until we find it to seek justice for this man and act in a manner such that there are no more Brian Terry tragedies going forward.

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

ROBERT MUELLER INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am here to discuss a very serious issue, which are the mounting threats and criticism of Robert Mueller's investigation into criminality taking place in the course of the Presidential election with interference by the Russians and possible collusion with various Americans working with him.

But I want to start by putting this in a general context, Mr. Speaker. Tom Paine said: "In the monarchies, the king is law; but in the democracies, the law is king."

We place everything on the rule of law here in the United States of America. It is how we control the people who occupy the highest offices of government and control vast amounts of resources that belong to the people of the United States.

In the monarchies and in the dictatorships, the people have no control over those who occupy government; but in the democracies, in the constitutional societies, we exercise control over the people who lead the government to make sure that they don't abuse their power for improper purposes: for private gain, for the enrichment of particular classes, or for the perpetuation of their own political power.

Now, when we took office at the beginning of this year, Mr. Speaker, we received an Intelligence Committee report, signed by 18 intelligence agencies: the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and on and on.

They all told us the same thing, which is that Vladimir Putin had attempted to interfere and had interfered in the American election through cyber espionage and cyber sabotage in an effort to determine the outcome of our election. That took place. We knew that way back when we first took office.

Now, in the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which I serve on, and in the House Judiciary Committee, which I serve on, we were told—and we have been told for months going all the way back to the beginning of the year—that we don't need to investigate this assault on the sovereignty of the American people in our own election because there is an excellent lawyer and law enforcement official in charge of the

special counsel investigation: Robert Mueller.

Indeed, Robert Mueller is a man of extraordinary and, perhaps, singular qualification. He is a decorated war hero from the Vietnam war; a U.S. attorney, who had been the U.S. attorney for both the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the State of California; a former Director of the FBI.

And do you know what?

Robert Mueller is a registered Republican. He was named as special counsel by another registered Republican and another widely heralded and highly-qualified law enforcement official: Rod Rosenstein, who had been a career attorney in the Department of Justice, and then the U.S. attorney appointed by President Bush in the great State of Maryland, my home State; and who is presently the Deputy Attorney General of the United States, appointed by another Republican: Attorney General Sessions.

So Attorney General Sessions appointed Rod Rosenstein, who is the Deputy Attorney General, a Republican; and Rod Rosenstein appointed another Republican and a widely admired and highly-qualified law enforcement official, Robert Mueller, to take over as the special counsel.

□ 1315

Now, with all these Republicans in charge of the investigation and with the Republicans here in Congress saying, "no, we won't do any investigations of our own," despite past practice, we have to ask why Special Counsel Robert Mueller this week has suddenly come under withering fire by our GOP colleagues in the most ferocious organized attack on a Federal prosecution and prosecutor I have ever seen.

Well, the answer, alas, is obvious. They are attacking Special Counsel Robert Mueller and his fine team of lawyers and investigators because Mueller and his team are doing their jobs and justice is being done. There have already been two guilty pleas arising from this investigation: one from President Trump's former National Security Advisor, General Flynn, who pled guilty to lying to the FBI about Trump-Russia; and another criminal confession and guilty plea from the former foreign policy assistant, George Papadopoulos, who also took full responsibility for his criminal conduct in lying about Trump-Russia to the FBI.

And there have been sweeping criminal indictments handed down by the Mueller team, the special counsel, against Paul Manafort, Trump's former campaign manager, and his associate, Rick Gates.

Now, for all we know, this might be the end of it. The special counsel isn't talking. He is not leaking. He is doing his job. But it is also possible that the investigation is just getting started and that they are closing in on even higher targets: perhaps Jared Kushner, the all-purpose Trump aide and the

President's son-in-law, perhaps he is within the scopes of this investigation; perhaps Donald Trump, Jr.; and perhaps the President of the United States himself, Donald Trump.

And so the White House has issued its apparently desperate and cornered animal orders. The President cries chaos and let's slip the dogs of war against Special Counsel Mueller and the rule of law. This week, Trump has called the Mueller investigation—an investigation led by a Republican, who is named by a Republican, who is named by a Republican—he calls this investigation “the single greatest witch hunt of a politician in American history.”

And I don't want to hear from any of my colleagues, either, GOP on the other side, Well, you can't take seriously what the President says because he is disconnecting from reality or he is paranoid or he is delusional, unless you are willing to try to activate the provisions of the 25th Amendment. We must take the President's word seriously.

And, in the meantime, of course, our friends across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, are going along with everything the President says and everything that he does, and they are enabling his attempt to defame the special counsel, Mr. Mueller, and to attack the work of the FBI.

The President calls the FBI an agency in tatters, and an onslaught has followed in the media. On FOX News, a full-scale campaign against the FBI has arisen with lots of people comparing the FBI to the KGB, which is amusing because, if that were true, they would like the FBI—because Donald Trump's best buddy in foreign relations and FOX News' beloved kleptocrat authoritarian dictator abroad is Vladimir Putin, the former chief of the KGB. But they compare our FBI, the tens of thousands of men and women who have given their lives to law enforcement in our country, they compare the FBI to the KGB under a totalitarian government.

Newt Gingrich calls Mueller corrupt, Newt Gingrich who was officially reprimanded right here, Mr. Speaker, right where we stand today, by this body. In a vote of 395–28, he was reprimanded and disciplined for violating the rules of this body, and he calls the former FBI Director, Special Counsel Mueller corrupt in an effort to undermine and discredit the special counsel investigation.

And now this propaganda campaign comes to the official channels of the House of Representatives. Yesterday, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein appeared before the House Judiciary Committee for an oversight hearing, and I was appalled and I was amazed at the way our GOP colleagues attacked him with a series of completely phony, overblown, and misleading accusations.

They are in full-scale assault mode now. They are in a frenzied wild goose chase to find anything possible to dis-

credit Special Counsel Mueller and his investigators in his team.

And guess what, they finally found their villain. This week they found their villain, and they pounced on him. It is an FBI agent named Peter Strzok, who was working on the Mueller investigation but was removed from it this summer when it was discovered that he had sent a bunch of text messages to his apparent girlfriend criticizing a number of politicians, including Donald Trump, whom he called an idiot, Mr. Speaker. I think he was watching one of the Presidential debates where he sent a text message to his girlfriend, writing: “OMG, he is an idiot.” That is the way I am reading the texts that were revealed to us yesterday.

Now, he was probably one of millions of people to send that exact same text across the country. It wasn't a very nice thing to say, but he said it. He also called BERNIE SANDERS, the Democratic candidate for President, the Vermont U.S. Senator, an idiot. He called Trump an idiot; he called SANDERS an idiot; and he had even more choice, unspeakable words for my friend, the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, which I don't think I can repeat on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

All right. Mr. Strzok was speaking his mind in these private texts, but it raised the potentiality of bias in one of the agents working on the team. And so what did Mr. Mueller do when he learned of it? He fired him immediately. He got him off of the investigation, removed him from the investigation, and put him into a different part of the FBI. He removed him immediately from the investigation.

Unlike President Trump, for example, who took 18 days to fire General Flynn after learning that Flynn was a serial liar about his connections with Russia.

