



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 2018

No. 69

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, April 30, 2018, at 2:30 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 2018

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 27, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE JOHNSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

As the Members of this people's House deliberate these days, give them the wisdom and magnanimity to lay aside what might divide us as a people to forge a secure future for our country.

We pray for all people who have special needs. May Your presence be known to those who are sick, that they might feel the power of Your healing spirit.

Inspire the men and women who serve in this House to be their best selves, that they may in turn be an inspiration to the Nation and to the world.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CURTIS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

NATIONAL PARK WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Park Week to celebrate America's treasures, our national parks.

For 1 week each April, the National Park Service joins with the National Park Foundation, the official charity of America's national parks, to celebrate National Park Week. This is a time to explore amazing places, discover stories of history and culture, and take in all the beautiful public lands our Nation has to offer.

National Park Week began last Saturday, April 21, and runs through Sunday, April 29. The theme for National Park Week in 2018 is "Park Stars," celebrating everything from starry skies to superstar volunteers, park features, and resources.

Parks, programs, and partners nationwide invite people everywhere to explore stories, experiences, and sites that brighten the national park system and public lands. Parks across the

□ 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.

H3709

country have hosted a variety of events throughout the week. Today is Military and Veteran Recognition Day. The National Park Service employs more than 5,800 Active-Duty veterans in a wide array of careers.

Mr. Speaker, our national parks are truly remarkable, and I encourage everyone to experience their breathtaking beauty.

Happy National Park Week.

NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Day of Silence, a day of silence to bring attention to the discrimination and harassment faced by our LGBT youth across our country.

Eight out of ten LGBT students are harassed because of their sexual orientation or gender identity by the time they graduate from high school, students like Annie Hsu, at Santa Cruz High School in my district on the central coast of California, who has said that “we must be unafraid to stand up against marginalization.”

This month, those of us on the LGBT Equality Caucus took that stand by introducing the Student Non-Discrimination Act. This bill would prohibit discrimination in public schools based on actual or perceived gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity, and it would protect students from the intimidation and violence they may receive.

By standing up and speaking out, Annie and other LGBT students give us motivation to push forward and pass laws that will protect every student in every school across every community so that they are not afraid to be themselves.

OPIOID USE DURING PREGNANCY

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the POPPY Study Act, which will improve research and awareness of opioid use disorder during pregnancy.

The opioid epidemic is a national crisis and has hit particularly hard in Utah. Unfortunately, Utah’s drug overdose rate is ranked among the highest in the Nation. Six Utahns die every week from an opioid overdose. Sadly, Utah also has the highest rate of opioid prescriptions for pregnant mothers in the country, double the national average.

Women have been disproportionately affected by the opioid epidemic, and little is understood about the effect this has had on pregnant women. That is why I have introduced the POPPY Study Act, to improve our understanding of prescription opioid use dur-

ing pregnancy, the effects that it can have on a mother and child, and how we can best help those who are pregnant and suffering from opioid use disorder.

It is my hope that the POPPY Study Act will improve the care and well-being of our expecting mothers and their children.

HONORING THE LIFE OF VEL PHILLIPS

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of a phenomenal woman, Vel Phillips, who hails from my hometown, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Vel Phillips passed away this month at the age of 95, but not before she led a phenomenal life. She was the first of so many things: the first African American and the first woman to become an alderman in the city of Milwaukee; the first African American to graduate from the University of Wisconsin-Madison; the first African American judge in Milwaukee County; the first and only African American to win election statewide.

Members may have heard of Father James Groppi, who led 200 days of marches for open housing. That was in support of Vel Phillips’ open housing ordinance in the city of Milwaukee on the Common Council, where it was defeated, repeatedly, 18-1. That led to the signature of open housing legislation nationwide.

She was the first Black person to serve on either the DNC or RNC.

I hope the House will join me in honoring the great life of Vel Phillips.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday marks the beginning of Small Business Week, where, as a nation, we come together to show support for the many risk takers, entrepreneurs, and mom-and-pop shops that make America great.

More than 99 percent of all businesses in the United States are classified as small businesses, and they are responsible for two out of every three jobs that are created in this country. That is why we often refer to small businesses as the backbone of the U.S. economy.

Thankfully, the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has given a boost to these operations, which is directly translating into more jobs, better pay, and new investments and expansion across America.

I have traveled all across the 15 parishes of my district, Mr. Speaker, over the last few months, and no matter

where I go, our constituents tell us how the historic reform has helped them and all of our local mom-and-pop shops. Hardworking Americans everywhere, from all walks of life, are reaping the benefits of our reforms, and the best is yet to come.

So, for Small Business Week, which is next week, I want to thank all those who truly are the backbone of our economy. Keep up the good work, and we will continue to fight for you in Washington.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 839 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4.

Will the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 0911

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes, with Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, April 26, 2018, amendment No. 87 printed in House Report 115-650, offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), had been disposed of.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR.

SHUSTER OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 839, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 102, 103, 105, 106, 109, 111, 113, and 116 printed in part A of House Report 115-650, offered by Mr. SHUSTER of Pennsylvania:

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

Page 270, line 21, strike “and” at the end.
Page 271, line 2, strike the quotation marks and both periods and insert a semicolon.

Page 271, after line 2, insert the following:
“(13) removing standing burned trees; and
“(14) replacing water systems that have been burned and have caused contamination.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 273, line 12, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 273, line 16, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 273, after line 16, insert the following: (3) how State, Tribal, and local governments, first responders, utility companies, hospitals, nursing homes, and other long-term care facilities should develop a strategy to coordinate emergency response plans, including the activation of emergency response plans, in anticipation of a major disaster, including severe weather events.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 297, line 12, insert “the Disaster Assistance Working Group of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency,” after “Development.”

Page 297, line 22, insert “the Disaster Assistance Working Group of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency,” after “Development.”

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER OF OREGON

Add at the end of title VI:

SEC. 637. ELIGIBILITY FOR CODE IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

Section 402 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170a) is amended—

- (1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4);
(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and
(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) provide assistance to State and local governments for building code and floodplain management ordinance administration and enforcement, including inspections for substantial damage compliance.”

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of title VI, insert the following:

SEC. _____. GAO REPORT ON LONG-TERM RECOVERY EFFORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 240 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on long-term recovery efforts following Hurricane Andrew, the attacks of September 11, 2001, Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Ike, and Hurricane Sandy.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report shall contain the following:

- (1) Information on defining a long-term recovery, the stages of a long-term recovery, and the transition from Federal Government management of long-term recovery efforts to State and local leadership.
(2) An assessment of the personnel needed, and the types of expertise or certifications required to accomplish the administration and management of recovery efforts for each of the disasters described in subsection (a).
(3) An analysis of the success and efficiency of the long-term disaster recovery, and best practices learned that may be applied to future long-term disaster recovery plans.
(4) Recommendations of the Comptroller General for what should be defined as a long-term disaster recovery project using existing authority and responsibility of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to advise and make recommendations to the President regarding Presidential Disaster Declarations.
(5) Recommendations of FEMA on the capacity and competence of FEMA to manage multiple major Presidential Disaster Declarations simultaneously of the magnitude of 3, 4, or all 5 of the disasters described in subsection (a) occurring within weeks of each other.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of title VI (page 322, after line 24), add the following new section:

SEC. 637. GUIDANCE AND TRAINING BY FEMA ON COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLANS.

(a) TRAINING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall provide guidance and training on an annual basis to State, local, and Tribal governments, first responders, and facilities that store hazardous materials on coordination of emergency response plans in the event of a major disaster or emergency, including severe weather events. The guidance and training shall include the following:

- (1) Providing a list of equipment required in the event a hazardous substance is released into the environment.
(2) Outlining the health risks associated with exposure to hazardous substances to improve treatment response.
(3) Publishing best practices for mitigating further danger to communities from hazardous substances.
(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The requirement of subsection (a) shall be implemented not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Add at the end of the bill the following:

TITLE IX—PREPAREDNESS AND RISK MANAGEMENT FOR EXTREME WEATHER PATTERNS ASSURING RESILIENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Preparedness and Risk Management for Extreme Weather Patterns Assuring Resilience and Effectiveness Act of 2018” or the “PREPARE Act of 2018”.

SEC. 902. INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON EXTREME WEATHER RESILIENCE, PREPAREDNESS, AND RISK IDENTIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a council to be known as the “Interagency Council on Extreme Weather Resilience, Preparedness, and Risk Identification and Management”.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Interagency Council shall be composed of the following:

- (1) Senior officials, to be appointed by the President, including representation from the following:
(A) The Council on Environmental Quality.
(B) The Office of Science and Technology Policy.
(C) The National Security Council.
(D) The Office of Management and Budget.
(E) The Department of Transportation.
(F) The Environmental Protection Agency.
(G) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
(H) The Department of Energy.
(I) The Department of Homeland Security.
(J) The Federal Emergency Management Agency.
(K) The Department of Defense.
(L) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(M) The Department of Agriculture.
(N) The Department of Housing and Urban Development.
(O) The Department of Justice.
(2) Senior officials, to be appointed by the President, who have relevant policy expertise and policy responsibilities, including in the following areas:
(A) Economic policy and risk analysis.
(B) Foreign affairs.
(C) Defense and intelligence.
(D) Homeland security.

- (E) Energy.
(F) Environmental protection.
(G) Natural resources.
(H) Coasts, oceans, rivers, and floodplains.
(I) Agriculture.
(J) Health.
(K) Transportation and infrastructure.
(L) Housing.
(M) Education.
(N) Extreme weather data analysis or meteorological science.
(O) Social science.
(P) Strategic planning.
(Q) Urban and land use planning.
(R) Other areas the President determines appropriate.

(c) CO-CHAIRPERSONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Interagency Council shall be co-chaired by the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security and the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. The President may appoint one or more additional members as co-chairs, as appropriate.
(2) DUTIES.—The co-chairpersons shall—

(A) oversee the Interagency Council’s response to the Government Accountability Office’s recommendations under subsection (f)(5);

(B) use the evaluation framework and performance metrics developed pursuant to subsection (f)(6) to evaluate agency progress in meeting the goals and implementing the priorities described in subsection (f)(1)(A); and
(C) work to ensure that sufficient resources are available for agencies to—

- (i) meet the goals and implement the priorities described in subsection (f)(1)(A); and
(ii) implement the recommendations developed under subsection (f)(2).

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—The co-chairpersons of the Interagency Council (or staff designed by the co-chairpersons) shall provide administrative support and additional resources, as appropriate, to the Interagency Council to the extent permitted by law and within existing appropriations. The Interagency Council co-chairpersons shall determine the amount of funding and personnel necessary for the Interagency Council to carry out its duties and the amount of funding and personnel each agency represented on the Interagency Council should contribute in order for the Interagency Council to carry out such duties. Agencies shall, upon the request of the co-chairpersons of the Interagency Council, make available personnel, administrative support services, and information to the Interagency Council.

(e) STRUCTURE.—

(1) STEERING COMMITTEE.—The co-chairpersons of the Interagency Council shall designate a subset of members of the Interagency Council to serve on a steering committee. Such steering committee shall assist the Interagency Council in determining its priorities and its strategic direction.
(2) WORKING GROUPS.—The co-chairpersons of the Interagency Council and its steering committee may establish working groups as needed.

(f) DUTIES OF THE INTERAGENCY COUNCIL.—
(1) GOALS AND PRIORITIES.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—The Interagency Council shall establish Governmentwide goals and priorities for extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management. In establishing such goals and priorities, the Interagency Council shall consider the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, agency continuity of operations plans, the National Preparedness Goal, the National Preparedness Report, the National Global Change Research Plan, the Mitigation Framework Leadership Group’s National Mitigation Investment Strategy (if available), State and

local mitigation plans, and all relevant provisions of the Government Accountability Office's High-Risk Series.

(B) **COORDINATION.**—In executing the duties pursuant to this subsection, the Interagency Council shall coordinate with other groups in the Federal Government focused on extreme weather mitigation and recovery (including the Mitigation Framework Leadership Group, the Recovery Support Functions Leaders Group, and the Emergency Support Functions Leaders Group), to avoid duplication among Federal activities to the extent practicable.

(C) **INCORPORATION INTO AGENCY ACTIVITIES.**—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Interagency Council shall, in order to ensure that information relating to extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management is incorporated into everyday agency activities—

(i) work with agencies to assist such agencies in considering the goals and priorities described in subparagraph (A) in agency strategic, programmatic, and budget planning;

(ii) identify details to be included in agency extreme weather plans; and

(iii) work to identify and communicate localized extreme weather and natural hazard risk to the extent possible using the best available information regarding risk, and encourage the development of thorough, updated maps, models, and tools to measure and evaluate risk.

(2) **PRIORITY INTERAGENCY FEDERAL ACTIONS.**—The Interagency Council shall develop, recommend, coordinate, and track implementation of priority interagency Federal Government actions related to extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management.

(3) **SUPPORT REGIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL ACTIONS.**—The Interagency Council shall support regional, State, and local action to assess extreme weather-related vulnerabilities and cost effectively increase extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management of communities, critical economic sectors, natural and built infrastructure, and natural resources, including by—

(A) conducting inventories under section 906;

(B) convening meetings under section 907;

(C) providing guidance to agencies to produce tools and products that enhance extreme weather resilience planning, risk knowledge, and actions for use in all levels of government, including guidance on how to prioritize funding in order to produce such tools and products; and

(D) reviewing State and local mitigation plans.

(4) **METEOROLOGICAL AND EXTREME WEATHER SCIENCE.**—The Interagency Council shall facilitate the integration of meteorological and extreme weather science, in addition to other scientific disciplines such as physical, natural, and social science that the Council determines to be appropriate, in the policies risk evaluation and communication, and planning of agencies and the private sector, including by—

(A) promoting the development of innovative, actionable, and accessible Federal extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management-related information, data, tools, and examples of successful actions at appropriate scales for decisionmakers; and

(B) providing such information, data, tools, and examples to the agency or agencies designated under section 904 to include on the website established and maintained or designated pursuant to such section.

(5) **HIGH-RISK REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The Interagency Council shall assess the specific recommendations relating to extreme

weather in all relevant provisions of the Government Accountability Office's High-Risk Series, identify the feasibility of revising Federal programs to implement such recommendations, and develop a plan to address such recommendations when feasible that does not duplicate the National Preparedness Goal.

(6) **FRAMEWORK AND PERFORMANCE METRICS.**—The Interagency Council shall use existing and emerging science to develop or adopt—

(A) a framework for evaluating the progress and success of extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management-related efforts that is complementary to and not duplicative of any local or national indicator system developed as part of the National Preparedness Goal; and

(B) performance metrics that allow tracking of the actions taken and progress made toward meeting the goals and implementing the priorities described in paragraph (1)(A).

(7) **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CEQ AND OMB.**—The Interagency Council shall provide to the Council on Environmental Quality, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Department of Homeland Security recommendations on how agencies should—

(A) develop or update agency extreme weather plans;

(B) remove barriers to State and local extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management, in agency regulations, guidance, and policies; and

(C) avoid duplication among Federal activities to the extent practicable.

(8) **PUBLIC INPUT AND COMMENT.**—The Interagency Council shall solicit and incorporate public input and comment as appropriate into the decisions of the Interagency Council.

(9) **INVENTORY AND MEETINGS.**—The Interagency Council shall conduct inventories under section 906 and convene meetings under section 907.

(10) **DEFINITION OF EXTREME WEATHER.**—The Interagency Council shall consider and may update, not less frequently than every two years, in consultation with appropriate scientific bodies, the definition of “extreme weather” and what other weather events (in addition to those described in section 909(3)) qualify as extreme weather for purposes of this title. The definition of “extreme weather” shall be published and updated, as necessary, on the website of the Council and in the Federal Register.

(11) **OTHER DUTIES.**—The Interagency Council shall carry out any other duties the co-chairpersons of the Interagency Council determine appropriate.

(12) **PUBLIC INFORMATION.**—The Interagency Council shall—

(A) make information available online—

(i) for tracking implementation of agency extreme weather plans and Governmentwide goals and priorities described in paragraph (1)(A);

(ii) on recommendations relating to extreme weather in all relevant provisions of the Government Accountability Office's High-Risk Series; and

(iii) on the results of the Council's efforts to identify nationwide and localized risks (including updated mapping efforts); and

(B) make such High-Risk Series and the reports submitted under paragraph (13) available as the Council determines appropriate.

(13) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter (concurrently with the United States Global Change Research Program Annual Report and the National Preparedness Report), the Interagency Council shall submit to Congress, and make

available to the United States Global Change Research Program and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, a report that—

(A) describes how the goals and priorities described in paragraph (1)(A) are being met and implemented using—

(i) the performance metrics developed under paragraph (6)(B); and

(ii) information on—

(I) agency expenditures, broken down by program activity level if practicable, that are directly related to extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management, including extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management of Federal facilities; and

(II) the effectiveness of such expenditures, along with associated financial impacts and community, infrastructure, and environmental benefits, to the extent such data are available;

(B) provides recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of such implementation and sets benchmarks to meet;

(C) describes the progress of the regional coordination efforts described in sections 906, 907, and 908; and

(D) includes a summary of public comments solicited under paragraph (8) and any action the Interagency Council took to respond to such comments.

(g) **CONSULTATION.**—In carrying out paragraphs (2) through (12) of subsection (f), the Interagency Council shall consult with agencies, State and local governments, academic and research institutions, and the private and nonprofit sectors.

(h) **OMB GUIDANCE.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, taking into consideration the recommendations provided by the Interagency Council under subsection (f)(7), shall issue guidance to agencies on—

(1) developing agency extreme weather plans, which shall incorporate existing agency reports, where appropriate, to prevent duplication and reduce overlap; and

(2) developing agency regulations, guidance, and policies to remove barriers to State and local extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management.

SEC. 903. AGENCY PLANNING FOR EXTREME WEATHER-RELATED RISKS.

(a) **AGENCY EXTREME WEATHER RESILIENCE, PREPAREDNESS, AND RISK IDENTIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.**—

(1) **AGENCY SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the head of each agency, in coordination with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to avoid duplication with the National Planning Frameworks, shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and to the Interagency Council a comprehensive plan that integrates consideration of extreme weather into such agency's operations and overall mission objectives (hereinafter referred to as an “agency extreme weather plan”).

(2) **HEARING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall convene an interagency budget crosscut and policy hearing to review and integrate all the agency extreme weather plans and to ensure that such extreme weather plans and the activities of agencies align with the goals and priorities established under section 902(f)(1)(A).