So it took President Trump 18 days. Mr. Mueller fired the guy immediately because people make mistakes, they do the wrong thing, and Mueller said: I don't want him on my team. He removed him, and they put him somewhere else.

Now, that should have been the end of the matter; right? It sounds like the end of the story is not a big deal. But, on the eve of our hearing yesterday, we received a dump of hundreds of these private text messages between Mr. Strzok and his friend, Ms. Page, and they make, no doubt, for titillating, fascinating, engrossing reading as these two people make their observations about the Presidential campaign. It's like “Anna Karenina” or “House of Cards.” It is fascinating. It is the kind of trivial gossip that people get into sometimes in this town.

I was amazed to learn that the Department of Justice itself—not Mueller, not his team, but the Department of Justice—the formal public affairs channel had actually orchestrated this dump of text messages that were revealed in the course of an ongoing

Department of Justice investigation, inspector general investigation. They took this material from the middle of an investigation, called up a whole bunch of reporters and brought them in to show them these texts.

Why?

Well, nobody could really explain it. I asked Mr. Rosenstein yesterday, and he couldn't explain what really—he said: Well, it had been approved.

I said: “Was there any precedent for it? Was there any precedent for the Department of Justice revealing material that turned up in the middle of an ongoing investigation to reporters?”

He couldn't name any. It wasn't even in the press conference.

So that took place. That strikes me as very odd that there are people in the Department of Justice who apparently are cooperating with this effort to undermine the integrity and the strength of the special counsel investigation.

Well, the key thing to understand is that all of those text messages are totally irrelevant. The great text message love story saga, which was dumped on us, is an irrelevant distraction. Mr. Mueller got rid of Mr. Strzok, removed him from the team, end of story.

Of course, FBI agents, prosecutors are allowed to have a political party. Mueller's got one; it is Republican. Rosenstein's got one; he is a Republican. That is fine. You can be Republican. You can be Democrat. You are not allowed to have your political ideas affect your work to the point that you are biased.

So I take it Mr. Mueller figured that those text messages suggested the possibility of bias, not just against BERNIE SANDERS and Martin O'Malley, but also against Donald Trump, and they said: Okay. We will remove him from the team. He is gone.

But yesterday, that is all the Republicans wanted to talk about, this great trumped up, fake text message scandal—totally irrelevant.

The only one who, to his credit, tried to make it relevant was a Republican colleague who said this is fruit of the poisonous tree, and he repeated it numerous times. He intoned the words, “fruit of the poisonous tree.”

Well, I am a law professor, so I know what “fruit of the poisonous tree” means. It is a Fourth Amendment doctrine which says that, if you have got an illegal search or seizure by the government, you cannot use evidence that is obtained by virtue of an illegal search or an illegal seizure against someone in court. If the government tries to use it, then the so-called exclusionary rule is activated, and you exclude evidence that is derived from an illegal search or seizure.

But there is no illegal search or seizure, and there is not even an allegation of an illegal search or seizure. All they have got is text messages between two lovebirds, and that is it.

I asked Mr. Rosenstein yesterday, I said: Was there an illegal search or seizure? Is there an allegation of an illegal search or seizure?

No, none at all.

So what is the relevance of all that stuff? Nothing. They found one FBI agent who is removed during the summertime for trashing a bunch of politicians on both sides of the aisle. They find that guy. They talk only about the fact that he called the President of the United States an idiot, which we must concede hardly makes him an original critic of the President. Okay. They find that one guy, and then suddenly they want to use that to claim that bias infects the whole operation, the whole investigation.

And why are they doing that? Well, look, if they just want to put up a propaganda smoke screen, that is within their First Amendment rights to do so and within their rights under the Speech or Debate Clause. The problem is that there is mounting fear and anxiety that this is trying to set the stage for President Trump to fire Robert Mueller, perhaps the most admired law enforcement official and prosecutor in the country, that they are setting the stage to fire him with all this trumped-up stuff about a bunch of texts between some lovebirds. That is it. That is all they have got.

After all this time, that is what they are using to try to discredit Robert Mueller and his team, who, at the time of his appointment, they described as unimpeachable, beyond reproach, and so on. But now that he is doing his job and it looks like the momentum of the investigation is leading to the very top of the U.S. Government, they may be looking for a reason to fire him.

Well, this is an emergency, a constitutional emergency if this is going to happen. This is why we are blowing the whistle on it.

I am delighted to be joined by a great legislator, someone whose career is woven into the fabric of the U.S. House of Representatives. He is the minority whip of this body, and I am just delighted to yield now to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

□ 1330

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this opportunity on the Special Order. I think, as an aside, I need to apologize to him for making him wait so long for this Special Order.

I also want to tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman who has taken this Special Order is probably the constitutional expert not only in this body, but one of the constitutional experts in our country. He is a great legislator himself. Although he is new to this body, he is not new to being a legislative leader at all. He has been a legislative leader in our State for many years. He is a wonderful teacher and somebody who has great political courage and is willing to stand and say that the emperor has no clothes. He is willing to call attention to the fact that our democracy is at risk, that our due process is at risk.

He used the phrase "trumped up." What an interesting phrase that is that

we have used for many years. I don't know that it has had as much relevance in years past as it now may have.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. RASKIN, for leading this Special Order. Our system of government, as he has pointed out, is based on the rule of law. We are a government of laws, not of men.

What that means is that it is not personalities, not dictators, not kings that rule our land. It is the law, the law of our Constitution, the law of our legislators, and the common law that we pursue as interpreted by our court systems. Its foundation is the constitutional principle that all are equal under the law. No one is exempt.

The appointment of a special prosecutor earlier this year to look into the possibility of the administration or Trump campaign officials colluding with a foreign adversary or obstructing justice falls into a long tradition in our country of using independent counsel to investigate those in the most senior offices of our government.

Our Founding Fathers would say that is a check and balance; that is a protection against the usurpation of democracy.

The choice of former FBI Director Bob Mueller to be that independent investigator was an extraordinarily wise one; a decision greeted with support from across the political spectrum, precisely because Mr. Mueller is so widely respected for his independence and his commitment to the law above all else.

And, parenthetically, although it is not necessarily relevant, he is a Republican. He is not, however, driven by the politics of left or right or Republican or Democrat. He is a man of the law, a man who seeks the truth, a man who has dedicated his career to assuring that we remain a land of liberty under law.

We have already seen a demonstration of that commitment in the prompt firing of a subordinate investigator for an act that was not illegal, as the gentleman from Maryland, our constitutional scholar, has pointed out, but, however, threatened to impugn the objectivity of the investigation.

In other words, he removed somebody who he thought might undermine the credibility of this investigation because he is so committed to this investigation being objective and unquestionably fair. Mr. Mueller has made it abundantly clear that he will not tolerate any hint of bias in this investigation.

So far, it appears that his investigation is bearing fruit, having uncovered serious crimes and secured three indictments as well as guilty pleas from two key subjects. Guilty pleas.

This was not a question of: We had a trial and somebody convinced 12 people that he was guilty.

This was a case where the individual said: "I am guilty. I did what was alleged. I know that it is illegal, and I should bear the consequences."

That included, of course, the National Security Advisor—who was National Security Advisor, I think, for 25 days, or close to that number—Mr. Flynn.

As the investigation has advanced, Mr. Speaker, we have seen troubling statements from the President and his advisers seeking to sow uncertainty about the legitimacy of the special counsel's activities and undermine confidence in him.

But it is not so much the confidence in him that is critical. It is confidence in the law. It is confidence in the process. It is confidence that, in fact, we are a nation of laws, and whether we are President or peasant, we will be held accountable if, in fact, we break the laws.

What is being done to undermine this process threatens the independence of the investigation and those who are undertaking it. It is dangerous to our democracy and to our freedom.

Now, in recent days, we have heard calls by the President and his allies to launch a counterinvestigation of the special prosecutor's investigation. Those of us who know history know that that is so often the defense of those who seek authoritarian power, of those who believe they are above the law, of those who believe they can intimidate others so that they will never be held accountable for wrongdoing.

This preposterous suggestion has but one purpose: to cast a shadow of doubt over the findings of Mr. Mueller's inquiry by attempting to frame it in a partisan way.

In fact, Mr. Mueller was appointed by a Republican-appointed Deputy Attorney General. It is tactics like this one that we see so often overseas in countries ruled by dictators and those seeking to become dictators. This willful effort to erode confidence in any institution that must be seen as impartial is harmful because if nobody and nothing is impartial, if everyone and everything is tainted by politics and interest, then no one can possess the moral authority to hold accountable one who wishes to be entirely unaccountable.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason I think that the President has also attacked the fourth estate, the newspapers, the broadcasters, the people whose duty it is to bring facts to the people so that they, the people, can make a rational judgment in a democracy, for it is in their hands that the power ultimately resides; and if you undermine those who give them the facts, then you undermine their ability to make decisions.

This ultimately is what the special prosecutor's work is all about: accountability, ensuring that every person is held to the same high standard of behavior under the laws of our Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in both parties—this is not about party. This is about country. This is about patriotism. This is about the rule of law. If we lose that respect

for law, we will lose our country. It will be a different, lesser country.

I urge my colleagues, from both parties, from every ideological corner, let us not forget the most fundamental principle that binds us together as Americans and as public servants: That all are created equal; that all of us, all Americans, are equal under the law.

That doesn't mean we are the same, but it means, in the eyes of the law, we are equal as we stand to be held accountable, or to be held innocent, or not involved, or not owing somebody else for wrongdoing. We need to uphold it by our words and by our deeds.

The special prosecutor's work must continue unimpeded, and it must continue to be respected. Yesterday, in the Judiciary Committee, that was not the case. To defend the indefensible undermines respect for law.

I want to thank my friend again, Mr. JAMIE RASKIN, from Montgomery County, Maryland, for this Special Order. As I said, he is a great constitutional scholar and teacher, a great legislator. More importantly than that, he is an individual who loves his country and, throughout his life, has fought to make the country all that the Founding Fathers meant it to be.

I thank him for coming to this floor and for his efforts to ensure that Mr. Mueller's investigation can continue to be seen as impartial and with its objectivity unquestioned, and that is accountability, accountability and justice, and equal justice under the law. That is our bedrock. That is our touchstone. That is our guiding star. That is what Professor RASKIN, Congressman RASKIN, Citizen RASKIN is talking about today, and we all ought to thank him for that.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) very much for his kind words and for his patriotism. I thank him for also pointing out the critical importance of civic equality to this discussion because civic equality implies that none of us is above the law.

Of the many dangerous things I have heard uttered over the last couple of weeks with respect to this investigation, perhaps none is more sinister or disturbing than the suggestion that the President cannot be guilty of obstruction of justice because the President himself oversees the whole government.

Well, at that point, we may as well hang it all up and go back to monarchy because the governing principle of our Constitution is we have no kings here. We have no kings here. So I thank Mr. HOYER for that.

James Madison wrote that the very definition of "tyranny" is the collapse of all powers into one. We are trying to defend the separation of powers and we are trying to defend the rule of law against all of it being drowned in a political agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined now by my very distinguished colleague on the House Judiciary Committee. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am a little late and I don't know exactly what has been discussed. I serve on the Judiciary Committee with the gentleman, and what we have seen in the Judiciary Committee is scary.

I am honored to be a Member of the United States Congress. I am honored to be an American citizen. I see a threat to the independence of the United States Congress in upholding its oath and looking out for the best interests of its people and to our country.

I have Republican friends, as the gentleman does, on the other side of the aisle, and I know that they, in representing their constituents, are not fond of the totalitarian Russian Government and philosophy that threatens NATO countries like Lithuania, and Estonia, and Latvia, and Ukraine, and Georgia, with the power of the Russian military.

They do not like democracy. They do not like America, and they do not like what we represent. They don't like freedom of the press. They don't like freedom of religion. They don't like freedoms of elections. They don't have really free elections. They say they do, but they kill their opponents or they put them in jail on trumped-up charges, and they count the votes. There is nothing good about Russia in regards of democracy, and even within their constitution after they formed a country after the Soviet Union fell apart.

Our Republican colleagues are like sheep, following the President in attacking the FBI; in attacking the Justice Department; in attacking heroic Americans who have risked their lives in the FBI, and heroic Americans like Robert Mueller, who served in Vietnam and risked his life and was wounded there, I believe. And they threaten them and talk to them as if they are complicit with the Clinton campaign and trying to do something to harm President Trump.

Mr. Mueller is a Republican, appointed first by a Republican, Bush, and then later by a Democrat, Obama. He is as fine a human being as I have come in contact with in my 11 years in Congress, and maybe as fine a human being as I have come in contact with in my 68 years on Earth.

□ 1345

Mr. Rosenstein said glowing things about him yesterday and how heroic he is and how strong he is, how dedicated he is, how patriotic he is, and how honest he is.

For the Republicans to be trying to take this man down and to take down others who serve in the FBI, the only reason they are doing this is because they are finding information in their charge that implicates the President of the United States in activities that are questionable as far as his oath of office and border on treason. Because of that, they attack the FBI, which is the top layer or the cream of the crop of law enforcement.

And the President goes out and talks about our wonderful first responders, but the top of the line he is against because they question him.

That is when your country no longer exists, when it is all about the leader, not about institutions, and not about other individuals who are doing their jobs in a proper manner.

FBI Director Wray said nothing but good things about Robert Mueller. I think Robert Mueller's job is in jeopardy from this President, who likes to fire people, which is what he did on television, and he still thinks he is on television. It is a big performance art. It is all about performance art, and the star is Donald Trump. He acts and he is the show; and the show goes on, and there is nothing else.

To fire Mueller is part of the show, to question what he has done in arresting Manafort and Gates, guilty pleas, I think, from one of the gentlemen he arrested—was it Papadopoulos?—and then a guilty plea from Flynn. They don't plead guilty unless they are guilty.

Mueller is doing his job. He is trying to protect America. I think he is the man of the year and will be the man of the year next year. He is the one person between us and a kleptocracy and group of oligarchs, but kleptocrats who are using their positions in government to benefit themselves financially and to build up their wealth.