(3) **OMB SUBMISSION.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, upon receipt of all agency extreme weather plans in a given year, shall consolidate and submit to Congress such plans.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—Each agency extreme weather plan shall include—

(1) identification and assessment of extreme weather-related impacts on, and risks to—

(A) the agency’s ability to accomplish its missions, operations, and programs over time periods to be designated by the Interagency Council; and

(B) State and local entities;

(2) identification and assessment of barriers posed by Federal programs the agency administers to State and local extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management efforts;

(3) a description of programs, policies, and plans the agency has already put in place, as well as additional actions the agency will take, to manage extreme weather risks in the near term and build resilience in the short and long term;

(4) a description of how the agency will consider the need to improve extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management, including the costs and benefits of such improvement, with respect to agency suppliers, supply chain, real property investments, and capital equipment purchases, including by updating agency policies for leasing, building upgrades, relocation of existing facilities and equipment, and construction of new facilities;

(5) a description of how the agency will support any ongoing or future public-private partnership to improve extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management, including the cost and benefits of technology and methodology improvements, hardening, or rapid restoration;

(6) a description of how the agency will contribute to coordinated interagency efforts to support extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management at all levels of government, including collaborative work across agencies’ regional offices and hubs, and through coordinated development of information, data, and tools, consistent with sections 906, 907, and 908; and

(7) any other details identified by the Interagency Council under section 902(f)(1)(B)(ii).

SEC. 904. WEBSITE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Interagency Council shall designate an agency or agencies to establish, maintain, or designate a website that provides timely, actionable, and accessible information, data, and tools on current and future risks related to extreme weather, preparedness, resilience, and risk identification and management, to support Federal, regional, State, local, private sector, and other decisionmakers.

(b) INTERAGENCY PROGRESS.—The website described under subsection (a), shall identify interagency progress, and propose the next interagency steps, towards responding to threats posed by extreme weather.

(c) BEST PRACTICES.—The website described under subsection (a) shall provide best practices and examples from Federal, regional, State, and local decisionmakers in the public and private sectors about how to use extreme weather-related information in planning and decisionmaking.

(d) INTERAGENCY COUNCIL INFORMATION AND TOOLS.—The website described under subsection (a) shall include the information, data, tools, and examples provided by the Interagency Council pursuant to section 902(f)(4).

(e) BEST AVAILABLE METEOROLOGICAL SCIENCE.—The website described under subsection (a) shall identify best available meteorological science relating to extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management.

(f) PUBLIC OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—The Interagency Council shall designate one or more agencies to conduct outreach and educational activities to inform the public and regional, State, and local decisionmakers about the tools and information available on the website described under subsection (a).

SEC. 905. PROVIDING ADEQUATE RESOURCES AND SUPPORT.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall ensure that each agency provides adequate resources to the Interagency Council, including administrative services and personnel support, as appropriate—

(1) for the website described under section 904; and

(2) to otherwise carry out this title.

SEC. 906. INVENTORY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Interagency Council, or a working group of such Interagency Council established by the co-chairpersons thereof, shall conduct and publish an inventory of all regional offices, centers, and programs of agencies that are assisting with extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management efforts at the State or local level, including—

(1) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s regional programs;

(2) the Department of the Interior’s Fish and Wildlife Service Landscape Conservation Cooperatives;

(3) the United States Geological Survey’s Climate Science Centers;

(4) the Department of Agriculture’s Climate Hubs;

(5) the regional offices of—

(A) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(B) the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(C) the Department of Transportation; and

(D) the Forest Service;

(6) the division offices of the Army Corps of Engineers; and

(7) such other offices, centers, and programs or other agency efforts as determined appropriate by the Interagency Council.

(b) ASSISTANCE DESCRIBED.—An inventory conducted and published under subsection (a) shall include a description of the assistance each agency office, center, or program is providing to assist with extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management efforts at the State or local level.

SEC. 907. MEETINGS.

Not later than 6 months after the publication of each inventory under section 906, the Interagency Council shall convene a meeting of representatives of the offices, centers, and programs included in such inventory and invite other local and regional stakeholders to participate and develop plans to coordinate the efforts of such offices, centers, and programs and facilitate efficient services to stakeholders. At such meetings, such representatives shall—

(1) share information regarding their office, center, or program’s extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management efforts;

(2) identify opportunities for collaboration and coordination of research agendas, extreme weather assessment activities, vulnerability assessments, data collection and analysis, and planning and implementing extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management projects;

(3) identify extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management information needs, research gaps, and decision support needs that are not met by any of the offices, centers, or pro-

grams included in the inventory under section 906 and make available such identification for purposes of information to be submitted to the Interagency Council under section 907;

(4) identify common and complementary goals for extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management within each region to be prioritized for the coming year and beyond;

(5) identify barriers to regional extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management planning and implementation that can be overcome or minimized through Federal action and specific suggestions for improvement;

(6) evaluate progress and jointly develop a strategy for realizing extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management-related goals, including clearly identified responsibilities by each collaborating regional office, center, or program; and

(7) share experiences and best practices in stakeholder engagement and communication, decision support, and science-practice interactions that support the realization of identified extreme weather resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management goals.

SEC. 908. PROGRESS UPDATES.

Not later than 90 days after each meeting under section 907, each agency that participates in such meeting shall submit to the Interagency Council, and make available to the United States Global Change Research Program and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, information describing progress in regional coordination and collaboration in aligning Federal resilience, preparedness, and risk identification and management efforts at the State and local level, and the benefits of such regional coordination and collaboration.

SEC. 909. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given the term “Executive agency” under section 105 of title 5, but does not include the Government Accountability Office.

(2) AGENCY EXTREME WEATHER PLAN.—The term “agency extreme weather plan” means a plan required under section 903(a).

(3) EXTREME WEATHER.—The term “extreme weather” includes observed or anticipated severe and unseasonable atmospheric conditions, including drought, wildfire, heavy precipitation, wave, high water, snowstorm, landslide, mudslide, hurricanes, tornadoes and other windstorms (including derechos), extreme heat, extreme cold, sustained temperatures or precipitation that deviate from historical averages, and any other weather event that the Interagency Council determines qualifies as extreme weather pursuant to section 902(f)(10).

(4) INTERAGENCY COUNCIL.—The term “Interagency Council” means the Interagency Council on Extreme Weather Resilience, Preparedness, and Risk Identification and Management established under section 902(a).

(5) MITIGATION PLAN.—The term “mitigation plan” means the mitigation plan required under section 322 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5165).

(6) NATIONAL GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH PLAN.—The term “National Global Change Research Plan” means the National Global Change Research Plan developed under section 104 of the Global Change Research Act of 1990 (15 U.S.C. 2934), or any revision thereof.

(7) NATIONAL OIL AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES POLLUTION CONTINGENCY PLAN.—The term “National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan” means

the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan described under part 300 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, or any revision thereof.

(8) NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS GOAL.—The term “National Preparedness Goal” means the national preparedness goal developed under section 643 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 743).

(9) NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS REPORT.—The term “National Preparedness Report” means the report required by section 652(a) of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 752(a); Public Law 109-295).

(10) PREPAREDNESS.—The term “preparedness” means actions taken to plan, organize, equip, train, and exercise to build, apply, and sustain the capabilities necessary to prevent, protect against, ameliorate the effects of, respond to, and recover from extreme weather related damages to life, health, property, livelihoods, ecosystems, and national security.

(11) RESILIENCE.—The term “resilience” means the ability to anticipate, prepare for, and adapt to changing conditions and withstand, respond to, and recover rapidly from disruptions.

(12) SENIOR OFFICIAL.—The term “senior official” means a Deputy Secretary (or an equivalent officer) of an agency.

(13) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, each commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian Tribe.

(14) UNITED STATES GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH PROGRAM.—The term “United States Global Change Research Program” means the United States Global Change Research Program established under section 103 of the Global Change Research Act of 1990 (15 U.S.C. 2933).

(15) UNITED STATES GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT.—The term “United States Global Change Research Program Annual Report” means the report required by section 102(e)(7) of the Global Change Research Act of 1990 (15 U.S.C. 2932(e)(7)).

SEC. 910. REQUIREMENT TO INCLUDE AGENCY EXTREME WEATHER PLAN IN AGENCY PERFORMANCE PLAN.

A description of the most recent agency extreme weather plan, as required under section 903, shall be included in the performance plan of an agency (as defined in section 909) required pursuant to section 1115(b) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 911. SUNSET AND REPEAL.

This title ceases to be effective and is repealed on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK OF VIRGINIA

Beginning on page 331, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 332, line 1 (and redesignate any subsequent subsections accordingly).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I support considering these amendments en bloc, all of which have been approved by both the majority and minority. These Members put forward thoughtful amendments, and I am pleased to be able to support moving them en bloc.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I support the adoption of the amendments en bloc and recommend them to my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 4, FAA Reauthorization and Disaster Recovery Reform Act, which is included in En Bloc Amendment Number Four.

I thank the Chair and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Rules for making this Jackson Lee Amendment in order.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their leadership in bringing the FAA Reauthorization and Disaster Recovery Reform Act to the House Floor for consideration.

I am disappointed that the other Jackson Lee Amendments to H.R. 4, the “FAA Reauthorization and Disaster Recovery Reform Act that addressed disaster recovery reform and offered improvements to commercial air transportation, were not made in order.

I offered Jackson Lee Amendment No. 609 because of my experience with Hurricane Harvey.

Over the years, Members of Congress, develop an extensive network of people we work with and those who may have need of legislative assistance.

The storm and the catastrophic flooding that resulted from Hurricane Harvey put at risk thousands of people who needed help.

The 911 emergency call centers serving the disaster area were inundated with thousands of calls for rescues.

I am pleased to say that my office managed dozens of calls, which came to me and my staff from Houston residents seeking rescue or medical assistance.

FEMA, the City of Houston and the State of Texas did exceptional work in the disaster response for Hurricane Harvey.

There is no blame or fault, but valuable lessons that can be learned.

There was no way to pre-prepare for Hurricane Harvey or Maria or Irma or any of the other major disaster events in 2017.

What we can do is learn as much as possible and apply those lessons to future disaster response and recovery efforts.

When there is an event, like Hurricane Harvey there are important and valuable lessons that can help us to meet future challenges.

Harvey’s significance is the size of the impact zone and the level of flooding experienced.

The nine-county Houston metro area impacted by Hurricane Harvey covers 9,444 square miles, an area larger than five states, including New Hampshire, New Jersey and Connecticut.

Harris County covers 1,778 square miles, enough space to fit New York City, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Seattle, Austin and Dallas, with room still to spare.

There was over 41,500 square miles of land mass impacted by Hurricane Harvey and the subsequent flooding that covered an area larger than the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont combined.

Hurricane Harvey dropped 21 trillion gallons of rainfall on Texas and Louisiana, most of it on the Houston Metroplex.

Harvey dropped 51.88 inches of rain near Cedar Bayou, in the City of Houston, and 52 inches in Nederland and nearby Groves Texas making this the highest rain totals ever recorded for a single U.S. weather event.

At its peak on September 1, 2017, one-third of Houston was underwater.

At the peak on August 31, there were 34,575 evacuees in shelters across Texas.

Hurricane Harvey is the largest housing disaster to strike the U.S. in our nation’s history.

Hurricane Harvey damaged 203,000 homes, of which 12,700 were destroyed.

On April 17, 2018, 2,585 families are still in hotel rooms in hotels because of Hurricane Harvey.

Thousands of others with severe damage to their homes continue to live with family or friends.

889,425 people have registered for assistance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

There are families including small children and the elderly living in mold infested or gutted-out homes.

The Jackson Lee Amendment made in order for consideration of H.R. 4, provides for a GAO report 240 days following enactment on long-term recovery efforts following Hurricane Andrew, September 11, 2001, Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Ike, and Hurricane Sandy to better inform the Congress when catastrophic events occur that may require long-term recovery planning.

My amendment is the first step to determine how best to stress test FEMA for capacity and competence to respond to several major disaster at the same time.

Disasters like Harvey, Maria, Jose, Sandy, Ike, and September 11, 2018 are exemplars of the most challenging and catastrophic events in our nation’s modern history.

These disasters will or have taken years to recovery from, which classifies them as long term recovery events.

We need to learn from our past to better secure our future should our nation face similar challenges.

This Jackson Lee Amendment would ensure that we learn and benefit from these tragic events so that we might be better prepared for future challenges.

The amendment will provide GAO report that will: define a federal disaster long-term recovery, define the stages of a long-term recovery, and report on the competence and capacity of FEMA to manage 2 or more major disasters of the magnitude exemplified—simultaneously.

Further, the GAO will report on lessons that may be applied to future long-term disaster recovery efforts.

The GAO will also report on what existing authority granted to FEMA to advise and make recommendations to the President regarding Presidential Disaster Declarations which may be instructive regarding a Presidential long-term recovery disaster declaration.

Another Jackson Lee Amendment to the Disaster Recovery Reform component of the bill, but which was not made in order would have made permanent the FEMA Office of Response and Recovery, which currently exists but is not codified by law.

In 2017, starting on August 25, when Hurricane Harvey struck Texas, on September 6,

when Hurricane Irma lashed the U.S. Virgin Islands, on September 9, when Hurricane Jose smashed into Puerto Rico, and Hurricane Irma moved over the Florida Keys, and on September 20, when Hurricane Maria took aim at Puerto Rico; FEMA had to respond to each disaster and engage in sustained recovery efforts that will in the cases of Texas and Puerto Rico last for years.

Hurricane Harvey broke a rainfall record for a single tropical storm with more than 4 feet of rain.

Puerto Rico is still mired in attempting to recover from the longest blackout in U.S. history after Hurricane Maria struck many months ago.

More than 1,000 are estimated to have died in Puerto Rico due to Hurricane Maria and its aftermath.

Following the hurricanes came California's most destructive and largest wildfire season ever.

The Tubbs Fire in Northern California killed 22 people and damaged more than 5,600 structures.

Last year was also the third-hottest year on record.

San Francisco reported its highest temperature ever, 106 degrees Fahrenheit, while other parts of the country set records for high-temperature streaks.

For states like Arizona and South Carolina, 2017 was the warmest year ever.

14 places across Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas reported record-high water levels during floods in April and May.

In 2017, requests for federal disaster aid jumped tenfold compared to 2016, with 4.7 million people registering with the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Last year will go down in the record books for many reasons, destructive hurricanes, wildfires, mudslides, and droughts struck leaving death and destruction.

Every place in this nation has one or more vulnerability to floods, damaging storms, wildfires, earthquakes, volcanic activity, or earth movement—such as mudslides.

FEMA is the nation's premier organization that must respond to catastrophes at a moment's notice.

This Jackson Lee Amendment will allow Congress to develop better situational awareness on FEMA's role in disaster response especially when there may be multiple disasters putting demand on limited agency resources that require long-term recovery planning.

Thank you for this opportunity to explain my amendment and I ask for bipartisan support for this Jackson Lee Amendment included in En Bloc Four.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment which helps to ensure that communities ravaged by wildfires, including the recent October fires, get the help they need to recover.

Last year, we saw the worst fire season in California history. The October fires alone included 21 major fires that were fought by 11,000 firefighters burning nearly 245,000 acres. Those fires forced 100,000 people to evacuate and destroyed 8,900 homes and structures. Tragically, 44 people lost their lives.

The City of Santa Rosa is located in my district and was hit especially hard by the October fires with over 3,000 homes and businesses destroyed. In the Fountaingrove neigh-

borhood, north of downtown, the contamination in the water system that resulted directly from the fire melting the plastic water lines and appurtenances servicing 350 homes, must be replaced due to ongoing contamination of benzene, a toxic organic chemical.

As our communities move forward on the long road to recovery, we are finding that the needs of suburban and urban communities impacted by devastating wildfires don't always fit neatly into some of FEMA's current rules and regulations, which seem geared towards hurricane and flooding response and mitigation.

Issues as simple as whether or not FEMA should cover the costs of removing standing burned trees or replacing water systems, like the one in Fountaingrove that was contaminated as a result of the October fires, are not so simple.

My amendment provides FEMA with the capability and authority to mitigate these issues by explicitly stating that FEMA hazard mitigation funding can be used to remove standing, burned trees and replacing water systems damaged and/or contaminated by wildfires.

I appreciate House leadership working with my office to include this amendment in the en bloc so that we advance this issue and I look forward to continuing to work with them to ensure that my district's fire recovery needs are being met.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 104 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 294, strike lines 5 through 8, and insert the following:

SEC. 618. RIGHT OF ARBITRATION.

Section 423 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5189a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) RIGHT OF ARBITRATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding this section, an applicant for assistance under this title may request arbitration to dispute the eligibility for assistance or repayment of assistance provided for a project of more than \$100,000 for any disaster that occurred after January 1, 2016. Such arbitration shall be conducted de novo by the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals and the decision of such Board shall be binding.

“(2) ELIGIBILITY.—To participate in arbitration under this subsection, an applicant—

“(A) shall submit the dispute to the arbitration process established under the authority granted under section 601 of Public Law 111-5; and

“(B) may submit a request for arbitration in lieu of an appeal under subsection (a) at any time before the Administrator of FEMA has issued a final agency determination.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, in the aftermath of disasters, billions and billions of dollars in claims are often worked out between local governments, State governments, and FEMA.

In many cases, because disasters are inherently unpredictable, volatile, and folks are doing what they need to do to help their communities recover and address these urgent needs, in some cases, not every i is dotted, not every t is crossed. These minor issues often become obstacles to these communities being reimbursed and their ability to recover.

FEMA has an appeals process, Mr. Chairman. In that appeals process, you basically have FEMA reviewing FEMA. I don't think that that is the appropriate approach.

Section 618 of the underlying bill has an arbitration process, but that arbitration process has other Homeland Security officials reviewing the work of Homeland Security.

There was a better model that was used after the 2005 disasters whereby an outside board that exists, the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals, which is an independent body, was brought in to help review some of these appeals that local and State governments brought forth to the Corps of Engineers.