This tax bill we are talking about is part of the same thing. It is oligarchs. No inheritance tax, meaning they get hundreds of millions of dollars—hundreds of millions of dollars—and the President goes and says to a middle class family earning \$75,000: You will have \$2,000 that you can spend any way you want, or you can even save it.

\$2,000 is tip change at Orange Julius to those people, the big money, hundreds of millions and hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars as the inheritance tax being repealed and the AMT being repealed and other changes.

And then they said: Oh, well, we only reduced the tax on the wealthiest from 39 percent to 37 because they weren't going to get to deduct as much of their State and local taxes, and it was going to hurt them more.

Well, there are people who aren't in the top bracket who aren't going to get to reduce their State and local taxes, and they gave them nada. They gave all of it to the wealthiest.

And that is what this is about. This is about the wealthiest people taking this country over and an oligarchy, and Trump is representative of them. It is about him. It is not about institutions. It is not about the Constitution. It is not about people. It is not about the First Amendment.

So many of the people who support him are good, hardworking, decent American people who don't want to be in bed with Russia and don't want to give up our democracy and don't want to give up our free elections to hacking and to internet social media games, and that is what we have had.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for having this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I have a bill I took over for Mr. CONYERS with Mr. WALTER JONES, a Republican, that says you can't fire Mr. Mueller without cause and gives a redress in court. SHEILA JACKSON LEE has another. We have to be aware and alert. And if this happens, the people have to let their Representatives know, and particularly the Republican Representatives know, that they won't stand for it and they won't have another Saturday Night Massacre, because Rosenstein said Mr. Mueller has done nothing to be fired. He probably would not fire him, which means Rosenstein will be fired, and that is the end of the rule of law, and that is what makes us different from other countries, makes us different from dictators and autocrats.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I thank him for invoking the critical Watergate analogy, the Saturday Night Massacre with the firing of Archibald Cox and other Department of Justice officials who refused to cover up for the President's crimes and misdeeds. I thank him for his legislation that would try to empower the special counsel not to be fired without a court's say-so at least, to build another check and balance.

I thank him, also, for invoking what is also taking place in Washington right now, which is this massive assault on the American middle class through this so-called tax cut bill, this tax scam, which would actually raise taxes for tens of millions of Americans while transmitting billions of dollars up the income and wealth ladder.

Ever since we have arrived here, the whole government has felt like a money-making operation for a person, a family, a small group of billionaires in the Cabinet, a handful of people in the country like the Koch brothers and the Mercers. We cannot allow either this assault on the basic middle class economics of the country to go through or this assault on the Constitution and the rule of law, which we witnessed so vividly yesterday in the House Judiciary Committee.

I want to thank the gentleman for his service and for being one of the first to blow the whistle about what is taking place here.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. 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 the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

President and Members of the Senate, whether originating as the Member's own words or being reiterated from another source.

LET HIS HOLINESS THE DALAI LAMA GO HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this week, people all around the world are commemorating Human Rights Day, the annual celebration of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Article 13 of the declaration affirms that everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country. I have that right. As a citizen of the United States, I can leave my country whenever I choose, and I have the right to return whenever I like. For me, this right is not theoretical. I exercise it every time I travel abroad and every time I return home.

But, Mr. Speaker, His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, born and educated in Tibet, has not seen his homeland since he was forced into exile in 1959.

The Dalai Lama, the spiritual leader of Tibet, describes himself as a simple Buddhist monk. He was recognized as the reincarnation of the previous Thirteenth Dalai Lama when he was only 2 years old, and he was only 6 when he began his monastic studies. But well before he finished his education, at the young age of 15, he was called upon to assume political leadership after China's invasion of Tibet in 1950.

For the next 9 years, he worked to preserve Tibet's autonomy and Tibet's culture. But after years of growing resentment against restrictions imposed by the Chinese Communists, a full-scale revolt broke out in March 1959, and the Dalai Lama was forced to flee as the uprising was crushed by Chinese troops. On March 31, 1959, he began a permanent exile in India, settling in Dharamsala in northern India.

Since then, he has not returned to Tibet, or, more accurately, he has never been permitted to return. He has spent more than 60 years in exile.

Today, the Dalai Lama is 82 years old, a man renowned all over the world for his commitment to peace. He has consistently advocated for policies of nonviolence, even in the face of extreme aggression.

In 1989, he won the Nobel Peace Prize in recognition of what was then his nearly 30-year nonviolent campaign to end China's domination of his homeland.

In 2007, the Congress awarded him the Congressional Gold Medal, and at the time, then-President George W. Bush called him a man of faith and sincerity and peace.

Now, I have long believed that the Dalai Lama is part of the solution to

resolving Tibetan grievances. There was a time, from 1959 until 1979, when the Tibetan goal was independence. But since the 1970s, the Dalai Lama has been looking for a way to resolve the situation of the Tibetan people through negotiations. In the late 1980s, he proposed the Middle Way Approach as a path toward Tibetan autonomy within China.

His commitment to nonviolence and his recognition as the spiritual leader of Tibetans worldwide confers on him an undeniable legitimacy that would be of great benefit were China willing to restart the dialogue that has been suspended since 2010.

But the Chinese Government has not recognized or taken advantage of this opportunity to achieve a peaceful resolution. Instead, Chinese authorities continue to view the Dalai Lama with suspicion, disparage him, and accuse him of fomenting separatism. They seem to believe that, with his inevitable death, they will be assured of consolidating their hold on Tibet.

Well, I would not be so sure. Today, all around the world, we are seeing the consequences of repression of religious and ethnic minorities. For the Chinese, there is still time to recognize that inclusion and respect for human rights of Tibetans offers the best path to security.

So today, I call on China to follow a different path. I call on the Chinese authorities to affirm the right of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama to return to his homeland, whether to visit or to stay. I call on them to welcome him home, afford him the respect he deserves as a man of peace, and sit down with him to resolve Tibetan grievances so as to prevent the deepening of tensions and eruption of conflict.

Were China to take such a step, I believe the international reaction would be very positive. I would be among the first to recognize and congratulate an important gesture.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be in the business of preventing and transforming conflicts instead of being forced to respond to their consequences after the fact.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in calling on the Chinese authorities to allow the Dalai Lama to return to his homeland. The Chinese Government should allow His Holiness the Dalai Lama, who is revered all around the world, the ability to go back to his home, to go back to where he was born.

This is a time for bold action, and I urge my colleagues to speak out along with me in urging the Chinese Government to do the right thing. Now is the time to raise our voices—now, before it is too late.

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN JOHN YATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take 30 minutes, but the time that I do spend is very important, because I want to honor a very, very special person.

First of all, let me start off by wishing you a Merry Christmas. I say that because, as we are getting into the season, many of us are thinking about family and friends and spending Christmastime at home, which I hope to be able to do as well.

Every Christmas season my thought goes back about 73 years ago. You see, my dad was a medic in World War II, and December 16, which will be just a few days from now, will be the 73rd anniversary of one of the largest, most significant battles of World War II: the Battle of the Bulge.

My father was a medic in the Battle of the Bulge, and I still remember the stories he used to tell of the cold weather and the snow and how, when the Germans broke through the Siegfried Line, they decimated American forces—we lost thousands and thousands of troops in those few days—how the snow was just so heavy and so thick that many were trapped in their foxholes, unable to escape. Many retreated back to areas of safety and the lines behind.

But I don't want to talk about my dad here today. I want to talk about someone else, a dear friend of mine, someone I got to serve in the Georgia Legislature with. It was another young Georgian from Spalding County who was a pilot in the Army Air Corps.

Now, Captain John Yates was not what you may think of. Most people think of an Army Air Corps pilot flying a B-29 or a B-25 Mitchell. What John Yates flew was a small, single-engine Piper Cub aircraft. He was a liaison pilot.

Now, most people aren't familiar with what a liaison pilot is, but they played a very crucial and critical role in the victory in Europe in World War II and even in the Pacific theater.

You see, as a pilot, I have a lot of appreciation for someone who will fly a very small plane. I mean, I am a pretty tall guy. I don't fit in the cockpit of a Piper Cub very well.

□ 1400

That is why I have never actually flown one. But John Yates would climb into the cockpit of this small, single-engine aircraft—which are still in use today. Many of them are used in the bush areas of Alaska because of how lightweight they are, and small, and compact. They don't take a whole lot of runway.

But he would climb into this small, aluminum airplane and would fly just above the treetops to draw enemy fire. He actually flew a plane to be shot at. This wasn't like close air support airplanes we have today that have titanium shells that can absorb a lot of im-

pact. No, this was just a small plane with an aluminum skin around the fuselage.

But his purpose was to fly close to the enemy to try to spot the enemy and cause the enemy to fire at him so our artillery and our other aircraft would actually know where the enemy forces were and where their heavy artillery was. That is an incredible job for someone to do, especially a young person, maybe in his twenties, as he was serving in World War II.

After 60 years from the time that he flew those Piper Cub aircraft, I had the opportunity to serve with John Yates in the Georgia Legislature. There is one thing I appreciated about John, as we find from a lot of veterans, and as a veteran myself—I know that same feeling—once you serve, you always have this desire to serve in another capacity.

In 1989, John was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives. I came several years later to serve with him. But John continued his fight for his fellow servicemen and for his country in the Georgia Legislature, as he was chairman of the House Defense and Veterans' Affairs Committee and was always on the front lines of fighting for veterans' care, to ensure that the government provided to veterans the care that they needed and the services that they deserved.

He understood the meaning of patriotism. He lived as a patriot. Everything he did portrayed the idea of patriotism. One thing I liked about John Yates is one of his favorite quotes was from Winston Churchill. That quote was: "Never give up. Never give up. Never give up."

That is something that we can take hold of ourselves today, especially as Americans. We have a history of never giving up, a fortitude of not just taking defeat and running away, but taking defeat and turning it into a victory.

John Yates never quit serving. All he looked for was the ability to serve in the next mission that he was called for. On December 11 of this year, John Yates went on to his next mission in Heaven.

We are going to miss John Yates. The State of Georgia is going to miss John Yates. But I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, to honor one of those true American patriots who stood in the face of battle and faced the enemy face-to-face; and when he came home, he followed that desire to continue to serve, and he served until he passed away just a few days ago.

HONORING HEROES OF CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL SHOOTING

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take a moment and recognize another anniversary. Six months ago today, on a baseball field just a few miles from here, I and several of our colleagues found ourselves in a combat zone of our own.

It doesn't seem like it has been 6 whole months since a crazed gunman walked onto our field and started

shooting at us. But the reason I want to bring that up today is because every person on that field that day who was shot at is still in this House today and still walking around in Washington, D.C.

By the grace of God, we were protected during that time, and I just want to thank everyone for their prayers and support, and those who responded to that event and came out and saved the lives of many of us.

STEVE SCALISE, the whip whom we serve with here; Matt Mika, one of our staff members; Zack Barth, a congressional staffer; and Capitol Police Special Agent Crystal Griner all were wounded during that battle, and it really was a battle.

But I also want to highlight some of those who did not leave the field that day, who stayed and helped others; people like my good friend from Mississippi, Congressman TRENT KELLY, an Army Reservist, who, when he identified the shooter, did not panic, but he alerted others, and then eventually led many to safety behind a concrete building.

Representative MO BROOKS stayed and helped apply a tourniquet to Zack Barth who had been shot in the calf.

Representative BRAD WENSTRUP, who is also a colonel in the Army Reserves, a combat doctor, was out on the edge of the field and could have easily run away, but he stayed and was one of the first to be able to run out and give aid to STEVE SCALISE out on the field as he lay near second base.

Retired Lieutenant General Representative JACK BERGMAN was able to actually lead several of our players and staff members to safety inside of the dugout away from the gunfire.

Brian Kelly, a civilian staff member on the team, stayed with me throughout the gunfire as we tried to lend aid to Matt Mika who was lying next to the Capitol Police SUV throughout the entire incident.

Finally, my thanks go out to Special Agent David Bailey, who I personally watched on numerous occasions put his own life in danger as he would move out into the line of fire to draw fire away from myself and Brian Kelly. He saw that, whenever the shooter was not shooting at Capitol Police, they were shooting at us so he would purposely move himself in the line of fire, and again, miraculously protected us, even as one of the rounds hit his cellphone which deflected away from his body.

Lastly, I want to thank the Alexandria Police Department, who came to our aid and eventually took down the shooter.

Moments like this are surreal to me and to others, and it is important that we go back and reflect and remember these moments. Because the only way that we can correct mistakes from our past, is if we go back and we relive them and we look at what caused this.

As we stand here today, one of the things that I see that we need in America that we have lost is the idea of civility. We have heard here on the floor

today differing opinions regarding policy; ideas of what is good for this country, what is right for this country. That is part of the strength of this country. That is the freedom that we have, which is to bring different ideas.

The whole idea of this Chamber is to bring different ideas and different policy opinions to the floor and debate them, and those ideas and opinions that have the support of a majority of the Members are moved forward.

But at some point in the past, we have transitioned beyond just arguing over ideas and we bring rhetoric that is distasteful. We attack the person and their families. I just believe that we can do a whole lot better in this Nation if we, once again, find the ability to agree to disagree and respect the rights, freedom, and the liberty of the other person to have their opinion. If we can do that, then we can engage in discourse and we will lessen the amount of violence that we see that is driven by political rhetoric.

That would be the message that I would pass off to America on the anniversary of the shooting because that is the idea that people like John Yates lived their lives for and fought their battles for, was for the freedom that we have in this Nation to continue to exist.

I believe America's greatest days are ahead of us, but we have got a little work to do to actually grasp hold of it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to honor the memory of my good friend and colleague, John Yates.

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

FEDERALISM ISSUES

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleagues across the aisle discussing the issue of Special Counsel Mueller. Since there are one or two possibilities about some of the things they said regarding Republicans, especially on a committee, either Mr. COHEN's memory is terrible or he is falsely, intentionally misrepresenting things.

I am not saying that is the case. I am saying it is one or the other, and I will get to that momentarily.

The hearing we had this week in the Judiciary Committee with Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein was deeply troubling to those who want the Department of Justice to be about justice; those who want to see the FBI be that great arbiter, that great entity that will ensure that justice is done. We need an entity like that.