□ 0915

It was a better approach. It provided for more thorough evaluation and, again, the independence of having an outside entity review this. Our amendment simply improves upon the existing arbitration process in section 618 of the bill.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this legislation. I think it is very important, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Obviously, the gentleman has had significant experience with these problems in his part of the world that I think are somewhat unique, and I can also understand we want to expedite the review of people's claims. The major concerns we have are, one, that it appears, under the wording, that there would be no timeframe. So 20, 30 years after a disaster, someone could come in and file for arbitration. And secondly, by lowering the cost to any project that is \$100,000, we have no idea what the scope of that would be or how many appeals that might generate. But I think the general idea about using the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals does have merit to expedite citizens' claims against the government agency.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, and I would like to thank the committee also for including the PREPARE Act in the en bloc package. I would also like to thank Congressman LANCE for being my partner on the PREPARE Act for the past two Congresses and Congressmen WEBSTER, SANFORD, and MEADOWS for being cosponsors and supporters of my amendment, the PREPARE Act. I would also like to thank the over 50 outside organizations, companies, and think tanks that have supported the PREPARE Act. Finally, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Congressman GOWDY for passing the PREPARE Act out of the T&I and OGR committees, respectively.

Extreme weather is expensive. Last year the public and private sector saw a combined \$300 billion in damages from major extreme weather events. Congress had to spend an extra \$120 billion in disaster supplemental appropriations so we could get our disaster-ravaged communities back on their feet. And from our infrastructure to our defense, our public buildings to our supply chains, the Federal Government itself has an enormous amount of assets that are vulnerable to extreme weather events.

I have been working for 5 years to build upon commonsense GAO recommendations to help our Federal Government and our Nation better prepare for extreme weather events. This amendment will save lives and will save money by helping get our government coordinated, improve planning, and facilitate a better working relationship with State and local officials.

We know extreme weather events are happening more frequently, and they are causing more damage. We owe our citizens better planning, better engagement, and a better response. In passing the PREPARE Act, the House of Representatives is taking a responsible, important step in that direction.

I thank the gentleman again for including this amendment in the en bloc package.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to make note that I do appreciate my friend from Oregon's comments, and I appreciate his sensitivity to timelines. But that is what this amendment addresses: timelines. In many cases, our local government simply cannot continue to carry these debts and not get reimbursed.

In regard to the amount of money, perhaps \$100,000 is not a lot of money to the city of Portland, but I am going to guess to the city of Coos Bay it may be important.

In regard to the details of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I am from Louisiana. If the gentleman from Oregon can help us make this even better, then I would be happy to work with him on

that. But I think this is very, very important. Access to due process is important. The existing process does not allow supplemental material to be considered to respond to concerns that were raised by agency officials. This is a good model. It has proven effective in the past, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I will say to the gentleman that my staff tells me they did contact his staff, they did express concerns. They said: Thank you for your concerns. And then, next thing we knew, the amendments were filed. And then she still said: We'd be happy to work with you. And we get no response.

I think there may be kind of a staff issue going on here. Again, I have some concerns about, particularly, the unlimited time to apply and other details, perhaps.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 107 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VI, insert the following:
SEC. 6 . REIMBURSEMENT.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) shall retroactively reimburse State and local units of government (for a period of 3 years after the declaration of a major disaster under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170)) upon determination that a locally-implemented housing solution, implemented by State or local units of government, costs 50 percent of comparable FEMA solution or whatever the locally-implemented solution costs, whichever is lower.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, once again, is a bipartisan amendment. My good friends Congressman CEDRIC RICHMOND, Congressman GENE GREEN, Congressman RALPH ABRAHAM, Congressman CLAY HIGGINS, and Congressman BRIAN BABIN are all supporters of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. Following our August 2016 floods in south Louisiana, FEMA came in and provided housing solutions. The solutions included the utilization of

trailers. Because FEMA needs an acronym for everything, they were called MHUs, mobile housing units. When you added up the cost to purchase, transport, store, and set up these things, FEMA was in the hole anywhere from \$120,000 to \$170,000 per pop.

Mr. Chairman, you could buy these same units right there in the vicinity of the flood from local trailer dealers for anywhere from \$28,000 to I think the highest cost we saw was about \$40,000, including setup. It doesn't take a rocket scientist, Mr. Chairman, to realize that you could get it faster and you are helping to revive the local economy by using local solutions, as opposed to the case when FEMA is doing this, when it took months and months and months to give people even a single housing option in some cases.

So what this amendment does is it simply says that, if a local entity, a local government entity, if a State entity, can provide a housing solution for 50 percent of the cost, or less, as compared to the alternative that FEMA provides, then they can be reimbursed. Mr. Chairman, this is faster. It saves taxpayer dollars. It stops this fleeing of American taxpayers that is occurring in the aftermath of disasters.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, in Livingston Parish, Sheriff Jason Ard: his deputies were flooded. Literally, families didn't have anywhere to go. They had looting in the parish. The sheriff stepped up, established mobile housing units, trailers, for his deputies to live in so they didn't have to worry about their families anymore, so they could get back to doing what they were supposed to be doing: enforcing law in these destroyed communities. And FEMA is rejecting them.

We have tried to work through the administrative process. I will say it again: the only way they are reimbursed is if the cost of their solution was 50 percent or less than that of the Federal Government alternative, in regard to the mobile housing units.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, as I look at the drafting—and, again, my staff says they did reach out to your staff—I am confused when you get to the 50 percent part, whether it would have to be exactly 50 percent or otherwise. I agree, and I think that it would be good to push for more flexibility.

For instance, I have a manufacturer of yurts in my district which are used in many places around the world as temporary housing. The military uses them, and others. I was approached by someone representing Airbnb about vacant houses they had, vacation homes in Puerto Rico, that could have been

used when they were saying there was absolutely no housing for any emergency workers anywhere. And certainly there could be lower cost alternatives.

I still remember when FEMA, I think it was under the Bush administration, bought a bunch of trailers that couldn't be used because they had some of that crappy Chinese formaldehyde-exuding wallboard in them, and they were not habitable. We are still importing that junk from China, by the way. So I agree they could be much more flexible.

I think this amendment, again, as written, is problematic, but I certainly agree with the intent of the amendment to look at other lower cost alternatives. However, they should meet at least some minimal standards for sanitary facilities and other things. So I, again, have concerns about the drafting.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member and the manager of this fourth en bloc and rise to support the Jackson Lee amendment that has been included in the en bloc legislation. And I am thankful to Mr. DEFAZIO and the chairman for that.

My amendment, made in order, deals with a GAO report of 240 days following any disaster, a long-term recovery efforts plan. These disasters are examples of the most challenging and catastrophic events in our Nation.

And I am reminded of August 2018 in Houston, Texas. Hurricane Harvey has been defined as the singular most catastrophic incident and natural disaster in the continental United States. We are still suffering. People are still in hotels, still without their homes. So to the list of long-term recovery experiences, this GAO study would have us learn a lot. We need to learn from our past to do better to secure our future.

This GAO report would define the Federal disaster long-term recovery, define the stages of a long-term recovery, and report on the competence and capacity of FEMA to manage two or more disasters of the magnitude that happened at the same time.

I do want to take note of the fact that my amendment that did not authorize the FEMA Office of Response and Recovery was not made in order. I look forward to introducing legislation that would respond to that.

I am also concerned that two amendments dealing with the endangered species the Rules Committee did not make in order. In this time, I believe it is time to stand up to protect our endangered species. One of my amendments had to do with trophy products coming across on international airways; and the other was, as airports are built—and many are built in wetlands—for those who are building those airports to collaborate with a number of agencies to address the question of protecting the endangered species.

We live on this Earth with the wonderment of this Earth, and those include our wonderful animals, many of them endangered. And I believe the episode with Cecil the lion recognizes that we must protect our endangered species. I would hope going forward I would have the opportunity, at some time, to debate on the floor of the House the value of protecting our endangered species.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentlewoman from Texas would be supportive of this, representing many of the flood victims from Hurricane Harvey. It is important to keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that, in many cases, these flood victims don't have other options. So you may have a trailer from your local trailer dealership; you may have a tent. In many cases, that is very attractive compared to being homeless.

I would love to work with the gentleman from Oregon and see if we can work together to perfect this amendment to address any concerns that he may have. In regard to the Chinese formaldehyde, I agree with you. If we can get good old American formaldehyde in our trailers, let's do that. I am kidding.

But I urge adoption of the amendment. I think this is very important. We should be commending leaders like Sheriff Ard for stepping up and providing efficient solutions for disaster survivors.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I look forward to working with the gentleman. Just on the issue of the formaldehyde: we have laws and standards in this country still, despite Mr. Pruitt, that regulate the amount of formaldehyde that can be put into plywood. I have many people in my district who make plywood without using formaldehyde glues, and the Chinese put in massive amounts of formaldehyde glue, do not meet our standards, but we don't enforce or prohibit the importation, though we are about to file a case on that issue to prohibit them poisoning the American people. So that is another subject for another day.

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

□ 0930

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 108 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VI, insert the following:
SEC. 6 FLOOD INSURANCE.

Section 406(d)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172(d)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "This section shall not apply to more than one building of a multi-structure educational, law enforcement, correctional, fire, or medical campus, effective January 1, 2016."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to state, in response to the formaldehyde issue, let me be very clear, formaldehyde was a major issue after Hurricane Katrina in the trailers. We certainly learned from that, and we absolutely don't need anyone exposed to it.

So I absolutely agree with the gentleman on that. But I think there have been better standards, and certainly lessons learned, from what we experienced with Hurricane Katrina when folks were in these trailers for long periods of time, and they weren't designed for that purpose, so I do agree with the gentleman there.

But on this amendment, Mr. Chairman, let me be clear, this is, once again, a bipartisan amendment. We have the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), and other cosponsors, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), all supporting this amendment because it is common sense and it responds to true on-the-ground problems that were seen in the aftermath of disasters.

What happens is the current law in the Stafford Act says that any time you have a flood, if you have a facility like a school, that FEMA may deduct \$500,000 from the recovery for rebuilding that school. Well, what FEMA has done is they have taken the law that Congress established where it said "per facility," and they have taken it and they have abused it. They have now determined that a facility is an individual building.

So, Mr. Chairman, you may have a classroom building, you may have a cafeteria, you may have another classroom building, you may have a gymnasium, you may have a storage room, you may have a concession stand—in that case, FEMA is applying \$500,000 to each individual building. Now, what adds insult to injury or makes this situation untenable is the fact that these schools generate the revenue oftentimes from property taxes in the destroyed community. So they are losing property taxes, FEMA is hitting them with bills, in some cases, in Ascension, Livingston, and East Baton Rouge Parishes, that are tens of millions of dollars each. What this does is it victimizes the survivors' children. So the kids

can't get back in schools because the schools can't afford to reestablish their facilities.

So, look, bottom line is, this is all about preserving congressional intent. Congress spoke on this. FEMA has trashed the interpretation, and this is all about preserving congressional intent and getting our kids back in schools to where they can have the education or opportunities that they need to have, and they should no longer be further victimized by FEMA's flawed interpretation of the law.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have to say, I have read the amendment, and I can't quite follow it, my staff can't quite follow it, the gentleman's staff couldn't quite explain it. The gentleman has explained it in a way that this language may or may not reflect.

FEMA has said they don't understand it. They may well be doing something regarding public facilities that is not following the intent of the law, but again, I am not certain about this as the solution.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, once again, I am more than happy to work with my friend from Oregon to address any concerns that he may have to ensure that we have the best solution on this moving forward.

I will tell you that Republicans and Democrats in Florida, in Texas, in Puerto Rico, in the Virgin Islands, all across these disaster areas that we have experienced in the last 2 years are running into this exact same problem.

And let me just reiterate, Mr. Chairman, what this interpretation, this flawed interpretation is doing. It is putting an unaffordable bill before a community that has been destroyed, and it is only victimizing children because they can't get back in their schools, they can't resume their education. It is disrupting the resumption of their normal lives and just further affecting them, and delaying restoration and recovery of these communities.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. BABIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 110 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VI, insert the following:
SEC. ____ CERTAIN RECOUPMENT PROHIBITED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall deem any covered disaster assistance to have been properly procured, provided, and utilized, and shall restore any funding of covered disaster assistance previously provided but subsequently withdrawn or deobligated.

(b) COVERED DISASTER ASSISTANCE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "covered disaster assistance" means assistance—

(1) provided to a local government pursuant to section 403, 406, or 407 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b, 5172, or 5173); and

(2) with respect to which, the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security has determined, after an audit, that—

(A) the Federal Emergency Management Agency deployed to the local government a Technical Assistance Contractor to review field operations, provide eligibility advice, and assist with day-to-day decisions;

(B) the Technical Assistance Contractor provided inaccurate information to the local government; and

(C) the local government relied on the inaccurate information to determine that relevant contracts were eligible, reasonable, and reimbursable.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has bipartisan support, the support of my colleagues from Louisiana, who have also been hit hard by hurricanes, Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. GRAVES, and I am from Texas.

Your word is your bond in the State of Texas, and I would hope that everyone here in Congress or across this great country would want to say the same thing about their own State. Credibility, trust, and keeping your promise is always important, but especially in times of disaster and crisis. And when Federal agencies like FEMA are called in to help communities ravaged by a natural disaster, we should expect nothing less.

Anyone who has ever experienced a federally declared disaster knows that after ensuring the immediate health and safety needs of those who are affected, the top priority is to get the hazardous and dangerous storm damage cleaned up.

As long as tree limbs, trash, and other debris remain in the streets, things cannot get back to normal, and they are a health and safety hazard. Kids cannot go back to schools, restaurants and shops can't open for business, the economy is at a standstill. And so when a FEMA employee, like a technical assistance contractor, or TAC, lays out a path for a mayor, a county judge, a county commissioner, or any other State or local official to get the federally funded debris removal process under way, they can and should be counted on to honor their commitment and their responsibility.

My amendment will ensure that that will be the case by holding FEMA ac-

countable to the promises made and the contracts authorized by its own employees. Under my amendment, if a local government entity can show and the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General can certify that a local government was acting at the direction and the consultation of a FEMA technical assistance contractor regarding disaster relief efforts, government bureaucrats here in Washington cannot simply change their minds a few years down the road and decide to foot the locals with the bill.

So while this amendment is certainly about fairness, equity, and certainty for local governments, it is also about accountability for Federal officials. FEMA officials will know that the advice and the recommendations that they offer actually matter. Local officials will rest assured knowing that the contracts and work that they are doing is valid and reimbursable. This means getting disaster-damaged municipalities up and running sooner, shortening the timeframe that their citizens and businesses need Federal assistance, and save taxpayer money.

I urge all of my colleagues to help ensure that our government can be trusted to do what they say it will by supporting this bipartisan amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. AMODEI). The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have in my district office something called the "casework staff." We do have disasters in Oregon, particularly floods. And we have had instances, apparently like the one that this legislation is trying to address, where we have gotten these improper decisions reversed and my communities reimbursed, handled by my casework staff.

Here, we are going to legislate. Now, apparently, there was a problem in the gentleman's district. Too bad his casework staff didn't take care of it. But the way this is written, here is the language: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, FEMA shall deem any covered disaster assistance to have been properly procured, provided, and utilized, and shall restore any funding of covered disaster assistance previously provided but subsequently withdrawn or deobligated."

It isn't specific to the gentleman's problem. This would be any community, anybody anywhere who might have legitimately misspent some disaster assistance, gets it back. This is so global. We might as well just not have a process to review disaster assistance and see whether it was properly spent, because this says, if you have got it and you spent it, that is all proper. I mean, it is deemed—deemed that every expenditure is legitimate, even if the money was diverted somehow.

So, again, I am not certain who the other side is using for drafting assistance, but I recommend leg counsel.

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Oregon's opinion, but, remember that this is an inspector general's. They have to pass on this. This is not just a mistake. All the T's were crossed. All the I's were dotted. The Babin amendment protects our communities because it requires FEMA to keep its word.

Under current practice, a local community can follow all of the FEMA rules and restore your community after a disaster, but then, years later, FEMA can come back and say: Oops, we know we told you to do it that way and we personally approved and reimbursed you for every bill that you sent to FEMA; oh, but we did it wrong. We know that you did exactly what we told you to do; however, we should have told you something differently. Please pay us \$3 million.

I think that this is not just pertinent to District 36 in the State of Texas that was hit by a hurricane years ago. This is pertinent to every district across this country that will be suffering from a disaster sooner or later.

Anyone who has a FEMA disaster this year or next, will no doubt be here on the floor in the future to offer this very same amendment. Please join me today in passing our amendment, and let's make FEMA keep its word.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 112 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 451.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment whenever the opportunity presents itself because it tests whether there is any program in the Federal budget that Congress can bear to cut.

Essential Air Service is perhaps the least essential program in the entire government. It is a direct subsidy paid to airline companies to fly empty and near empty planes from small airports to regional hubs nearby. There was supposed to be a temporary program to allow local communities and airports

to readjust to airline deregulation in 1978. Instead, it has grown to include 173 communities and a program that has doubled in cost in the last decade.

I want to emphasize, this program has nothing to do with emergency medical evacuations. It solely subsidizes regular scheduled commercial service that is so seldom used that it cannot support itself.

And why can't it support itself? In many cases, the small airports in the program are less than an hour's drive from regional airports. Essential Air Service flights are flown out of Merced Airport near my district in the Sierra Nevada of California; yet, Merced is less than an hour's drive from Fresno Regional Airport, offering regular scheduled commercial air service.

Subsidized service is available from Lancaster, Pennsylvania, just 31 miles from Harrisburg International Airport. Subsidized flights from Pueblo, Colorado, are just a 45-minute drive from Colorado Springs Regional Airport, and I could go on and on.

There are supposed to be subsidy caps of \$200 per passenger and a minimum of 10 passengers per day, and yet, every request to waive these requirements has been granted—every one—for passenger subsidies that can go as high as nearly \$1,000 per passenger. Now, by comparison, you can charter a small plane for around \$150 to \$200 an hour.

□ 0945

Over the next 5 years, this program will cost taxpayers nearly \$1 billion in direct appropriations, which this amendment would cease. The program also gets another \$100 million a year from overflight fees that would otherwise be available to fund high priorities in the aviation system, like 21st century air traffic control technology.

The argument for abolishing this program is simple: if a route cannot generate enough passengers to support its costs, that means that passengers themselves are telling us that it is not worth the money to them.

Perhaps we should listen.

Our country is drowning in debt. It now costs us \$475 billion a year just to pay interest costs on the \$21 trillion that we have already borrowed. Debt and taxes are driven by one thing: spending.

In the last 10 years, inflation and population combined have grown 26 percent. Revenues have more than kept pace, growing 29 percent in the same period; but spending has grown 46 percent, and it has doubled under this program. If we don't get control of spending soon, our Nation could enter a debt spiral that threatens our very future; and the Orwellian-named Essential Air Service is a prime example of non-essential programs that we just can't afford.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman pointed out, Essential Air Service, to ensure that all Americans have access to something that is critical to economic development and, basically, livability for many smaller isolated communities, is paid for out of the trust fund. The trust fund is composed of fees paid by the airlines, by passengers, and by foreign airlines overflying the United States of America.

This doesn't add to the debt, unlike this tax bill we passed. I know that the six largest banks in America saw a \$4 billion windfall in tax cuts in one-quarter. It is projected they will have a \$20 billion windfall by the end of the year.

We are going to borrow \$20 billion to give to profitable banks, including Wells Fargo, that just paid a \$1 billion fine. Now they are getting the money back because we gave them a tax break.

But he is concerned about the debt and the deficit, so we have got to screw the small communities in America and take away their air service. I think there are better ways to deal with our debt and deficit, and this doesn't add to it because it is paid for out of the trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's attempts and work to try to decrease the deficits and the debt in this country, but Essential Air Service is just that. He named a few communities, and they are close to—I guess I can't make a great argument about those, but there are places like Alaska, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, or Iowa. These folks are living miles and miles, hours and hours away—several hours, in many cases—from the nearest airport. As Mr. DEFAZIO pointed out, this connects those communities for economic development.

The other thing, he makes a point, as a conservative, when you pay user fees into a trust fund and it goes to that intended purpose—in this case, a small piece of that goes to Essential Air Service—that is what we should be doing in America: people that use something are contributing to that service or whatever that government agency is providing them.

Again, under the bill, in 2012, we put reforms in to reform Essential Air Service; and, this bill, the underlying bill, directs the GAO to study and find out the effects of those reforms.

So, again, while I support and applaud the gentleman's efforts to help get the debt under control, this is not the place to start.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of this amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN).

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

I am acutely attuned to concerns about fiscal responsibility. While Congress has struggled with fiscal concerns, the consistent attacks on the critical EAS program demonstrate a complete lack of concern for the realities of life across rural America.

Supporters of this amendment claim that, in many cases, an alternative airport is a short drive away. This incorrectly assumes that point-to-point miles on a map are the same as road miles.

The truth is that EAS is a vital economic engine that remains just as important today as when it was created. It supports economic development in small and rural communities by connecting businesses to larger markets.

Page, Arizona, in my district, is just one example of the need for this type of critical infrastructure. The challenges are real, but so is the promise in Page. Taking away vital EAS dollars at a time when Page and places like it all over the country are trying to attract business and capital would be devastating and undermine the critical work being done.

Let's work to support these communities, not exasperate the stark economic disparities in rural America. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this shortsighted amendment.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, three points:

First, these amendments don't cut the fee support, only the \$1 billion in direct taxpayer subsidies that would be paid into this program over the next 5 years. Under the so-called reforms referenced by the chairman, this program has doubled in cost over the past decade, and all Americans do not benefit from this program.

Let's take the remote communities, like those in Alaska. This program subsidizes 61 small communities in a State with 259 airports. That means there are roughly 200 airports and 350 local communities in Alaska, alone, that seem to do just fine without Essential Air Service.

If Alaska or any State believes that air service should be subsidized within their State, they certainly have the ability to do it themselves. So do individual towns. The States choose not to pay for the service; the local communities choose not to pay for the service; and, most importantly, the passengers, themselves, choose not to pay the actual cost of the service. Perhaps as we approach \$1 trillion annual deficit, we should consider choosing not to pay for it either.

We hear that it helps prop up small airports and small airlines that service them. Well, sure, if you hand somebody wads of cash, that person does very well. The problem is that the people you took that cash from do very poorly to exactly the same extent.

A \$275 million program out of a \$4 trillion Federal budget seems like a drop in the bucket, and I agree we are not going to balance a \$1 trillion annual deficit just by cutting programs like this. But if we can't cut a 40-year-old temporary program that has doubled in cost over the last 10 years—this is the kindest and easiest cut of all—then I fear that we will never summon the courage to get our budget back to balance before we bankrupt our country.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

We have been down this road before, and yet, again, we are witnessing attempts to remove rural America's connectivity to the national air transportation system. Those who would look to scrap the Essential Air Service program often fail to acknowledge reforms that have been put in place to modernize and streamline the program. This reauthorization does the same.

Mr. Chairman, for too long, rural America has received the scraps of our suburban and urban counterparts. Last year, the Airport Improvement Program, another program, not the Essential Air Service, issued more than \$264 million in grants to 95 airports in 31 States.

Among them, \$2 million was issued for Sacramento International Airport in Sacramento, California, to purchase five zero-emission electric shuttle buses to take passengers between the airport parking lots and the terminal buildings. Mr. Chairman, these types of projects are nice, but the fact is that \$2 million is about equal to the amount a small rural airport requires for commercial service for 2 years.

Let's get serious here. Striking the Essential Air Service program is bad for rural America. It is time to stop the witch hunt on rural America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 114 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. ____ NATIONAL HIRING STANDARD OF CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An entity hiring a federally licensed motor carrier shall be deemed to have made the selection of the motor carrier in a reasonable and prudent manner if before tendering a shipment, but not more than 45 days before the pickup of the shipment by the hired motor carrier, that entity verified that the motor carrier, at the time of such verification—

(1) is registered with and authorized by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to operate as a motor carrier or household goods motor carrier, if applicable;

(2) has the minimum insurance coverage required by Federal law; and

(3)(A) before the safety fitness determination regulations are issued, does not have an unsatisfactory safety fitness determination issued by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration in force at the time of such verification; or

(B) beginning on the date that revised safety fitness determination regulations are implemented, does not have a safety fitness rating issued by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration under such regulations that would place a motor carrier out-of-service.

(b) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 30 days after the implementation of the safety fitness determination referenced in subsection (a)(3), the Secretary shall issue guidelines that specifically outline how a motor carrier's operating authority and registration number could be revoked and subsequently placing them out-of-service.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment to establish a national standard of care for hiring freight shippers. This is purely and simply about highway safety, and everything carried on planes, of course, goes to and from on our highways.

Currently, there is no law that requires freight brokers or others to have any sort of standard when hiring a carrier for a shipment. Under this amendment, a broker or other entity would be deemed to have acted in a reasonable and prudent manner if they made sure the carrier met these three requirements:

One, authorization to operate by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration;

Two, the minimum insurance coverage required by Federal law; and

Three, that the carrier had no current Federal unsatisfactory safety fitness determination.

This amendment does not prohibit or limit in any way any type of lawsuit, and, in fact, a lawyer could show that a broker or a company had acted in an

unreasonable manner if they did not comply with this hiring standard. This amendment would actually help trial lawyers by giving them stronger grounds to sue brokers who did not comply with this standard and tried to get cheaper rates by using unsafe or uninsured carriers.

This amendment would also make it less likely that a person or a company that hired a safe, legal motor carrier would be held liable for an accident that happened through no fault of their own.

This amendment also will help make it far less likely that unregistered, uninsured, unsafe freight carriers get any business in this country in the future.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, there is a problem here, and the problem actually is the Department of Transportation. They launched a new carrier monitoring system known as CSA to make data available, but they have yet to establish a test and apply that data.

So even though the data is available, the Republicans have adopted amendments—other Republicans who are here today—that prohibit DOT from finalizing a safety fitness determination rule. So there is data out there, but there is no bright line test.

The best relief that we could provide would be to force DOT, in the very near future, to issue a safety fitness ruling as soon as possible and also raise the minimum insurance requirement—\$750,000, it has been that since 1980. It doesn't cover much in a truck accident.

We want to have people be able to get legal recourse and compensation, but we also don't want to give the brokers an impossible task, which is what they have now: How do they choose someone who meets the safety fitness requirements that the administration has yet to promulgate and Congress is preventing them from promulgating?

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, on June 1, 2011, Sal and Helen Sparich were sitting in traffic in Tamaqua in northeastern Pennsylvania when, suddenly, without warning, a loaded tractor-trailer rammed into them from behind, cutting their car in half, killing Helen instantly and debilitating and giving horrible, severe, grievous injuries to Sal Sparich. He ended up spending the next 15 months in the hospital, and then he died. He left \$1 million in medical bills, which Medicare had to pay for.

What we know about this accident is that the driver of the tractor-trailer

had a horrible driving record. The company, the fly-by-night independent contractor trucking company that he worked for, had an insanely bad safety record, and it was one that anybody could have discovered by going on the safety website because there were flashing yellow icons next to the name of that company.

□ 1000

But the broker and the shipper in this case didn't care, Mr. Chair. They didn't check. They can't care about the safety record, about the driving record. The only thing they checked was who had the lowest price. The only thing they cared about was who had the lowest price.

Mr. Chair, we Americans care about personal responsibility and accountability. It is something we teach our children.

This is an amendment that would take away accountability and responsibility for the brokers and shippers.

This is a longstanding, time-honored part of American law that brokers and shippers are responsible and accountable for picking safe companies and safe drivers.

This amendment would take that away, it would make American roadways much more dangerous because of this exact type of situation.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment. I urge a "no" vote on it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, Americans really shouldn't care that much about this Duncan amendment if they don't go on the highway; but if you go on the highway, like hundreds of millions of Americans do, you better watch out, because this amendment makes it far more likely that there will be reckless and negligent truckers on the road and that you won't be able to sue for your damages if they smash up your car.

Take the shocking case of a 19-year-old man whose car was totaled by a truck driver who was high on crystal meth. He was left injured and blinded for the rest of his life.

Now, the truck company never drug tested or road tested its employees, but that didn't stop the shipper from hiring that trucking company to do business with.

Now, the Duncan amendment would reward the shipper by immunizing it from any liability for hiring a low-road trucker that doesn't drug test its employees, or even knowingly hires employees who are high on crystal meth or who have a drug problem.

This would give the shippers even greater incentive to hire reckless and negligent truckers, making our roads and highways all the more dangerous.

In "Born to Run", Bruce Springsteen talks about cars that are suicide machines and a deathtrap.

Mr. Chair, this amendment would make that vision of our highways the law.

There is no way that the American people support excusing shippers from liability for their decision to hire low-road truckers, low-road trucking companies that do not drug test or do background screening on their employees.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment. It does remove the confusion with the industry stakeholders, but the hysteria that the other side is proclaiming, that roadways are going to become a slaughterhouse because if this goes away or it is clarified, truckers are just going to be out there running into people left or right, I mean, it is ridiculous.

It is not a good business model for any company to want to have an incentive, which the other side has, I think, said, to hire unsafe drivers. That is not a good business model. In fact, you will go out of business, most likely, if you go out there and hire drivers who are bad drivers, dangerous drivers. The facts don't bear that out.

Of the auto accidents that include trucks in it, over 75 percent of them are not the trucker's fault, it is the person in the car's fault.

Truckers are professionals, and to have impugned this whole class of people, this whole group of people that go out on these roadways and work hard every day and try to do it as safely as they can, is just plain wrong.

Again, as I said, truckers are professionals. Seventy-five percent of those accidents that truckers are involved in, it is not their fault.

We continue to hype up and to put these things out there for, again, another class of worker out there, and that is the trial lawyers. They make millions and millions of dollars going out there and suing these people that, again, do their best every day to try to be safe on the roadways.

So, again, this is a sensible amendment, this clarifies it, and it helps to make our roadways safer, not more dangerous.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption, and I thank the gentleman again for yielding.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I will simply say this: neither of the cases cited by the opposition would be stopped under this amendment. In fact, this amendment would make it more likely that freight brokers would be required to hire safe, insured carriers for their shipments, so it would make the highways safer.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for my amendment. It is an amendment about fairness and justice, because all lawyers—I was a plaintiff's lawyer before I came to Congress, and I have supported

the trial lawyers in every way possible in my 30 years here, but I can tell you, no lawyers want people sued who have done nothing whatsoever wrong in a case.

Mr. Chair, I urge passage of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BACON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 115 will not be offered.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) having assumed the chair, Mr. BACON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4) to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1040

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RATCLIFFE) at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 839 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1041

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 114 printed part A of House Report 115-650, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 115-650 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 112 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California;

Amendment No. 114 by Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 113, noes 293, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

AYES—113

Abraham	Gohmert	Poe (TX)
Allen	Goodlatte	Polis
Amash	Graves (GA)	Posey
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Ratcliffe
Babin	Griffith	Renacci
Banks (IN)	Handel	Rice (SC)
Biggs	Harris	Roe (TN)
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Rohrabacher
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Rokita
Brat	Hice, Jody B.	Rooney, Francis
Brooks (AL)	Himes	Roskam
Buchanan	Holding	Ross
Buck	Hollingsworth	Royce (CA)
Budd	Hudson	Russell
Burgess	Huizenga	Sanford
Byrne	Hultgren	Scalise
Calvert	Hunter	Schweikert
Carter (GA)	Issa	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Conaway	Latta	Stewart
Cooper	Lewis (MN)	Trott
Crawford	Loudermilk	Upton
Culberson	Massie	Wagner
Davidson	McClintock	Walberg
DeSantis	McHenry	Walker
DesJarlais	McMorris	Walorski
Duncan (SC)	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Duncan (TN)	McSally	Weber (TX)
Dunn	Messer	Webster (FL)
Emmer	Norman	Wenstrup
Ferguson	Olson	Williams
Flores	Palmer	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Paulsen	Witman
Gaetz	Perry	Woodall
Gallagher	Peters	Yoho
Garrett	Pittenger	Zeldin

Adams	Garamendi	Mooney (WV)
Aderholt	Gianforte	Moore
Aguilar	Gibbs	Moulton
Amodei	Gomez	Mullin
Bacon	Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Barletta	Gosar	Nadler
Barr	Gottheimer	Napolitano
Barragan	Granger	Neal
Barton	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Bass	Green, Al	Nolan
Beatty	Green, Gene	Norcross
Bera	Grijalva	Nunes
Bergman	Grothman	O'Halleran
Beyer	Guthrie	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Palazzo
Bishop (UT)	Hanabusa	Pallone
Blum	Hartzler	Panetta
Blumenauer	Hastings	Pascarell
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Payne
Bonamici	Higgins (LA)	Pearce
Bost	Higgins (NY)	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Hill	Perlmutter
Brady (TX)	Hoyer	Peterson
Brooks (IN)	Huffman	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Hurd	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee	Poliquin
Bucshon	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Bustos	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Jenkins (KS)	Raskin
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Reed
Cárdenas	Johnson (LA)	Reichert
Carson (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rice (NY)
Carter (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Cartwright	Joyce (OH)	Roby
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rogers (AL)
Castro (TX)	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Cheney	Keating	Rooney, Thomas J.
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Ciçilline	Kelly (MS)	Rosen
Clark (MA)	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Rouzer
Clay	Khanna	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Kihuen	Ruiz
Clyburn	Kildee	Rush
Coffman	Kilmer	Rutherford
Cohen	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Cole	King (IA)	Sarbanes
Comer	King (NY)	Schakowsky
Comstock	Kinzinger	Schiff
Connolly	Knight	Schneider
Cook	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Correa	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Costa	LaMalfa	Scott, David
Costello (PA)	Lamb	Serrano
Courtney	Lance	Shea-Porter
Cramer	Langevin	Sherman
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Shimkus
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Shuster
Cuellar	Lawrence	Simpson
Cummings	Lawson (FL)	Sinema
Curbelo (FL)	Lee	Smith (NE)
Curtis	Levin	Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Smucker
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Soto
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Speier
DeGette	Long	Stefanik
Delaney	Love	Stivers
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Suozi
DelBene	Lowe y	Swalwell (CA)
Demings	Lucas	Takano
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham, M.	Tenney
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Diaz-Balart	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
Doggett	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Thornberry
Donovan	Maloney, Sean	Tipton
Doyle, Michael F.	Marchant	Titus
Duffy	Marino	Tonko
Ellison	Marshall	Torres
Engel	Mast	Tsongas
Eshoo	Matsui	Turner
Españillat	McCarthy	Valadao
Estes (KS)	McCauley	Vargas
Esty (CT)	McCollum	Veasey
Evans	McEachin	Vela
Faso	McGovern	Velázquez
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Visclosky
Fleischmann	McNerney	Walden
Fortenberry	Meadows	Wasserman
Foster	Meehan	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Frelinghuysen	Meng	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Mitchell	
Gabbard	Moolenaar	
Gallego		

Welch Womack Yoder
 Westerman Yarmuth Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—22

Black Jenkins (WV) Ruppertsberger
 Blackburn Jones Sánchez
 Boyle, Brendan Kuster (NH) Sewell (AL)
 F. Kustoff (TN) Sires
 Butterfield Labrador Walz
 Denham Lewis (GA) Wilson (FL)
 Gowdy Lofgren Young (AK)
 Harper Noem

□ 1106

Messrs. CAPUANO, MARINO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. COOK, Mmes. TORRES and LOVE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CHABOT, ISSA, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. HIMES, SMITH of Missouri, PETERS, WALBERG, ABRAHAM, GALLAGHER, CARTER of Georgia, and ARRINGTON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 191, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

AYES—212

Abraham Collins (NY) Gibbs
 Aderholt Comer Gohmert
 Allen Comstock Goodlatte
 Amodei Conaway Gosar
 Arrington Cook Granger
 Babin Costello (PA) Graves (GA)
 Bacon Cramer Graves (LA)
 Banks (IN) Crawford Graves (MO)
 Barletta Cuellar Grothman
 Barr Culberson Guthrie
 Barton Curbelo (FL) Handel
 Bergman Curtis Harris
 Biggs Davidson Hartzler
 Bilirakis Davis, Rodney Hensarling
 Bishop (MI) Dent Herrera Beutler
 Bishop (UT) DeSantis Hice, Jody B.
 Blum DesJarlais Hill
 Bost Diaz-Balart Holding
 Brady (TX) Duffy Hollingsworth
 Brat Duncan (SC) Hudson
 Brooks (AL) Duncan (TN) Huizenga
 Brooks (IN) Dunn Hultgren
 Buchanan Emmer Hunter
 Buck Estes (KS) Hurd
 Buehson Faso Issa
 Budd Ferguson Jenkins (KS)
 Burgess Fleischmann Johnson (LA)
 Byrne Flores Johnson (OH)
 Calvert Fortenberry Johnson, Sam
 Carter (GA) Foxx Jordan
 Carter (TX) Frelinghuysen Katko
 Chabot Gaetz Kelly (MS)
 Cheney Gallagher Kelly (PA)
 Coffman Garamendi King (IA)
 Cole Garrett Kinzinger
 Collins (GA) Gianforte Knight