The ATF, their reputation was sorely soiled back during the attack by the ATF on Waco at the facility where some folks had been sucked into basically a cult. It didn't have to happen. And as we found out, local law enforce-

ment said that they knew that David Koresh went to Sam's Club right there on Belle Meade—I think they said Tuesday. And if the ATF had told us they wanted to arrest him, we could have helped them arrange to pick him up as he walked out of Sam's Club with grocery sacks in his arms. There would have been no incident. No lives would have been lost, no children burned up in a fire, no people killed. It was so unnecessary, but the ATF apparently wanted to make a point and wanted to have a big show. Actually, there were constitutional issues there.

I read in the paper that a gentleman who served with me at Fort Benning in Georgia, during my time in the Army, had advised the post commander out at Fort Bliss that he should not allow the U.S. Army tanks or equipment to be used, in violation of the posse comitatus, unless he had a direct order from the President himself.

As we found out after the fact, the President made clear that: Oh, that was Reno's deal. You have to talk to her about that.

So, clearly, he did not order the U.S. military to use equipment and allow their equipment to be used against civilian American citizens. So there were all kinds of terrible things that came out and it really made the ATF look bad.

□ 1415

I was a fan of the ATF, the Federal ATF. I knew them to have done some great things, and I had some very dear friends, and still do have some very dear and very great friends, who are in the ATF.

But the point is that such horrendous judgment in the ATF set up what they knew or should have known would probably result in losses of lives, including severe injuries to ATF themselves. I don't think they lost anybody, but they certainly were severely wounded and treated there in Waco. But that kind of outrageous judgment that puts political and news interests ahead of just doing the job and seeing justice done ends up being such a terrible blot on the reputation of any entity that it is hard to work back from that.

I still hear people who refer to that incident nearly 25 years ago, and still it is such a blot on the ATF that it is hard for people to consider the ATF without thinking how terribly, just inappropriate, the ATF acted at times and caused people to wonder: Is that the general rule, or was that an exception? People, after some other episodes, began to think it is the rule with the ATF. Some claim: Let's get rid of it.

What has gone on now and is currently going on now with the Deputy Attorney General taking all three positions that he sees no evil, he hears no evil—he doesn't know of any evil going on. He thinks everything is like the poet said: "God's in His Heaven, all's right with the world." I believe the author had a little girl saying that.

But it is not right with the world. It is terribly wrong. America and the world sit in a position of Western civilization where potentially the most incredible and amazing strides in healthcare, in energy, and all kinds of areas of life on this Earth have been made better exponentially, and the United States of America is at the very heart of those great developments.

A majority in the United States throughout our history would always say: We call those blessings from God.

Now, maybe it is and maybe it isn't a majority, but we are ever getting closer to a position where this grand experiment in self-judgment is potentially on the verge of being lost. History is not being taught as zealously as it once was. Places like Hillsdale College or Liberty or Regent, there are some places where it is being taught. I had fantastic history teachers, which is what I majored in at Texas A&M because I knew I was going to do 4 years in the Army, at least, and if we were at war when my 4 years were up, I would have continued to serve.

But our students don't know history anymore. Why? Because President Carter decided that the Federal Government intervention into education, even though it is not an enumerated power under the Constitution, and it is, therefore, a power that is reserved to the States and the people and not the Federal Government, we have been acting extra-constitutionally, that means outside the Constitution, for quite some time going back to the late seventies under President Carter.

Our students have suffered as a result. They don't know history. Someone had advised me that even though history is not an important part of the federally mandated test, there are things that in different subjects are mandated by the Federal Government. Here is an element that students should know about the subject. I was advised that the one area that the federally mandated test, the only area historically that students were required to know, is that when the United States dropped two atomic bombs, one on Hiroshima and one on Nagasaki, it raised serious questions about the United States' morality, which is absolutely fictitious unless the ignorance of the authors requiring such a thing did not allow them to know the truth.

The truth is that Truman was advised that because the Emperor of Japan had ordered the Japanese people to fight for their homes to the death, then the Allied Forces would have to land in Japan. They would have had to move across the country, and it was considered a very fair and possibly quite conservative estimate that there could be 10 million people losing their lives if Allied Forces had to land and were fighting the Japanese people home to home to home.

So the morality of the issue is: Would we morally be better off in this absolute war that the Japanese started

against the United States, would we be better off losing the horrible tragedy of 300,000 or so lives, or would we be better off having 5 or so million Japanese people killed and 5 or so million Allied Forces being lost?

The morally correct decision was that a Democrat, a man who apparently really wrestled with the issue from a moral standpoint, decided to put the American bombers at risk, those flying the planes and taking the atomic bombs, and to put 200,000 or 300,000 or so people at risk in an effort to avoid losing 5 million or so Japanese and an equal number or more of the Allied Forces. I think he made the correct moral decision.

So that doesn't raise moral issues about the United States. It raises ignorance issues about the federally mandated test. We would be so much better off if we got back to allowing local school boards to decide and States to decide—as they had been for many decades—deciding what their students should learn. That was the beauty of a federalist situation where States would have so much power.

But as is often the case when the Federal Government takes over an area like education, then it gets worse. I was on the board of directors of the Texas A&M Association of Former Students, and I can recall the president advising us that the official SAT had to change the scoring system for the SAT because students across the board were doing so much worse than they did when classes around my era, in the 1970s, had done, that we had done, overall, so much better than the students who came through after the Federal Government took over education.

So I don't know if it was accurate, but I had educators back at that time say that there is a formula; so it is hard to say. But if you scored, say, 1,400 out of 1,600 on the SAT in the seventies, then under the new scoring system it would probably be scored closer to 1,600, 1,500 to 1,600, maybe a couple hundred points that they had to add to the system, because after we had a Federal Department of Education, then students started doing worse. So to keep it from looking like the Department of Education here in Washington made education as poor as it helped to do, we had to raise the SAT scores basically on an arbitrary basis.

We know that the students coming through in the eighties, nineties, and then this new millennium have the potential to do better than we ever did, but because the Federal Government got involved, I don't think it is just a great irony when the Federal Government took over education under President Carter that, wow, ironically, isn't it amazing, at the same time students were doing worse and worse. So that is what often happens when the Federal Government gets involved.

We saw that with Waco. If they had gotten the help of the local law enforcement, there would have been no loss of life, in all reality, but the ATF

was going to bust in and make a big show out of it, and it cost an awful lot of lives.

You would like to think that, when the FBI comes in, you don't have to worry, they are going to do the right thing. I know so many incredible, outstanding FBI agents. But for Mr. COHEN to continue to say, even after he has been advised and reminded that I have been raising Cain about Robert Mueller for over a decade, I guess, he came in, sworn in in January of '07, as I understand it. Initially, when I questioned Robert Mueller as FBI Director when I first got to Congress, I was carrying that image of the great FBI, the image that so many of the agents still carry, thousands of them still carry, but with more and more difficulty because of the cesspools that have developed here in Washington and the way in which it has been used, as we saw with the IRS, during the Obama administration, weaponized and used as a political instrument.

Now, how do we know that? We didn't know near as much as we continue to find out, but Robert Mueller ran off thousands of years of experience, and I contend it was because he wanted nothing but yes people. He didn't want the experienced people around the country who might try to point out to the director when he made one of his many mistakes as FBI Director or chose software programs, chose law enforcement programs that created problems because they had more experience than he did, he did not really want people around the country to have more experience than he did because they might question something that he ordered inappropriately, and he just wanted people to salute him, salute the flag, figuratively speaking, and drive forward.

That means when Mueller wanted somebody to bust down the door in the middle of the night, even though there was no threat of the individual fleeing, no threat of the individual hiding evidence, it was done, as we are now seeing the Mueller special counsel group, team, SWAT unit, unofficial SWAT, of course, but we are seeing them use these types of tactics.

Now, I don't really know Paul Manafort. He doesn't seem like a fellow that I would enjoy getting along with. Nonetheless, it certainly appeared that he was very materially mistreated because Mueller wanted to make sure he got his point, and he knocked down the door, or at least went in in the middle of the night, however they got in. We have heard this before, this heavy-handed Federal Government, and there was no reason for that other than bullying, mean, Federal agents at the top wanting to bully people around.

We saw that kind of conduct with Mike Flynn as he was set up. He had been, as part of the transition team, talking to people at the FBI about different issues, and now we know Strzok was part of that, this man that absolutely loathed President-elect Trump, he loathed everything about Trump

and those he was going to be bringing into office. We didn't know how badly they despised or loathed the President and Republicans supporting him until we got more information.

□ 1430

But these kind of things are things that Robert Mueller should have known. He should have known the Department of Justice's reputation and hope for being considered righteous was all riding on him and what he did. Yet he rode in with his black hat—figuratively, for those in the mainstream media who don't understand those type of references—and he began to overreach.

We heard yesterday from the guy that appointed Mueller, Rod Rosenstein, that, to have a special counsel, you have to believe that a crime was committed. So it would seem to reason that Mueller was appointed to investigate something that they had reason to believe that possibly a crime had been committed.

Yet because of whether it is incompetence or zeal in wanting Mueller to go on a witch hunt, to just keep searching until you find something, even if it is a poor guy like Scooter Libby who devoted his life to helping his country, we need somebody's scalp. It doesn't look like Donald J. Trump was colluding with the Russians, so we have got to have somebody's scalp. Let's intimidate some people. Let's bully our way into homes in the middle of the night. Let's do whatever we have got to do and maybe we will scare somebody into admitting something.

Like many are saying, Michael Flynn didn't lie. To be a lie, you have to have intent to deceive. But whether they are right or wrong about that, the word is he was bankrupted by an overzealous bully.

All my friends on the left are talking about bullying. I was small for my age. In my class, I was bullied. I had a black eye, a bloody nose. A fifth grade teacher, after a big bully took my football and I tried to get it back and ended up with a bloody nose and a black eye—our teacher loved the bully back then—pulled me in front of class while I was trying to get my nose to stop bleeding and told the class: This is what happens when little boys try to play with big boys.

I know something about being bullied and I recognize it in a government group when I see it. The Mueller team has been bullies, but that is what Mueller wanted. Why do you think he went and hired Weissmann, who destroyed thousands and thousands of employees' lives who worked for Arthur Andersen in a joust at windmills that cost these people their livelihoods, caused more pain and suffering than imaginable, for what the Supreme Court said, 9-0: You are a fool. This was not a crime. You made this up?

That is who Mueller wanted on his team. This is the same Robert Mueller, as I have been pointing out for years,

who has been grossly unfair in running off the thousands of years of experience that he did so he could have great people, wonderful people.

Not only were they new and young, but he was eliminating the older folks who had the experience that could bring them along, because Mueller wanted them created in his image and to get rid of all the wisdom of the ages that could be found throughout the FBI before he took over.

I am sure there are a bunch of people that needed to go, but you don't destroy an entire entity like the Federal Bureau of Investigation just because you want a bunch of yes men. That is what Bob Mueller did. That man shouldn't have been close to being a special counsel. He couldn't stand Trump.

As the Washingtonian magazine was glorifying James Comey—I believe it was in a 2013 issue where they said, basically, in essence, if the world were burning down, James Comey knew that the one person who would be standing with him would be Bob Mueller—Comey is the very guy who admitted leaking information out in order to try to get a special counsel appointed.

As I covered with Mr. Rosenstein yesterday, this is part of an FBI typical employment agreement. Everybody is supposed to sign this thing and swear to it: "All information acquired by me in connection with my official duties with the FBI and all official material to which I have access remain the property of the United States of America. I will surrender upon demand by the FBI, or upon my separation from the FBI, all materials containing FBI information in my possession."

If a man like Comey goes to a meeting in his official capacity of FBI Director with the President of the United States and he comes out of this and types up a memo, even though it appears it was a pretty less than unbiased memo trying to make President Trump look bad, so he commemorates it with a memo, that memo, as I discussed with Mr. Rosenstein yesterday, is probably government property. That is government information, government property. And the question is: Did he commit a crime when he leaked that information?

There is a decent chance it is, yes.

So where is the FBI in its investigation of James Comey's potential crime?

When you look at the record and you go back, now we know from that one incident this is the person to whom he leaked, and then that got to The New York Times. Well, here is another meeting where he was the principal character there, the most likely person to have leaked.

Well, lo and behold, his same conduit for leaking information that he has admitted to ends up being in place in this story. There may be at least six other places where he has leaked information, and some of them will be crimes, but because the special counsel was all

about trying to strip the winner of a Presidential election, we are not going after Comey. We are not going after any of these other people. They are trying to find something.

As we know from the text messages of FBI Agent Strzok, they wanted an insurance policy so that, in case Trump won, they could still get rid of him. Poor Strzok believed that no one in this country should vote—not a single person, not even Donald Trump's family—should vote for him. It ought to be 100 million to zero.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is so clear, in my days of trying cases in Federal court and State court, where you are asking questions of a jury panel to see who would be fair enough to sit on a jury, we can see that these people who were working and have been—and some still are—for the FBI, for the Department of Justice, have no business getting close to this investigation unless they are a target of investigation.

Andrew Weissmann should never have been a part of the special counsel team.

Peter Strzok, this is only some of the text message he sent, but he says:

He asked me who I'd would vote for, guessed Kasich.

It goes on:

God Trump is a loathsome human.

Yet he may win.

Good for Hillary.

It is.

Would he be a worse President than Cruz? Trump? Yes, I think so.

This, of course, is an exchange between Peter Strzok, or PS, and his mistress, Lisa Page, who is also working for the FBI. These people had done irreparable damage to the FBI. But worse than that, they have made a mockery of justice in the United States.

What really gets me is I know how upset I was in the Bush administration when I saw somebody doing wrong. I didn't care if he was appointed by a Republican or a Democrat. I didn't care that President Bush had appointed a man or a woman to a position. What I cared about was them being righteous and doing the right thing.

Now, where is my Democratic friend who will stand up and say this isn't right?