LaHood Paulsen Smith (NE)
 LaMalfa Pearce Smith (TX)
 Lamborn Perry Smucker
 Lance Pittenger Stefaik
 Latta Poe (TX) Stewart
 LoBiondo Poliquin Stivers
 Long Posey Taylor
 Loudermilk Reed Tenney
 Love Reichert Thompson (PA)
 Lucas Roby Thornberry
 Luetkemeyer Roe (TN) Tipton
 Marino Rogers (AL) Trott
 Marshall Rogers (KY) Turner
 Mast Rohrabacher Upton
 McCarthy Rokita Valadao
 McCaul Rooney, Francis Wagner
 McClintock Rooney, Thomas Walberg
 McHenry J. Walden
 McKinley Ros-Lehtinen Walker
 McMorris Roskam Walorski
 Rodgers Ross Walters, Mimi
 McSally Rothfus Weber (TX)
 Meadows Rouzer Webster (FL)
 Meehan Royce (CA) Wenstrup
 Messer Rutherford Westerman
 Mitchell Sanford Williams
 Moolenaar Scalise Wittman
 Mooney (WV) Schweikert Womack
 Mullin Scott, Austin Sensesbrenner
 Newhouse Sessions Woodall
 Norman Shimpus Yoder
 Nunes Shimkus Yoho
 Olson Shuster Young (IA)
 Palazzo Simpson Zeldin
 Palmer Smith (MO)

NOES—191

Adams Frankel (FL) McGovern
 Aguilar Fudge McNERNEY
 Amash Gabbard Meeks
 Barragán Gallego Meng
 Bass Gomez Moore
 Beatty Gonzalez (TX) Moulton
 Bera Gottheimer Murphy (FL)
 Beyer Green, Al Nadler
 Bishop (GA) Green, Gene Napolitano
 Blumenauer Griffith Neal
 Blunt Rochester Grijalva Nolan
 Bonamici Gutiérrez Norcross
 Brady (PA) Hanabusa O'Halleran
 Brown (MD) Hastings O'Rourke
 Brownley (CA) Heck Pallone
 Bustos Higgins (LA) Panetta
 Capuano Higgins (NY) Pascrell
 Carballo Himes Payne
 Cárdenas Hoyer Pelosi
 Carson (IN) Jackson Lee Perlmutter
 Cartwright Jayapal Peters
 Castor (FL) Jeffries Peterson
 Castro (TX) Johnson (GA) Pingree
 Chu, Judy Johnson, E. B. Pocan
 Cicilline Joyce (OH) Polis
 Clark (MA) Kaptur Price (NC)
 Clarke (NY) Keating Quigley
 Clay Kelly (IL) Raskin
 Clyburn Kennedy Renacci
 Cook Khanna Rice (NY)
 Connolly Kihuen Rice (SC)
 Cooper Kildee Richmond
 Correa Kilmer Rosen
 Costa Kind Roybal-Allard
 Courtney King (NY) Ruiz
 Crist Krishnamoorthi Rush
 Crowley Lamb Russell
 Cummings Langevin Ryan (OH)
 Davis (CA) Larsen (WA) Sarbanes
 Davis, Danny Larson (CT) Schakowsky
 DeFazio Lawrence Schiff
 DeGette Lawson (FL) Schneider
 Delaney Lee Schrader
 DeLauro Levin Scott (VA)
 DelBene Lieu, Ted Scott, David
 Demings Lipinski Serrano
 DeSaulnier Loeb sack Shea-Porter
 Deutch Lowenthal Sherman
 Dingell Lowey Sinema
 Doggett Lujan Grisham, M.
 Donovan Luján, Ben Ray Smith (NJ)
 Doyle, Michael M. Smith (WA)
 F. Lynch Soto
 Ellison MacArthur Speier
 Engel Maloney, Carolyn B. Suozzi
 Eshoo Maloney, Sean Swalwell (CA)
 Españalatt Massie Takano
 Esty (CT) Matsui Thompson (CA)
 Evans Matsui Thompson (MS)
 Fitzpatrick McCollum Titus
 Foster McEachin Tonko
 Torres

Tsongas Velázquez Waters, Maxine
 Vargas Visclosky Watson Coleman
 Veasey Wasserman Welch
 Vela Schultz Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Black Huffman Noem
 Blackburn Jenkins (WV) Ruppertsberger
 Boyle, Brendan Jones Sánchez
 F. Kuster (NH) Sewell (AL)
 Butterfield Kustoff (TN) Sires
 Cleaver Labrador Walz
 Denham Lewis (GA) Wilson (FL)
 Gowdy Lofgren Young (AK)
 Harper Marchant

□ 1112

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUTHRIE) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4) to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 839, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I am opposed, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Velázquez moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title VI of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . FEDERAL COST SHARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any agreement, the Federal share of assistance, including direct Federal assistance, provided for the States of Texas (DR-4332), California (DR-4344), Louisiana (DR-4345), South Carolina (DR-4346), Georgia (DR-4338), and Florida (DR-4337), the Seminole Tribe of Florida (DR-4341), the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (DR-4336, DR-4339) and the territory of the

U.S. Virgin Islands (DR-4335, DR-4340) in connection with Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, the California Wildfires, and Tropical Storm Harvey under sections 403, 406, 407, and 408 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b, 5172, 5173, and 5174) shall be 100 percent of the eligible costs under such sections.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—The Federal share provided by subsection (a) shall apply to disaster assistance applied for before or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. 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.

Mr. Speaker, 2017 was a year of historic disasters. We saw category 5 hurricanes, devastating floods, and wildfires that covered hundreds of miles. For the towns and communities in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Louisiana, California, Texas, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, they continue to struggle with what once would have been considered a once-in-a-lifetime disaster.

My motion will help these communities right now. It will do so by waiving the local matching requirements for FEMA assistance for those affected by Irma, Harvey, Maria, and the wildfires out west. This is critical because many States like Florida and Georgia did not have dedicated disaster funds set aside to pay for such requirements. The result is that these disasters will require States to dip into their operating budgets, meaning less money for roads, business investment, healthcare, and schools.

In addition, many communities hit by these disasters are struggling financially as businesses close, homes are rebuilt, and many individuals leave for good. This reshuffling of economic fortunes creates massive financial stress. It is in our power to help these towns and cities, whether they are in Georgia, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or Puerto Rico.

Take Port Aransas, just outside Corpus Christi. It used to have 4,000 residents but now only has 3,000, a decline of 25 percent. Its hotels should be packed with college students on spring break, but 33 percent are vacant. Why? Because they are still rebuilding, struggling to be ready for what should be the most financially important part of this season.

These areas and places like Galveston, Texas; Lake Charles, Louisiana; or Isle of Palms in South Carolina must come up with millions of dol-

lars if they want to access FEMA assistance. And out west, entire communities are still reeling from wildfires: towns like Lake Perris, Kettleman City, Oroquieta, and Corona.

People's lives, Mr. Speaker, have been turned upside down, and communities, cities, and States are under massive budget pressure to rebuild. The least we can do is provide relief from these massive, unforeseen costs.

This motion to recommit will boost assistance for areas still struggling to rebuild. It will take stress off municipal and State budgets, recognizing that massive disasters like these cannot simply be absorbed by small fishing towns and rural areas.

If you vote "no," you are voting against these small communities; you are voting against the people who live in Texas, Florida, California, Georgia, South Carolina, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. I urge you to stand with them and vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and strongly support the motion to recommit.

This is a historic bill, the FAA bill. I want to thank my staff: Kathy Dedrick; Alex Burkett; Rachel Carr; Michael Tien; Luke Strimer; Janet Erickson; David Napoliello; Helena Zyblikewycz; Auke Mahar-Piersma; Ward McCarragher, who has moved on; Alexa Old Crow; and Jamie Harrell.

I want to congratulate the outgoing chair, FRANK LOBIONDO. It is his last major bill in Congress, and FRANK was great to work with. I hope he has a great life after Congress.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, first, to the gentlewoman's motion: First of all, everybody should know that the President already has the authority to waive the cost-share, so this is unnecessary for us to pass it.

I want to thank all the committee staff, all the staff, for their hard work on this bipartisan bill: full committee staff, my personal staff, aviation staff, economic development staff, and, of course, the legislative counsels.

There is one particular former staffer I want to thank, Matt Sturges, who was with the committee for 5½ years, the staff director, just went down to be the Deputy Administrator at FRA. He worked tirelessly for the past couple of years on this FAA bill.

Again, I thank the following staff.

Our full committee staff, including Chris Vieson, Geoff Gosselin, Fred Miller, Clare Doherty, Kathy Loden, Collin McCune, Hannah Matesic, Brittany Smith, Tracy Mosebey, Justin Harclerode, Jeff Urbanchuk, Andrew Wargofchik, Eric Burgeson.

Our Aviation Subcommittee staff: Holly Woodruff Lyons, Naveen Rao, Hunter Presti, Max Rosen, Cameron Humphrey.

Our Economic Development Subcommittee staff: Johanna Hardy, Pam Williams, Hannah Noyes.

Our Legislative Counsels: Tom Dillon, Rosemary Gallagher, Karen Anderson, Stephen Hagenbuch.

Finally, I want to thank a few staff who have recently moved on, but were instrumental in this process: Matt Sturges, Simone Perez, Keith Hall, and Curt Haensel with Legislative Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, I would like to finish by thanking the minority staff and the minority leader on the other side, again, working very closely with the minority staff to produce this bill. And finishing up with thanking the minority staff, I just want to say this is a good bipartisan bill that was introduced with seven Democratic cosponsors, including the ranking member and subcommittee ranking members as well as our subcommittee chairmen.

Over the last 2 days, we worked in a very bipartisan manner. We had 116 amendments to this bill: 50 Democratic amendments and over 22 bipartisan amendments. The process has been nothing short of fair and equitable to both sides, I believe. This is a good bill that needs to get through the House so that we can achieve the first long-term reauthorization of FAA in years.

We have had five short-term extensions since the last long-term bill in 2012, creating uncertainty for the FAA, air traffic controllers, our airports, and, most importantly, the American people. It is time we move forward on this.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to also say that FRANK LOBIONDO has been a very, very able subcommittee chair on Aviation. I thank the gentleman for all his service to the Nation and to the committee, as well as this will be my last Aviation bill.

Just in case anybody wants to give FRANK a great send-off, I would encourage having a big bipartisan vote on this bill, because, again, Mr. LOBIONDO and I both worked very, very hard to make sure this bill was crafted in a bipartisan fashion. So, again, we need to get this bill to the Senate and get the bipartisan bill to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill, 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 yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX,

this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the bill, if ordered;
Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 223, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

AYES—182

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

NOES—223

Abraham	Bost	Collins (GA)
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)
Allen	Brat	Comer
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Amodi	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Arrington	Buchanan	Cook
Babin	Buck	Costello (PA)
Bacon	Bucshon	Cramer
Banks (IN)	Budd	Crawford
Barletta	Burgess	Culberson
Barr	Byrne	Curbelo (FL)
Barton	Calvert	Curtis
Bergman	Carter (GA)	Davidson
Biggs	Carter (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Bilirakis	Chabot	Dent
Bishop (MI)	Cheney	DeSantis
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	DesJarlais
Blum	Cole	Diaz-Balart

Donovan	Kinzinger	Rokita
Duffy	Knight	Rooney, Francis
Duncan (SC)	LaHood	Rooney, Thomas
Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	J.
Dunn	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Emmer	Lance	Roskam
Estes (KS)	Latta	Ross
Faso	Lewis (MN)	Rothfus
Ferguson	LoBiondo	Rouzer
Fitzpatrick	Long	Royce (CA)
Fleischmann	Long	Russell
Flores	Loudermilk	Love
Fortenberry	Love	Rutherford
Fox	Lucas	Sanford
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Frelinghuysen	MacArthur	Schweikert
Gaetz	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Gallagher	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Garrett	Marshall	Sessions
Gianforte	Massie	Shimkus
Gibbs	Mast	Shuster
Gohmert	McCarthy	Simpson
Goodlatte	McCaul	Smith (MO)
Gosar	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Granger	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Graves (LA)	McMorris	Smucker
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Stefanik
Griffith	McSally	Stewart
Grothman	Meadows	Stivers
Guthrie	Meehan	Taylor
Handel	Messer	Tenney
Harris	Mitchell	Thompson (PA)
Hartzler	Mooleenaar	Thornberry
Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Tipton
Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Trott
Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse	Turner
Higgins (LA)	Norman	Upton
Hill	Nunes	Valadao
Holding	Olson	Wagner
Hollingsworth	Palmer	Walberg
Hudson	Paulsen	Walden
Huelskamp	Pearce	Walker
Hunter	Perry	Walorski
Hurd	Pittenger	Walters, Mimi
Issa	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)
Jenkins (KS)	Poliquin	Webster (FL)
Johnson (LA)	Posey	Wenstrup
Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Westerman
Johnson, Sam	Reed	Williams
Jordan	Reichert	Wilson (SC)
Joyce (OH)	Renacci	Wittman
Katko	Rice (SC)	Womack
Kelly (MS)	Roe (TN)	Woodall
Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Yoder
King (IA)	Rogers (KY)	Yoho
King (NY)	Rohrabacher	Young (IA)
		Zeldin

NOT VOTING—23

Black	Jones	Ruppersberger
Blackburn	Kuster (NH)	Sánchez
Butterfield	Kustoff (TN)	Sewell (AL)
Denham	Labrador	Sires
Gowdy	Lewis (GA)	Walz
Harper	Lofgren	Wilson (FL)
Huffman	Noem	Young (AK)
Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo	

□ 1130

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. SHUSTER. 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 393, nays 13, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—393

Abraham	Amodi	Barletta
Adams	Arrington	Barr
Aderholt	Babin	Barragán
Aguilar	Bacon	Barton
Allen	Banks (IN)	Bass

Beatty	Españillat	Lawson (FL)
Bera	Estes (KS)	Lee
Bergman	Esty (CT)	Levin
Beyer	Evans	Lewis (MN)
Biggs	Faso	Lieu, Ted
Bilirakis	Ferguson	Lipinski
Bishop (GA)	Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo
Bishop (MI)	Fleischmann	Loeb sack
Bishop (UT)	Flores	Long
Blum	Fortenberry	Loudermilk
Blumenauer	Foster	Love
Blunt Rochester	Fox	Lowe y
Bonamici	Frankel (FL)	Lucas
Bost	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Boyle, Brendan	Fudge	Lujan Grisham,
F.	Gabbard	M.
Brady (PA)	Gaetz	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brady (TX)	Gallagher	Lynch
Brat	Gallego	MacArthur
Brooks (AL)	Garamendi	Maloney,
Brooks (IN)	Garrett	Carolyn B.
Brown (MD)	Gianforte	Maloney, Sean
Brownley (CA)	Gibbs	Marchant
Buchanan	Gomez	Marino
Bucshon	Gonzalez (TX)	Marshall
Budd	Goodlatte	Massie
Burgess	Gosar	Mast
Bustos	Gottheimer	Matsui
Byrne	Granger	McCarthy
Calvert	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Capuano	Graves (LA)	McCormac
Carbajal	Graves (MO)	McEachin
Cárdenas	Green, Al	McGovern
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	McHenry
Carter (GA)	Griffith	McKinley
Carter (TX)	Grijalva	McMorris
Cartwright	Grothman	Rodgers
Castor (FL)	Guthrie	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Gutiérrez	McSally
Chabot	Hanabusa	Meadows
Cheney	Handel	Meehan
Chu, Judy	Harris	Meeks
Ciulline	Hartzler	Meng
Clark (MA)	Hastings	Messer
Clarke (NY)	Heck	Mitchell
Clay	Hensarling	Mooleenaar
Cleaver	Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)
Clyburn	Hice, Jody B.	Moore
Cohen	Higgins (LA)	Moulton
Connolly	Higgins (NY)	Mullin
Cooper	Hill	Murphy (FL)
Correa	Himes	Nadler
Costa	Holding	Napolitano
Courtney	Hollingsworth	Neal
Crist	Hoyer	Newhouse
Crowley	Hudson	Nolan
Cuellar	Huizenga	Norcross
Cummings	Hultgren	Nunes
Davis (CA)	Hunter	O'Halleran
Davis, Danny	Hurd	O'Rourke
DeFazio	Issa	Olson
DeGette	Jackson Lee	Palazzo
Delaney	Jayapal	Pallone
DeLauro	Jeffries	Palmer
DelBene	Jenkins (KS)	Pascarell
Demings	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen
DeSaulnier	Johnson (LA)	Payne
Deutch	Johnson (OH)	Pearce
Dingell	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Doggett	Johnson, Sam	Perlmutter
Doyle, Michael	Jordan	Perry
F.	Joyce (OH)	Peters
Ellison	Kaptur	Peterson
Engel	Katko	Pingree
Eshoo	Keating	Pittenger
Españillat	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Esty (CT)	Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)
Evans	Kelly (PA)	Poliquin
Foster	Kennedy	Polis
Frankel (FL)	Khanna	Posey
	Kihuen	Price (NC)
	Kildee	Quigley
	Kilmer	Raskin
	Kind	Ratcliffe
	King (IA)	Reed
	King (NY)	Reichert
	Kinzinger	Renacci
	Knight	Rice (NY)
	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (SC)
	LaHood	Richmond
	LaMalfa	Roby
	Lamb	Roe (TN)
	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
	Lance	Rogers (KY)
	Langevin	Rokita
	Larsen (WA)	Rooney, Francis
	Larson (CT)	Rooney, Thomas
	Latta	J.
	Lawrence	Ros-Lehtinen

Rosen	Sinema	Vela
Roskam	Smith (MO)	Velázquez
Ross	Smith (NE)	Visclosky
Rothfus	Smith (NJ)	Wagner
Rouzer	Smith (TX)	Walberg
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Walden
Royce (CA)	Smucker	Walker
Ruiz	Soto	Walorski
Rush	Stefanik	Walters, Mimi
Russell	Stewart	Wasserman
Rutherford	Stivers	Schultz
Ryan (OH)	Suozzi	Waters, Maxine
Sanford	Takano	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Taylor	Weber (TX)
Scalise	Tenney	Webster (FL)
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Welch
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Wenstrup
Schneider	Thompson (PA)	Westerman
Schrader	Thornberry	Williams
Schweikert	Tipton	Wilson (SC)
Scott (VA)	Titus	Wittman
Scott, Austin	Tonko	Womack
Scott, David	Torres	Woodall
Serrano	Trott	Yarmuth
Sessions	Tsongas	Yoder
Shea-Porter	Turner	Yoho
Sherman	Upton	Young (IA)
Shimkus	Valadao	Zeldin
Shuster	Vargas	
Simpson	Veasey	

NAYS—13

Amash	Lowenthal	Sensenbrenner
Buck	McClintock	Speier
Ellison	Norman	Swalwell (CA)
Eshoo	Panetta	
Gohmert	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—22