We know Alan Dershowitz, a great Democrat, brilliant intellect, has done it. But where are people across the aisle who would do what I did during the Bush Presidency, pick up the phone and say: This is an outrage. What has happened under this Attorney General should never have happened. He has got to go?

Where is the Democrat who has a sense of moral outrage when the justice system is just shaken to its core by people who want to take out a President because they didn't support him, they didn't want him to be there, they didn't think any American should vote for him, and they are destroying the sense of justice and our justice system?

It is time for Americans to wake up. It is time to clean house, get rid of Mueller, and get some fair people in there to investigate.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that remarks in debate in the House may not engage in personalities toward the President, whether originating as the Member's own words or being reiterated from another source.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 15, 2017, at 5:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3390. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions (Multiple Chemicals) [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0563; FRL-9969-16] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3391. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's temporary final rule — Investment Company Reporting Modernization [Release Nos.: 33-10442; 34-82241; IC-32936; File No.: S7-08-15] (RIN: 3235-AL42) received December 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3392. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ziram; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0536; FRL-9970-38] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3393. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0196; FRL-9970-92-Region 9] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3394. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0600; FRL-9968-95] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3395. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ethofumesate; Pesticide

Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0314; FRL-9969-13] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3396. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Nitrpyrin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0295; FRL-9967-73] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3397. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Polyethyleneimine; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0616; FRL-9970-06] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3398. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to California State Implementation Plan; Bay Area Air Quality Management District; Emission Reduction Credit Banking [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0130; FRL-9970-68-Region 9] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3399. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0740; FRL-9970-93-Region 9] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3400. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Revision of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of New York; Regional Haze State and Federal Implementation Plans [EPA-R02-OAR-2017-0013; FRL-9971-28-Region 2] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3401. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; ID; 2012 PM2.5 Standard Infrastructure Requirements [EPA-R10-OAR-2015-0856; FRL-9971-33-Region 10] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 1,3-dibromo-5,5-dimethylhydantoin; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-1033; FRL-9968-30] received November 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3403. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Certification Related to Condition 7(C)(i) of Senate Executive Resolution 75 (1997) Concerning Advice and Consent to the Ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3404. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting 21 notifi-

cations of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3405. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Office of Inspector General Semi-annual Report to Congress for the period April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, Public Law 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3406. A letter from the Vice President, Congressional and Public Affairs, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Agency Financial Report for FY 2017, including annual audited financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3407. A letter from the General Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures Further Implementing the Annual Limitation on Suspension of Deportation and Cancellation of Removal [EOIR Docket No.: 180; AG Order No.: 4034-2017] (RIN: 1125-AA25) received December 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3408. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Donations of Technology and Related Support Services To Enforce Intellectual Property Rights [USCBP-2016-0076] [CBP Dec. 17-21] (RIN: 1515-AE21) received December 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3409. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting notification of the Secretary's determination that, by reason of the statutory debt limit, the Secretary will be unable to fully invest the portion of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (CSRDF) not immediately required to pay beneficiaries, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 8348(1)(2); Public Law 89-554, Sec. 8348(1)(2) (as added by Public Law 99-509, Sec. 6002(c)); (100 Stat. 1933); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform.

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 follow:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4292. A bill to reform the living will process under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; with an amendment (Rept. 115-465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 4642. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to include in the Veterans Choice Program all veterans enrolled in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4643. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to the duties of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 4644. A bill to withdraw certain National Forest System land in the Emigrant Crevice area located in the Custer Gallatin National Forest, Park County, Montana, from the mining and mineral leasing laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 4645. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 4646. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, as the "Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 4647. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 4648. A bill to delay the effective date of certain regulations relating to home mortgage disclosures, to suspend certain data sharing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 4649. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AGUILAR (for himself, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 4650. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to develop and make available guidance relating to domestic preparedness for and collective response to terrorism regarding active shooter and mass casualty incident response assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 4651. A bill to provide that the final rule of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection titled "Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C)" shall have no force or effect; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr.

COHEN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee):

H.R. 4652. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make permanent the Tennessee disproportionate share hospital (DSH) allotment under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4653. A bill to provide for a prescription drug take-back program for members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, the Judiciary, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. EMMER, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 4654. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to use certain data in determining an actual or benchmark county yield, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MARINO, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. BACON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. STEWART, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 4655. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or transportation of child sex dolls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 4656. A bill to extend a prohibition relating to permits for discharges incidental to the normal operation of certain vessels; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 4657. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code, to allow full subrogation, including subrogation to the priority rights of the United States, of claims for the payment of customs duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 4658. A bill to provide consumer protections for students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 4659. A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to recognize the exposure-reducing nature of client margin for cleared derivatives; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr.

SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GOSAR, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 4660. A bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

148. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 26, urging the executive branch and the Congress to work in conjunction with the State of Texas to identify federal regulations promulgated during the last eight years, especially those promulgated under the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency, the United States Department of the Interior, and the United States Department of Energy, and determine whether they should be revised, delegated to state agencies, or eliminated in order to ease the overly burdensome regulatory patchwork on the oil and gas industry in Texas; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

149. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 37, urging the Congress to increase appropriations from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to ensure that the nation's ship channels are appropriately maintained and safe; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. TIPTON:

H.R. 4642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4643.

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

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

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 4644.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 4645.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 4646.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7

The Congress shall have Power To . . . establish Post Offices and post Roads . . .

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 4647.

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

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 4648.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4649.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 4650.

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

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 4651.

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

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 4652.

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

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4653.

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

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4654.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution. Also, clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 4655.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and/or Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 4656.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4657.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 4658.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Subsection 18: 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4659.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests lies in Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which allows for every

bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

Additionally, the Constitution grants to Congress the explicit power to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 4660.

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

Commerce Clause

Section 8 of Article I to make all laws necessary and proper for the carrying into execution of powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States

Section 5 of the 14th Amendment

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 113: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 519: Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 632: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 866: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1192: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1205: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 1243: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1318: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1456: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1457: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1487: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1528: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1664: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1825: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BERA and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1836: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1861: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1889: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1896: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2215: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2219: Mr. SIRES, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 2267: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 2295: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2340: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2366: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2401: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2569: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 2584: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2640: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2646: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 2651: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2719: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2740: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2813: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2826: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2851: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 2899: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 2902: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2996: Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 3032: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3079: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 3255: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3282: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 3320: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 3444: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3495: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3545: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 3576: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 3596: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 3600: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3666: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 3776: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 3798: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 3806: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3851: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 3881: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 3913: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3931: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 4072: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4143: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4202: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 4207: Mr. POLIS and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 4221: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 4222: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4229: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. COMER, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 4265: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 4306: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4328: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4360: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 4392: Mr. MARINO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. FASO, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 4396: Mr. GALLEGRO.

H.R. 4437: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 4444: Mr. CLAY and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 4459: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4473: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 4474: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 4485: Mr. PALLONE and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 4505: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 4506: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 4518: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MENG, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. BASS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POSTER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 4526: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 4527: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4541: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 4545: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 4547: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 4573: Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4616: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 4633: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.J. Res. 33: Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.J. Res. 121: Mr. ALLEN.

H.Con. Res. 63: Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Res. 274: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 495: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 528: Mr. PETERS and Mrs. LAWRENCE.