Black	Jones	Sánchez
Blackburn	Kuster (NH)	Sewell (AL)
Butterfield	Kustoff (TN)	Sires
Denham	Labrador	Walz
Gowdy	Lewis (GA)	Wilson (FL)
Harper	Lofgren	Young (AK)
Huffman	Noem	
Jenkins (WV)	Ruppersberger	

□ 1138

Mr. SWALWELL of California 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. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at an event off the Capitol Hill campus, I was unable to make rollcall votes Nos. 162–166. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: No. 162 “no” H.R. 4 On Agreeing to the Amendment, No. 163 “no” H.R. 4 On Agreeing to the Amendment, No. 164 “yes” H.R. 4 Motion to Recommit and No. 165 “yes” H.R. 4 Final Passage of H.R. 4.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, Father Patrick Conroy has served honorably as House Chaplain since May 25 of 2011 when he was then appointed by Speaker John Boehner in consultation with Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi;

Whereas, Father Conroy had been reappointed and approved by the House of Representatives on three separate occasions, most recently January 3 of 2017;

Whereas, on April 16, 2018, the Nation’s first Jesuit, and only the second Catholic, Chaplain of the United States House of Representatives submitted his resignation before the full House;

Whereas, this resignation was forced by Paul D. Ryan, Speaker of the House of Representatives and Members of the House Republican Conference;

Whereas, the Speaker’s team said “. . . the decision to remove the Chaplain was his, Speaker Ryan’s;”

Whereas, the lack of notification of his forced resignation or adequate explanation provided by Speaker Paul D. Ryan is not reflective of the integrity of the House of Representatives;

Whereas, on November 6, 2017, during debate on the GOP tax scam, the Chaplain led an opening prayer asking God to bless Congress and for Congress to guarantee that there are not winners and losers under the new tax laws, but benefits balanced and shared by all Americans;

Whereas, this prayer reflects the core values of many Americans, in particular people of the Catholic faith, including care and concern for the poor and the marginalized;

Whereas, on April 9, 2018, Pope Francis published his third apostolic exhortation entitled “Gaudete et Exsultate” or rejoice and be heard which states that Christians must care for the poor, the sick, and the immigrant;

Whereas, under the GOP tax bill, more than 80 percent of its benefits flow to the richest 1 percent and the corporate special interests, ignoring the needs for struggling men and women and children;

Whereas, this prayer has been reported to be the chief reason for Father Conroy’s forced resignation by the Republican Congress;

Whereas, the dismissal of Father Conroy following this prayer shows Republicans’ true refusal to embody the values of faith and charity in their legislative work;

Whereas, Father Conroy’s forced resignation is concerning to a number of Members of both sides of the aisle;

Whereas, the House of Representatives would benefit from being guided by a Chaplain with a commitment to caring about those most in need;

Whereas, the rights of Members of the House of Representatives were undermined when the leader of one party made a unilateral decision to dismiss the Chaplain;

Whereas, this forced resignation has compromised the dignity of the House of Representatives by politicizing the Office of the House Chaplain;

Whereas, the circumstances behind his resignation compromised the integrity and dignity of the House of Representatives;

Resolved, that there is hereby established a select committee to investigate the actions and motivations behind the resignation of the House Chaplain. The select committee shall be comprised of six Members, of which

three shall be appointed by the chair of the Committee on Ethics and three by the ranking member of the Committee on Ethics;

The select committee shall investigate the motivations and actions of the Speaker behind the resignation of the Chaplain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now recognize the gentleman from New York to offer the resolution just noticed. Does the gentleman offer the resolution?

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution just noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 856

Whereas, Father Patrick Conroy has served honorably as House Chaplain since May 25 of 2011 when he was then appointed by Speaker John Boehner in consultation with Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi;

Whereas, Father Conroy had been reappointed and approved by the House of Representatives on three separate occasions, most recently January 3 of 2017;

Whereas, on April 16, 2018, the Nation’s first Jesuit, and only the second Catholic, Chaplain of the United States House of Representatives submitted his resignation before the full House;

Whereas, this resignation was forced by Paul D. Ryan, Speaker of the House of Representatives and Members of the House Republican Conference;

Whereas, the Speaker’s team said “. . . the decision (to remove the Chaplain) was his (Speaker Ryan’s);”

Whereas, the lack of notification of his forced resignation or adequate explanation provided by Speaker Paul D. Ryan is not reflective of the integrity of the House of Representatives;

Whereas, on November 6, 2017, during debate on the GOP tax scam, the Chaplain led an opening prayer asking God to bless Congress and for Congress to guarantee that there are not winners and losers under the new tax laws, but benefits balanced and shared by all Americans;

Whereas, this prayer reflects the core values of many Americans, in particular people of the Catholic faith, including care and concern for the poor and the marginalized;

Whereas, on April 9, 2018, Pope Francis published his third apostolic exhortation entitled “Gaudete et Exsultate” or rejoice and be heard which states that Christians must care for the poor, the sick, and the immigrant;

Whereas, under the GOP tax bill, more than 80 percent of its benefits flow to the richest 1 percent and the corporate special interests, ignoring the needs for struggling men and women and children;

Whereas, this prayer has been reported to be the chief reason for Father Conroy’s forced resignation by the Republican Congress;

Whereas, the dismissal of Father Conroy following this prayer shows Republicans’ true refusal to embody the values of faith and charity in their legislative work;

Whereas, Father Conroy’s forced resignation is concerning to a number of Members of both sides of the aisle;

Whereas, the House of Representatives would benefit from being guided by a Chaplain with a commitment to caring about those most in need;

Whereas, the rights of Members of the House of Representatives were undermined

when the leader of one party made a unilateral decision to dismiss the Chaplain;

Whereas, this forced resignation has compromised the dignity of the House of Representatives by politicizing the Office of the House Chaplain;

Whereas, the circumstances behind his resignation compromised the integrity and dignity of the House of Representatives:

Resolved, that there is hereby established a select committee to investigate the actions and motivations behind the resignation of the House Chaplain. The select committee shall be comprised of six Members, of which three shall be appointed by the chair of the Committee on Ethics and three by the ranking member of the Committee on Ethics;

The select committee shall investigate the motivations and actions of the Speaker behind the resignation of the Chaplain.

□ 1145

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of privilege.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, does, in fact, the Speaker of the House have the right to remove the Chaplain?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's inquiry does not relate to the pending proceedings. The matter that is before the House at the present time is a question of privilege.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, is it correct that the Chaplain is elected by the whole House to be the Chaplain of the House of Representatives?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not going to respond to the matter as expressed by the gentleman.

As stated, the issue before the House presently is the question of privilege just offered.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

Are we in the position where the House will be unable to speak to the issue of removing the official, i.e. the Chaplain, elected by the whole House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is no longer recognized. The gentleman has not stated an inquiry that relates in a practical sense to a matter before the House.

MOTION TO TABLE

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCarthy moves that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table

will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 171, answered "present" 3, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—215

Abraham	Gohmert	Nunes
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Olson
Allen	Gosar	Palazzo
Amash	Granger	Palmer
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Arrington	Gosar	Pearce
Babin	Graves (MO)	Perry
Bacon	Griffith	Pittenger
Banks (IN)	Grothman	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Guthrie	Poliquin
Barr	Handel	Posey
Barton	Harris	Ratcliffe
Bergman	Hartzer	Renacci
Biggs	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Roe (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Holding	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Rokita
Brat	Hudson	Rooney, Francis
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Roskam
Buck	Hunter	Ross
Bucshon	Hurd	Rothfus
Budd	Issa	Rouzer
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Russell
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Scalise
Chabot	Katko	Schweikert
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	King (IA)	Sessions
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Simpson
Comer	Knight	Smith (MO)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	Lance	Smucker
Cramer	Latta	Stefanik
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Stewart
Cuberson	LoBiondo	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Tenney
Curtis	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Davidson	Love	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Tipton
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Trott
DesSantis	MacArthur	Turner
DesJarlais	Marchant	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Valadao
Donovan	Marshall	Wagner
Duffy	Massie	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	Mast	Walden
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	Walker
Dunn	McCaul	Walorski
Emmer	McClintock	Walters, Mimi
Estes (KS)	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Faso	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	McMorris	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Westerman
Fleischmann	McSally	Williams
Flores	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Messer	Wittman
Fox	Mitchell	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	Yoder
Gallagher	Mullin	Yoho
Garrett	Newhouse	Young (IA)
Gianforte	Norman	Zeldin

NAYS—171

Adams	Brady (PA)	Clarke (NY)
Aguilar	Brown (MD)	Clay
Barragán	Bustos	Cleaver
Bass	Capuano	Clyburn
Beatty	Carbajal	Cohen
Bera	Cárdenas	Connolly
Beyer	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Correa
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Costa
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Crist
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Crowley
Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline	Cuellar
F.	Clark (MA)	Cummings

Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Peterson
DeFazio	Kind	Pingree
DeGette	Krishnamoorthi	Pocan
Delaney	Lamb	Polis
DeLauro	Langevin	Price (NC)
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
Demings	Lawrence	Raskin
DeSaulnier	Lawson (FL)	Reed
Deutch	Lee	Rice (NY)
Dingell	Levin	Rosen
Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Ruiz
F.	Lipinski	Rush
Ellison	Loeb	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Eshoo	Lowey	Schakowsky
Espallat	Lujan Grisham,	Schiff
Esty (CT)	M.	Schneider
Evans	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schrader
Foster	Maloney,	Lynch
Frankel (FL)	Carolyn B.	Scott (VA)
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Serrano
Gabbard	Matsui	Shea-Porter
Gallego	McCollum	Sherman
Gomez	McEachin	Sinema
Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Gottheimer	McNerney	Soto
Green, Al	Meehan	Speier
Green, Gene	Meeke	Suozzi
Grijalva	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Gutiérrez	Moore	Takano
Grijalva	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Hastings	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Heck	Nadler	Titus
Himes	Nadler	Tonko
Hoyer	Neal	Torres
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Tsongas
Jayapal	Norcross	Vargas
Jeffries	O'Halleran	Veasey
Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke	Velázquez
Kaptur	Pallone	Vislousky
Keating	Panetta	Wasserman
Kelly (IL)	Pascarella	Schultz
Kennedy	Payne	Waters, Maxine
Khanna	Pelosi	Watson Coleman
Kihuen	Perlmutter	Welch
Kildee	Peters	Yarmuth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Thomas	Taylor
	J.	

NOT VOTING—39

Black	Higgins (NY)	Reichert
Blackburn	Huffman	Richmond
Brownley (CA)	Jenkins (WV)	Royal-Allard
Buchanan	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Jones	Sánchez
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Kustoff (TN)	Sewell (AL)
Denham	Labrador	Shuster
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Sires
Garamendi	Lewis (GA)	Vela
Gibbs	Lofgren	Walz
Gowdy	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Harper	Noem	Young (AK)

□ 1204

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at an event off the Capitol Hill campus, I was unable to make rollcall vote No. 166. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: No. 166 "no" On Motion to Table.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote 166. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the motion to table H. Res. 856.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 27, 2018, I missed rollcall vote 166, a Motion to Table H. Res. 856, a Privileged Resolution offered by Mr. CROWLEY of New York to create Select Committee to investigate the motivations and reasoning behind the forced resignation of the House Chaplain. I stand in full support of the Crowley resolution regarding the Speaker's decision to

forcibly push the House Chaplain Father Conroy to resign.

If I had been present for this vote, I would have voted: "nay" on rollcall vote 166.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the following votes because I chose to remain in my congressional district in Miami for an important district event.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "No" on rollcall Vote No. 162, "no" on rollcall Vote No. 163, "yes" on rollcall Vote No. 164, "yes" on rollcall Vote No. 165, and "no" on rollcall Vote No. 166.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, during the week of Monday, April 23, 2018, I missed rollcall votes 148–166. Had I been present for these recorded votes, I would have voted as listed below: Rollcall Vote 148: "aye," rollcall Vote 149: "aye," rollcall Vote 150: "nay," rollcall Vote 151: "nay," rollcall Vote 152: "aye," rollcall Vote 153: "nay," rollcall Vote 154: "aye," rollcall Vote 155: "aye," rollcall Vote 156: "nay," rollcall Vote 157: "nay," rollcall Vote 158: "nay," rollcall Vote 159: "nay," rollcall Vote 160: "aye," rollcall Vote 161: "aye," rollcall Vote 162: "nay," rollcall Vote 163: "nay," rollcall Vote 164: "aye," rollcall Vote 165: "aye," and rollcall Vote 166: "nay."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 774

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor from H. Res. 774.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 2018, TO TUESDAY, MAY 1, 2018

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 1, 2018.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 4, FAA RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 4, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

NORTH KOREA WANTS A UNIFIED COMMUNIST KOREAN PENINSULA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for generations, the Korean war has continued with no feasible end in sight.

Today, North and South Korea supposedly reached a peace agreement, which includes a denuclearized peninsula, but the definition of denuclearization is not defined in the agreement.

To the North, denuclearization only means the U.S. nuclear umbrella to protect South Korea will end. To the South and to the U.S., this means North Korea will denuclearize.

This is not the first time little Kim has made agreements only to break them. And Kim's delusional idea of a unified Korea is a unified communist Korean Peninsula with him in charge, standing against the West.

For over 6 decades, the Kim regime has actively pursued nuclear and ballistic weapons, terrorizing anyone who opposes the rogue regime.

President Trump's hardball tactics have had their intended insurmountable effect.

We must proceed with caution and stand with our allies to ensure that this agreement is not merely a ploy to serve North Korea's nefarious, totalitarian, aggressive interests.

And that is just the way it is.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

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

Ms. BASS. The FAA SoCal Metroplex project has dramatically changed flight paths into Los Angeles International Airport, effectively cramming traffic from a six-lane highway in the sky into a single lane.

Constituents in my district now have low-altitude flights over their heads, sometimes every 3 minutes. Parents have reported that aircraft noise wakes up their children, movie studios in my district report that the noise has made it very difficult to film outdoors on their lots, which poses a major economic threat.

Guided by my constituents, I proposed and supported over 30 amendments to the FAA reauthorization. I am glad to report that a terminal sequencing spacing amendment that was crafted specifically by constituents in

my district passed yesterday. However, more needs to be done, and I will continue to urge this body to do more to fix this problem.

The constant barrage of noise has real measurable costs in disrupted sleep, lost property values, and business disruption for thousands of people in my district. We cannot allow airline efficiency to come at the sacrifice of the health and well-being of those on the ground.

RECOGNIZING TODD UNGERECHT

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank one of the House's own and a great public servant. Todd Ungerecht is a proud son of Pasco, Washington, and has given this Nation over 20 years of tireless public service.

Prior to his most recent service with the House Natural Resources Committee as deputy staff director to Chairman ROB BISHOP, Todd served the United States Senate for Washington's former U.S. Senator Slade Gorton, for the George W. Bush administration as an appointee with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for former chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee Doc Hastings.

A proud Gonzaga University undergraduate and law school graduate, Todd is a man of family, of faith, and of public service. He represents the quintessential staffer, working diligently behind the scenes, never looking for credit, never seeking the limelight. Todd is a humble public servant, who places the highest value on good public policy.

As Todd retires from the House, and his wife, Magda; and their two children, Alexa and Evan, head west, we send them our sincere gratitude and warmest wishes.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE NATION REGARDING EDUCATION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is an open letter to the Nation regarding education or the education of our children.

I represent the 18th Congressional District and have at least seven school districts, and certainly aware of the school districts throughout the State of Texas and also what school districts are facing across the Nation to pay teachers, most of all to educate our children.

The Houston Independent School District and its board are attempting and, I believe, are committed to educating our children. However, at this present stage, we have at least ten schools with an IR status, a diminished status, with the potential of being closed by the State of Texas.

I will be going home to rally the community, because right now today is Friday, and children are learning in our schools. Why punish them, make them the victims of the lack of resources, credentialed teachers, and the lack of a plan that all of us can agree with?

I happen to have agreed with the initial step to at least solve a problem temporarily, but we know that a temporary solution is not the best.

We need to be able to have those children meet the basic test standards, but, more importantly, we have to reflect on changing these—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARRINGTON). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Very tough test standards that don't test the child's knowledge. So—

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, to that school district, to the city of Houston—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

HONORING MAJOR STEPHEN DEL BAGNO

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

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of our fallen heroes, Major Stephen Del Bagno of the United States Air Force Air Demonstration Squadron, more commonly known as the Thunderbirds, who lost his life this past month.

Major Del Bagno came from my district, from Valencia, California, and exemplified the skill and professionalism that we expect from our airmen.

Major Del Bagno was the very first F-35 pilot to join the ranks of the Thunderbird squadron.

Tragically, Stephen Del Bagno lost his life earlier this month during a training exercise at the Nevada Test and Training Range. While he is no longer with us, his legacy continues in the hearts and minds of future aviators he inspired.

I sat with my wife at his funeral a few weeks back and I watched the missing man formation of F-35s and F-16s, and I listened to his father and his teammates talk about Major Del Bagno. They talked about what a great pilot he was, but they also talked about what a great mentor he was and what a good dude Major Del Bagno was, and that is what he wanted to be recognized as and remembered as.

So America lost one of its finest pilots in his passing.

May God bless him and may he rest in peace.

□ 1215

HONORING THE LIFE OF RACHAEL PARKER

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Rachael Parker. Rachael attended the Route 51 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Rachael worked as a record technician at the Manhattan Beach Police Department for 10 years. She was known as the “matron” of the police department's front desk.

Rachael always treated people the same, no matter their circumstances. She loved her family, and had a passion for animals. She rescued two dogs, that she loved more than anything else.

Rachael always went out of her way to help those in need. Everyone knew her and remembers her as being a gifted, kindhearted, and caring woman.

I would like to extend my condolences to Rachael Parker's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

RECOGNIZING THE CHATHAM-SAVANNAH COUNTER NARCOTICS TEAM

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Chatham-Savannah Counter Narcotics Team, also known as CNT.

In 2017, CNT and the DEA identified a drug distribution group operating throughout Chatham County, and learned that a large drug transaction was to take place. With this knowledge, CNT conducted drug operations at various hotels, covering several local jurisdictions.

On March 25, 2018, CNT seized 25 kilograms, or 55 pounds of cocaine, and made six arrests, which is the largest single cocaine seizure in CNT's history. The confiscated cocaine had an estimated street value of \$4 million.

Cocaine is a highly addictive and mind-altering drug that poisons communities and tears families apart. I applaud CNT's groundbreaking work, which makes the entire Savannah community a better place to live.

THE HOUSE MAJORITY'S GREAT INJUSTICE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the majority in this House has just exacted a great injustice. The unwarranted, unjust, forced resignation of a sworn officer of this United States House, the House Chaplain, Patrick Conroy, is a

complete, complete violation of justice. It is also a complete violation of the rules of this House and the 229-year precedents of this House.

As well, Speaker PAUL RYAN's unilateral decision to remove the House Chaplain, who is elected by the entire membership of this House, is simply wrong. The Chaplain deserves just and fair treatment by every Member of this body that would attend to any Member who is subjected to such treatment or any citizen in our country who appears before the law. Every life in our Nation should matter.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. And the lives and reputations of the officers of this House should matter. Our heads should hang low today—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

Ms. KAPTUR. * * *

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Father Conroy has served this institute honorably for the past seven years. He is only one of two Roman Catholic clerics ever to have served as pastor for the U.S. House of Representatives since the founding of our Republic 229 years ago, of 60 who have served. As an elected officer of this House, the Chaplain serves as its spiritual leader, abiding the heavy weight that the Chaplain bears for hundreds of Members, their families, hundreds more staff members, visitors and others who seek guidance and help. From what is trickling out in the media, this political crucifixion of Father Conway was executed following a visit from Speaker Paul Ryan's Chief of Staff in which Fr. Conway's resignation was demanded. Fr. Conroy complied. He transmitted a letter of resignation under coercion on April 15. On April 16, under cover of convoluted parliamentary procedure, with the vast membership of this institution unnoticed and unaware, Speaker Ryan requested ascension from the entire body. But who in this House even knew procedurally what was occurring? There was no notice. There was no prior House official proceeding to hear this matter. There was no one to object as no Member other than the Speaker and his inner circle knew what the Speaker was demanding.

In such an important matter of a human being's life and reputation, what happened to our House Rules? What happened to regular order? This forced resignation is without cause. It is unprecedented. It is wrong. It is simply a unilateral decision and abuse of power by the Speaker who himself will soon leave Congress. He should hang his head. The Speaker solely delivered an honorable man up for political crucifixion without hearing or trial.

Justice in such a consequential action demands the full attention and engagement of this entire House. It is not the prerogative of a single individual, no matter how powerful that individual may feel he is. The Speaker's action is a violation of the fundamental Rules of this House. It cannot stand the light of scrutiny. This consequential decision about a human being's life was summarily imposed with no justice, no consultation, and importantly a complete abdication of our House Rules and Constitutional precedents. It must be overturned. Justice and regular order must return to this House.

According to the Pew Research Center, Religious 'nones' are underrepresented in Congress compared with U.S. adults overall: Christian: 485 members, 90.7 percent of Congress, 71 percent of U.S. adults [(Protestant: 299, 55.9 percent, 48 percent; Baptist: 72, 13.5 percent, 15 percent; Methodist: 44, 8.2 percent, 5 percent; Anglican/Episcopal: 35, 6.5 percent, 1 percent; Presbyterian: 35, 6.5 percent, 2 percent; Lutheran: 26, 4.9 percent, 4 percent; Congregationalist: 5, 0.9 percent, 1 percent; Non-denominational Protestant: 8, 1.5 percent, 6 percent; Pentecostal: 2, 0.4 percent, 5 percent; Restorationist: 2, 0.4 percent, 2 percent; Adventist: 2, 0.4 percent, 1 percent; Christian Scientist: 2, 0.4 percent, <1 percent; Holiness: 1, 0.2 percent, 1 percent; Reformed: 1, 0.2 percent, <1 percent; Anabaptist: 0, 0 percent, <1 percent; Friends/Quakers: 0, 0 percent, <1 percent; Pietist: 0, 0 percent, <1 percent; Unspecified/other: 64, 12 percent, 5 percent) (Catholic: 168, 31.4 percent, 21 percent) (Mormon: 13, 2.4 percent, 2 percent) (Orthodox Christian: 5, 0.9 percent, <1 percent)]; Jewish: 30, 5.6 percent, 2 percent; Buddhist: 3, 0.6 percent, 1 percent; Muslim: 2, 0.4 percent, 1 percent; Hindu: 3, 0.6 percent, 1 percent; Unitarian Universalist: 1, 0.2 percent, <1 percent; Unaffiliated: 1, 0.2 percent, 23 percent; Other faiths: 0, 0 percent, 2 percent; Don't Know/refused: 10, 1.9 percent, 1 percent. For more information: "Faith on the Hill, the religious composition of the 115th Congress," <<http://www.pewforum.org/2017/01/03/faith-on-the-hill-115/>>."

Excerpt from rule 2, section 1 of U.S. House Rules:

Rule II other officers and officials

Elections

1. There shall be elected at the commencement of each Congress, to continue in office until their successors are chosen and qualified, a Clerk, a Sergeant-at-Arms, a Chief Administrative Officer, and a Chaplain. Each of these officers shall take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and for the true and faithful exercise of the duties of the office to the best of the knowledge and ability of the officer, and to keep the secrets of the House. Each of these officers shall appoint all of the employees of the department concerned provided for by law. The Clerk, Sergeant-at-Arms, and Chief Administrative Officer may be removed by the House or by the Speaker.

Page 363 of house rules and manual of 115th congress: <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/HMAN-115/pdf/HMAN-115.pdf>

Excerpt form article 1 section 2 of U.S. Constitution

The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other Officers; * * *

The officers of the House are the Speaker, who has always been one of its Members and whose term as Speaker must expire with the term as a Member; and the Clerk, Sergeant-at-Arms, Chief Administrative Officer, and Chaplain (I, 187), no one of whom has ever been chosen from the sitting membership of the House and who continue in office until their successors are chosen and qualified (I, 187). In one case the officers continued through the entire Congress succeeding that in which they were elected (I, 244, 263). Former officers include Doorkeeper (abolished by the 104th Congress, see §663b, *infra*) and Postmaster (abolished during the 102d Congress, see §668, *infra*). The House formerly provided by special rule that the Clerk should continue in office until another should be chosen (I, 187, 188, 235, 244). Currently, certain statutes impose on the officers duties that contemplate their continuance (I, 14, 15; 2 U.S.C. 5602).

Page 13 of house rules and manual of 115th congress: <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/HMAN-115/pdf/HMAN-115.pdf>

[From The Hill, Apr. 27, 2018]

DEM LAWMAKER LOOKING INTO WHETHER RYAN VIOLATED HOUSE RULES BY FORCING OUT CHAPLAIN

(By Avery Anapol)

A Democratic Ohio lawmaker is looking into whether Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) violated House procedure when he sought the resignation of House Chaplain Patrick Conroy.

Rep. Marcy Kaptur told Roll Call that she believes a House vote is necessary to remove a chaplain, as the position is considered an "officer of the House."

Conroy submitted a letter of resignation on Thursday at Ryan's request, and a bipartisan group of lawmakers told The Hill that Conroy was forced out by the speaker.

"[His departure was] more than a little suspicious," Kaptur told Roll Call.

The reason behind Conroy's ouster is unclear, though Democratic sources told The Hill it was because Conroy offered a prayer on the House floor that could have been interpreted as critical of the GOP tax law, legislation strongly championed by Ryan.

Kaptur said she wants to find a bipartisan solution, which could include a privileged resolution to reinstate Conroy.

"I don't want to make it a partisan thing," she said. "This is about a person and justice has to prevail."

"For me as a Catholic, with everything else that has gone in my church with cover-ups and all the rest, I feel a special responsibility to not have someone's reputation damaged," she said, adding that she thinks the chaplain was "deeply hurt" by the situation.

[From Roll Call, Apr. 26, 2018]

KAPTUR EXPLORING LEGISLATIVE REPRIEVE FOR OUSTED HOUSE CHAPLAIN

Ohio Democrat said any legislation she proposes would be bipartisan.

(By Lindsey McPherson)

Rep. Marcy Kaptur does not believe Speaker Paul D. Ryan has authority to remove House Chaplain Patrick J. Conroy without a vote of the House. And she's exploring legislation to prevent his ouster.

Conroy submitted a letter of resignation April 15 at the speaker's request that was read on the House floor the following day. Ryan's spokeswoman AshLee Strong confirmed that Ryan sought the Jesuit priest's resignation but did not provide a reason why.

Rep. Walter B. Jones, R-N.C., and Joe Crowley, D-N.Y., both pointed to a prayer that Conroy delivered on the tax overhaul as the reason he was asked to leave. Jones said he spoke with Conroy and he confirmed that, saying the only intended meaning of the prayer was that the tax bill should help everyone.

"As legislation on taxes continues to be debated this week and next, may all Members be mindful that the institutions and structures of our great Nation guarantee the opportunities that have allowed some to achieve great success, while others continue to struggle," Conroy said his Nov. 6 prayer on the House floor. "May their efforts these days guarantee that there are not winners and losers under new tax laws, but benefits balanced and shared by all Americans."

A senior GOP aide said there was not a specific prayer that led to Ryan's decision. Conroy's resignation comes more than five months after he delivered the prayer on the tax debate but just days after Ryan announced his plans to retire from Congress at the end of his term.

"If we cannot protect freedom of prayer on the floor of the House, there is no hope for America. None," Jones said. "This chaplain

is elected by all the members we vote on. And this should be a vote by all the members for him not to be here."

NO RULE FOR REMOVAL?

Like Jones, Kaptur also spoke with Conroy, who was reluctant to talk about his resignation but upon her pressing revealed it was a request from the speaker.

"I said, 'But why?' and he didn't say anything," she said. "So I went back to my staff and . . . looked at the rules of procedure for the House under the section dealing with the chaplain. . . . As an officer of the House, this should have consideration if there's no cause. I mean what's the cause?"

Indeed the Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives identifies the chaplain as an officer of the House, along with the speaker, clerk, sergeant-at-arms and chief administrative officer. The manual says the officers shall be elected at the commencement of each Congress.

While the speaker's term expires with the conclusion of each Congress, the other officers "continue in office until their successors are chosen and qualified," the manual says.

"The clerk, sergeant-at-arms, and chief administrative officer may be removed by the House or by the speaker," the manual says, while making no mention of the procedure for removing the chaplain.

If the matter should be subject to a vote it's unclear whether Conroy waived that by submitting his resignation.

LEGISLATIVE REMEDY?

Kaptur is continuing to dig into the matter. The longest-serving woman in the House said she has not seen anything like this in her nearly three dozen years serving in this institution.

"I don't think it's fair," she said, calling the Conroy's ouster "more than a little suspicious."

Asked if there's a procedural action members could take, like filing a privileged resolution reinstate Conroy, Kaptur said, "I am certainly of that mind. But I want to work on a bipartisan basis. I don't want to make it a partisan thing. This is about a person and justice has to prevail."

Kaptur said any procedural action would be about treating Conroy, with the respect he deserves as an officer of the House.

"For me as a Catholic with everything else that has gone in my church with cover-ups and all the rest, I feel a special responsibility to not have someone's reputation damaged," she said.

Kaptur said she was surprised that Ryan, who is also Catholic, would make this decision. She said Conroy didn't say much when she spoke with him, but noted, "I think he's deeply hurt."

GROUP FORMED TO VET SUCCESSORS

While Kaptur and others look for ways to keep Conroy in his position—Crowley, for example, is calling on Ryan to reconsider his decision—conversations about the next House chaplain have begun.

Ryan has asked Rep. Doug Collins, R-Ga., to lead a bipartisan group of members in looking at potential replacements for Conroy. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver, D-Mo., will serve as the lead member of the group for the Democrats.

Collins, a military chaplain for 17 years, said there's no set number of members for the group yet or timeline for the group to submit recommendations. He predicted it could take a few months and a replacement would likely not be ready before Conroy's May 24 resignation date.

"This decision will be on the speaker ultimately," Collins said.

Collins said he is not looking for candidates of a specific faith, just ones who have

“a heart for people,” relate well to others and can listen.

Rep. Mark Walker, chairman of the Congressional Prayer Caucus, is also serving on the group that will recommend the next chaplain. Both he and Collins said they had no issues with Conroy and were not familiar with Ryan’s reason for asking him to resign.

As for successors, Walker, who served as a pastor for nearly 20 years before running for Congress, said he’s looking for someone with a nondenominational background that has a multicultural congregation or an otherwise diverse background.

The North Carolina Republican also said he’d prefer “somebody who has a little age, that has adult children, that kind of can connect with the bulk of the body here, Republicans or Democrats as far as what we’re going through back home—you’ve got the wife, the family, things you encounter—that has some counseling experience or has managed or worked with people, maybe a larger church size, being able to have that understanding or that experience.”

While Walker had initially specified someone with children and said “having somebody who’s walked in those shoes I think allows you to immediately relate a little bit more than others.”

Catholic priests take a vow of celibacy. Walker followed up with the reporters he made his comments to clarify he was not disqualifying Catholic priests because of that vow.

“When I say family experience I mean that you’ve been a priest or pastor over a parishioner with families who have situations, adult children, those kinds of things.”

REMEMBERING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WILLOW ISLAND DISASTER

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 40th anniversary of the Willow Island disaster, when 51 construction workers perished in the deadliest construction accident in United States history.

These men were building cooling tower No. 2 at the Pleasants Power Station in West Virginia. Just after 10 o’clock on that tragic day, as the third lift of concrete was being lifted, the cable housing on the crane went slack and the crane collapsed in on the tower.

The concrete that had been poured the previous day then started to unwrap the tower, taking out the scaffolding. All the men who were on the scaffolding at that time were killed, and many workers on the ground were buried under the falling debris.

This horrible accident spurred a national conversation about more construction safety and led to improved standards. And for those of us who have worked in the construction industry, it underscored just how fragile life is and that paying attention to every detail can make a difference whether we go home or not.

This is a tragedy that is still felt throughout the Pleasants County community. Angie Colvin, who was just in the fifth grade at the time of the dis-

aster, lost 12 family members that day, including her father.

The Willow Island community will gather this evening at the memorial erected in honor of those 51 workers. Our prayers are with the entire community on this day of remembrance.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JAMES ZECCA

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable public servant and close friend in New York’s 22nd District, Mr. James Zecca, of Utica, New York.

At the end of May, Jim will retire from his position as the director of the Madison County Department of Solid Waste and Sanitation, a position he started and created in 1988. A few years ago, a colleague of Jim’s said that his “forward thinking attitude and determination has made Madison County a leader in recycling in New York State.” He ensured the county was open and transparent to everyone, always including the community as a whole in every process.

Even though he works in Madison County during the day, Jim has served his community, his own community in Utica, the city of Utica, for many years. He served as a city councilman representing the Second District, and also a councilman-at-large during his time on the Utica Common Council.

Jim has always been a champion of the little guy, the small-business owner, and the citizens who have been hurt by government incompetence, overreach, and yes, even corruption.

It is my honor to congratulate Jim on 30 years of exceptional service to Madison County and our entire community. His hard work, courage, and compassion will be missed by all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in congratulating Jim on his retirement, and best wishes for the future, and also, for his tireless effort in making America great again. Congratulations, Jim.

RECOGNIZING SESAME PLACE ON ITS DESIGNATION AS A CERTIFIED AUTISM CENTER

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, April is Autism Awareness Month, and I would like to recognize a family landmark in my district that has gone the extra mile to assist individuals with autism.

Sesame Place, a theme park located in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, in my district, and my former employer, was recently designated as a Certified Autism Center. This distinction, developed by the International Board of

Credentialing and Continuing Education Standards, certifies facilities that are compatible for those with autism, and their families.

To earn this designation, all staff at Sesame Place underwent extensive training on autism awareness and sensitivity. When the park reopens for its 38th season this year, it will also include two new “quiet rooms” with adjustable lights and noise-canceling headphones.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to say that Sesame Place in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, is the first theme park in the world to be designated as a Certified Autism Center. I would like to thank the staff and all of my friends at Sesame Place for making the park a hospitable and fun place for our entire community.

CONGRATULATING NEBRASKA’S THEDFORD HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL SCIENCE BOWL TEAM

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Nebraska’s Thedford High School National Science Bowl Team on winning their regional competition and securing a position in next week’s tournament in our Nation’s capital.

The National Science Bowl is one of the largest and most prestigious academic competitions, having been created in 1991 by the Office of Science within the U.S. Department of Energy.

Our team from Thedford High School, comprised of students David Gordon, Andrew Gordon, Rhiannon Painter, Kalee Jepsen, and Ariel Bryant, and led by Coach Geri Smith, brings pride to Nebraska’s Third District.

I know the constituents I represent join me in wishing them well as they begin the tournament on Sunday, April 29, 2018. On behalf of the people of Nebraska’s Third District, I commend the Thedford High School National Science Bowl Team for this noteworthy accomplishment, and wish them well in the competition.

Go Knights.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF BILL MULDER

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to honor the life of a high school buddy of mine and a decorated Navy SEAL, Bill Mulder. Bill was a true American hero who served our country with honor and distinction.

Like many of our troops, Bill’s greatest fight wasn’t on the battlefield; it was the struggle that often ensues from the mental, emotional, and physical wear and tear from military service. On top of that, people like Bill,

who spend their entire careers pursuing excellence as a warrior, often wrestle with life back as a civilian.

The Transition Assistance Program can help prepare folks like Bill for the challenges and opportunities of transitioning to civilian life, to create a new sense of purpose, to equip them with the tools to be successful in the marketplace, leveraging their unique experiences and skills from their time in the armed services.

Named in honor of Bill Mulder, my legislation works to strengthen and improve this program. We owe it to Bill and every veteran to make the transition from Active Duty to civilian life more seamless and successful, which I believe this legislation does.

God bless the Mulder family. God bless our troops. God bless America.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and the honor to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and I come to the floor today to bring up a list of subjects that I think should be deliberated upon here in the House Chamber.

The first one that is on my mind is the moral calling that we have to step in to save the lives of the most innocent among us. And as I watched some of the discussion that took place here on the floor today, and I look over at the people that were a part of the privileged motion, as I reflect upon however strong they are in their verbal support for the Catholic Church, I didn't see one of them over there that actually will defend innocent, unborn human life. And we have tested it time after time here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

So the central principle of the Catholic Church, and many other Christian faiths, I will add, is to protect innocent, unborn human life, to oppose abortion-on-demand, and to respect the values that once a child is conceived, once fertilization takes place, we have a unique combination of DNA that is never matched again in history; and that unique combination of DNA is created in God's image, and I believe that he puts a soul in that little baby from that moment.

□ 1230

And as that little baby starts to grow in its mother's womb, we have a child that is a gift to the world and a gift here to America; a gift to that child's parents, grandparents, family, neighbors, community; a gift to our country.

Yet there is a policy here that allows for the Supreme Court to step in and intervene with the will of the people and establish what they seem to be-

lieve is a right to decide who lives and who dies and under what terms that might be.

In 1973, January 22 of 1973, two decisions came down from the United States Supreme Court. One was *Roe v. Wade*, which most everyone seems to know and understand; and that *Roe v. Wade* decision essentially was that they believe that the child wouldn't be protected until after the first trimester. Trimesters were part of the dialogue in *Roe v. Wade*.

Doe v. Bolton was the companion case; and in that companion case of *Doe v. Bolton* that was decided on the same day, it essentially said, except for all of these other things: the life or health of the mother, the familial relationship of the mother, the economic condition of the mother, of course the physical health of the mother. The list went on.

But it was so broad that it really said this: that *Roe v. Wade* says you can have abortion on demand after the first trimester. *Doe v. Bolton* said you can have abortion on demand for any reason or essentially no rational reason whatsoever.

And that stayed in place from 1973 until 1992, when the *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* decision came down.

It is interesting that the son of Democrat Governor of Pennsylvania—former Governor of Pennsylvania, since passed away, God rest his pro-life soul—BOB CASEY, who was denied the opportunity to speak before the Democratic National Convention because of his pro-life credentials, was the subject of the lawsuit from *Planned Parenthood* to Governor Casey of Pennsylvania.

Out of that decision came a majority opinion that ratcheted the abortion issue a little ways, and it said: Well, you can't abort them after there is a viability.

But that viability was indistinct, and it settled in somewhere around 24 or 25 weeks. So it had litigation around that. We have had legislation around that. But, meanwhile, abortion on demand pretty much walked its way across this country.

In the late part of the 1990s, we had legislation that passed that banned partial-birth abortion. It was a big debate here on the floor of the House of Representatives, that ghastly and ghoulish practice—and I won't describe it here on the floor out of sensitivity, Mr. Speaker, to ears that might not be able to absorb this—but it is ghastly and it is ghoulish, a partial-birth abortion.

Yet that practice was going on around this country. This Congress banned it in the House and in the Senate. Then it was litigated; and, let's see, as it was litigated, the Supreme Court ruled that partial-birth abortion was a legal act because the Congress had failed to define the act of partial-birth abortion precisely enough that it was a vague description as to what that act actually was. So they said

that that burden couldn't be upon the abortionist to know what Congress actually meant. Therefore, the Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional.

They also added to it being indistinct that Congress had not established that it was never medically necessary to save the life of the mother.

So we went back to work here in this Congress, and I was part of that as a member of the Judiciary Committee. The chairman of the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee at that time was Congressman STEVE CHABOT from Ohio, a very strong and principled pro-life Congressman to this day, and I hope the next chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and he is the central player in this, and I got to weigh in and maybe tweak the language a little bit, but we precisely defined the act of partial-birth abortion precisely enough.

We also held hearing after hearing that concluded that a partial-birth abortion was never necessary to save the life of a mother.

There were ghastly testimonies that came before the Judiciary Committee in that period of time, but we passed that legislation off the House, we passed it off the Senate, and it was litigated again. LeRoy Carhart was the lead abortionist who litigated this case. It was *Gonzales v. Carhart*, as I recall.

I went to Lincoln, Nebraska. It was heard in three circuits. The one in Lincoln, Nebraska, is the one I sat in on; and after a number of hours of listening to that case be heard before the court, I went out and did a press conference outside the Federal building because the judge had said that the two attorneys in the case, the opposing attorneys in the case, had done more due diligence than the United States Congress.

I knew what the due diligence was here. He did not. So I raised that issue: How do you do more due diligence than the United States Congress bringing in the wisdom of America and the American people and having public hearings and rolling that information out over and over again, and the due diligence of precisely parsing the language of the decision that went against life and for a ghastly and ghoulish abortion, and precisely defined that act so that it could no longer be argued that we didn't make it clear enough in our legislation?

And we made it very clear that it was never necessary to do a partial-birth abortion to save the life of the mother.

We established those principles; and once we established those principles, then I am there in Lincoln, Nebraska, to defend it. I could only speak to that court through the press. There wasn't a way for me to walk down and make a case before the judge, but I made the case to the press; and when he read the press clippings the next morning, apparently, is when he discovered this, he offered to recuse himself.

Well, I wish they had taken him up on that. But in any case, Judge Kopf

found against life and for abortion, as did the other two circuits, and we had now lost at two or three circuits in the previous legislation, we lost before the Supreme Court, the ban on partial-birth abortion had been struck down, and we have lost in three circuits when we came back with the better language and the congressional findings that it is never necessary to do a partial-birth abortion to save the life of the mother.

We lost in all of these areas. So that is two or three circuits the first time around, and a Supreme Court the first time around, and three circuits the second time around on our way to the Supreme Court.

Now, who would think we would be successful before the Supreme Court the second time through with *Gonzales v. Carhart*?

And I would say that, looking back on history, we should have been able to expect that. I don't know what I expected, I just knew what my job was was to do all I could do to save the lives of the most innocent among us.

So the Supreme Court found in favor of life and against *LeRoy Carhart* and said that Congress had successfully and legally and constitutionally banned the ghastly and ghoulish act of partial-birth abortion.

That is the only case that I know of where we have gone back to the court after we had failed the first time on the life issue, tried again. So when we went back to the court, we gained ground; we didn't lose.

And if you track the court along the way, I think that you see that there has been an incremental increase in their support for the authority, the constitutional authority of Congress and the State legislatures, to ban abortion or to limit abortion. And we are sitting there today with a Supreme Court that might well be a 5-4 decision against the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490; the Heartbeat bill that requires an abortionist who is contemplating committing an abortion to first check for a heartbeat, and if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. That is the standard that is within H.R. 490.

We don't make exceptions for rape or incest because I believe it is immoral to execute a baby for the sin and the crime of the father.

So we have a very clean, very precise, very well-worded—and it is not worded in anticipation of it going before this court, Mr. Speaker, but it is written in anticipation of going before the Court after the next appointment and confirmation to the Supreme Court. *Gorsuch 2*, I might say.

And even though this Court could be disposed to uphold Heartbeat, because their legal argument gets a little vague, they don't get to say a heartbeat is vague. We know if there is a beating heart, there is life. We know it is a human life. We know that an unborn baby with a beating heart has at least a 95 percent chance of experiencing a successful birth.

And some of those numbers go higher than that, not to 100 percent, but ap-

proach 100 percent. I use 95 percent because I am confident that that number does not overstate. It does not overstate the prospects for a child that has a heartbeat.

We know that a heartbeat designates life. We know that abortion stops a beating heart. And we know that, in the 14th Amendment, it requires that we protect life, liberty, and property, in that order, I might add, in a prioritized order.

And, Mr. Speaker, I take it all back to the Declaration of Independence when Thomas Jefferson penned the words that the protection for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, are the words that are in our Declaration. A little bit different than John Locke's life, liberty, and property.

But the life, liberty, and property is deeply entrenched within the literature that brought us up to the Declaration and the Constitution and is enshrined in the 14th Amendment.

So I assert that our Founders understood, and nearly a century later, with the 14th Amendment, the Framers of the 14th Amendment understood, that they were prioritized rights. They didn't get this wrong. They never put property, liberty, and life; or liberty, property, life; or any other combination that might be conceivable with the three rights that are protected.

In every case that I can find in literature anywhere, it is always life, liberty, and then it either says property or pursuit of happiness.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, pursuit of happiness was understood by our Founding Fathers to be rooted in the Greek word "eudemonia." E-u-d-e-m-o-n-i-a is how it is spelled, and I believe exactly how it is also pronounced.

And what it means is, that is the Greek word for pursuit of happiness, which they understood to mean the development of the whole human being. The development of a person's physical body, to get to exercise and stay in shape, get in shape, stay in shape, become proficient athletically so that you can use your body for all of the things you might need to use it for.

And the second component of this is to develop one's self intellectually, because God gives you a brain, after all, and that raw material, that brain, is a gift to you. You have an obligation to develop your intellectual capacity. So that is your education, your training, your cognitive skills, develop them to the max.

So develop yourself physically, develop yourself intellectually, and then the third component is develop yourself spiritually to put together the composition of the whole human being. That pursuit of happiness is understood by the Greeks and identified by the Greek word "eudemonia."

That is what the Founding Fathers understood when Thomas Jefferson took the quill and wrote: "Life, liberty, pursuit of happiness." Not a fun tailgate party, not putting your feet up and watching the ball game. Not a cele-

bration among your family in that way. All those things are fine, but it is about developing the whole human being.

And even that, as important as it is to develop yourselves as a whole human being, the efforts and endeavors to do so could never step on the liberty of others; the liberty of others to have a speech, religion, assembly, the right to keep and bear arms, the rights to property. All of those things that are some of the liberties that are God-given liberties that are protected, they are protected even from someone else in their pursuit of happiness or their development of their own eudemonia, cannot take away someone else's freedom of speech, religion, right to assembly, freedom of the press, the right to keep and bear arms, the protection from unreasonable search and seizure, or the right to own property. All of those things are protected as God-given liberties in the Framers' documents, and particularly in the Declaration of Independence, and then they are additionally enshrined within the Constitution itself.

So pursue happiness, use your liberties to do that. None of those things are any good if you don't have life. Life is the paramount right; and in protection of life, especially the most vulnerable among us, innocent, unborn human life, and the protection of that life, no one can use their liberties to take someone else's life.

□ 1245

And no one can use their pursuit of happiness to take someone else's liberty or life. These are prioritized in that order: life is paramount, liberty comes second, and eudemonia—pursuit of happiness—comes third.

That is the structure that was understood intellectually and intuitively by our Founding Fathers, by the Framers of our Constitution, and the drafters of our Declaration, and that is the framework that we must adhere to in this country if we are going to continue to enjoy God-given liberty in any of its forms over the long haul.

The sin that this Nation is committing with 60 million abortions—these innocent little babies who are the future of our country, 60 million, and today we have what we call a full-employment economy. The unemployment rate is as low as it has been since 2001. And I am constantly hearing employers say: You need to get me a labor force.

Well, I remember 10 years ago the message was: You need to create jobs. The private sector creates jobs—not government, as a rule. But it was jobs 10 years ago. Today, it is: We have too many jobs and not enough workers.

Well, where are those workers? They are the aborted generations that we are missing today, the ghosts that sit between us when nearly a third of a generation is gone and 60 million are missing.

Not only 60 million are missing, but there is roughly another 60 million who

were not born because their mothers were aborted. And when you do the back-of-the-envelope calculation on that, it falls to roughly 60 million more. So somewhere between 100 million and 120 million Americans are missing because *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*—*Planned Parenthood*, that, itself, spends millions lobbying the United States Congress and State legislatures across this land, millions.

They are the number one abortion company—factory—in America, committing around 354,000 abortions a year of the right at 1 million abortions a year.

When I talk to people here on this floor, a gentlewoman from the other side of the aisle just spoke here some minutes ago, who said to me: STEVE, why are you worried about abortion? We have got abortions down to under 1 million a year.

The peak was about 1.6 million abortions a year, so why am I worried about this?

They score the difference between the high watermark in abortions at 1.6 million and what appears to be a very stable, maybe low watermark of 1 million abortions a year. They think that somehow by messaging we have saved 600,000 babies every year is good because we are not aborting babies at the willy-nilly pace we were at the peak of abortions a couple, four decades ago.

I say instead, you don't get to keep score because there aren't as many babies being taken today by abortionists. You can only keep score by ending a ghastly, ghoulish, and immoral practice and protecting these innocent lives. These are innocent lives of all races. All of God's children, every one, created in His image.

And that unique piece of DNA that I mentioned at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, that will never be matched up again. Of all of the possible combinations, it is beyond our imagination to think how that unique person could become matched up in another generation. There are 7 billion people on this planet, and what are the distinctions between us?

Just think, how many times have you heard a voice from another room and recognized that voice because it is unique. You know who it is. It has to be somebody usually close to you or somebody you have heard quite often.

I know that I have come up behind a vehicle out in my neighborhood and the vehicle had probably been traded two or three times since I had seen the driver, but I come up behind that pickup, I see the back of his head, and I can tell by the way he sits behind the steering wheel who he is—even if I haven't seen him in 20 years—because we are that unique. There are 7 billion faces here, and they are all unique.

Even though there is identical DNA in the case of identical twins, triplets, quadruplets, quintuplets, septuplets, sextuplets—I think I covered all that has ever existed—but whatever kind of

combination of unique matches of DNA, they still look different enough. All of their mothers can tell them apart. And the older these identical twins get, the easier it is for all of the rest of us to tell them apart just by looking at their face, sometimes by listening to their voice.

Even the genetically identical are not identical. We can tell them apart because God has given us a unique visage, a face. And think what we do with it. I mean, can you imagine if you were going to create the world and invent all of the things that were put here in Genesis and then you put Adam and Eve down there on the planet, what kind of thought process that takes to give us a visage, a face, that is so unique that everybody can tell it apart from everybody else?

Think how hard it would be if we all wore a mask every day. We couldn't recognize each other. If we couldn't recognize voices or faces, or if we couldn't read facial expressions, how hard would it be to go do business? How hard would it be to express a feeling, a sense? How hard would it be to say: "I am happy with you"; "I kind of wonder about you"; "I have my doubts about you"; and "I am angry at you."

All of those things come out of our faces, and little kids, from babies on up, recognize facial expressions. They know a smile means joy; they know a frown might not be; and we listen to them and watch their faces. It is instinctive in them, because God gave us those abilities to be unique and to express ourselves, each with our own unique visage.

And that is what we are eliminating with abortion, somehow believing that it is a mass of tissue that doesn't have identifying characteristics, that doesn't have a potential—and we all know in our hearts better than that. That is why I wrote the Heartbeat bill, because it does touch to our hearts, and we know what the sound of that beating heart is.

In my iPhone here, Mr. Speaker, I have a series of different little babies with beating hearts, and I can turn on that audio and listen to the beating heart of my little granddaughter that is due to be born in the latter part of July of this year. The baby is 26 weeks and 2 days along, today, as we speak, and the last heartbeat pulse I got was 161 beats per minute. I also have, of course, the ultrasound pictures in here of that little miracle that is waiting to burst forth and breathe the free air here in America.

And I am far from alone. There are millions of Americans that experience the same thing.

I have what is now a former district representative that worked for me for a decade, and there framed in his office—a picture about this big—framed was the first picture of their firstborn son, firstborn child, and his name is Joseph Dean Anderson, and the picture is of his ultrasound.

The picture was there well before he was born, and they bonded with him

from the beginning because they could see the facial expressions. They could watch him move. They could hear his beating heart. And today, that little guy is about 9 years old, a handsome, towheaded little boy that loves God and will be a fine American citizen.

We have an obligation to protect those lives, Mr. Speaker. This Congress has, I believe, the votes within it to protect those lives, but not the will, at this point, to move H.R. 490, the Heartbeat bill, to this floor—or even to committee, for that matter.

Now, I have gone to work on this and we brought the Heartbeat bill further and faster than any pro-life legislation of consequence since *Roe v. Wade* in 1973. As we entered into this Congress and we went to work on this—and my thanks to Janet Porter and Tom DeLay for their tremendous work that they have done—we built a whip team here in this Congress of about 12 to 15, and we fanned out throughout the Conference, and people brought their cards back in, and we ended up with 170 cosponsors on H.R. 490.

Well, I said, "ended up." That is how many we had yesterday when the Sun came up. We added one more at the end of the day yesterday, and I am thankful that we are still making progress. And I expect there will be a trickling that will be added on to that, but it is a pretty good, long list of Republican Members that say: I will vote for it. I am just not quite ready to sign on the bill yet.

They have their own political reasons for that, but I believe the votes are here in this Congress to pass Heartbeat.

And if we pass Heartbeat, we will have taken the first step to saving the lives of nearly 1 million babies a year in America and starting to fill back up again that hole that is two or three generations old by now, 45 years old. Some would say that is two generations. It is probably closer—Thomas Jefferson declared a generation to be 19 years. Two, or a little more than two generations are missing in America. Some of those little girls who were aborted would have had babies by now, and there would have been roughly maybe another 60 million babies already born to that generation that is missing.

We have an obligation to defend their lives. We have an obligation to defend life. We have an obligation to restructure, again, the priorities of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

How can we sit here and say we are moral? How can we be indignant about a discretionary decision made by the Speaker of the House and not have a bit of a qualm about 60 million babies aborted because of the intransigence of the people who stood there just an hour ago to lecture the American people on a judgment call that they disagreed with from the President of the United States and, by the way, with the Speaker of the House.

That lack of a moral position over on that side of the aisle is why we still

have *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, nearly 1 million abortions a year, two missing generations, and a population that would be 100 million to 120 million stronger had that Supreme Court made the decision that was constitutional, true, right, and just in all of its aspects in 1973.

Information emerged years later at the retirement of Justice Blackmun that Justice Kennedy was prepared to vote on the pro-life side in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* and that there were decisions that were made that will always be within the bowels of the Supreme Court as to why that didn't happen. But the information out there says it was very close, that the decision really was on the side of life; and for an unexplained reason, it went the other way in 1992, and that gave Kennedy the opportunity to write the majority opinion in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. That is why we came up with the viability nonstandard standard.

Now we have taken the Heartbeat bill up through the circuit court in North Dakota, and the court struck it down, as we knew they would. It just should be common knowledge by anyone who is involved in this discussion that with the Supreme Court precedent decisions, and especially precedent decisions that are as well-known and have extended as long as they have with *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* and *Doe v. Bolton* and *Roe v. Wade*, that with those precedent cases, no lower Federal court is going to attempt to defy the United States Supreme Court.

So any pro-life legislation that challenges existing Supreme Court precedent, which we must do if we are going to ever reduce the nearly 1 million abortions a year down to far fewer—by, say, 95 percent—will always lose at the lower court. At every level in the Federal court, we will lose, because those lower courts will not challenge the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker.

That means we have to go back through this motion that we had again, go back through the exercise we had again that three circuits heard the ban on partial-birth abortions. Three circuits struck it down, even though we had rewritten the legislation to conform with the Supreme Court decision because they were not about to tell the United States Supreme Court that the inferior courts are superior to the Supreme Court. So we accept that.

I don't want to hear an argument from pro-life organizations that say: Well, the case is already settled. We tried Heartbeat before the circuit when it was passed in North Dakota, and the circuit struck down the North Dakota law, so we are defeated.

Really, that is not a defeat. When you know you have to accept that defeat in order to qualify to get to the Supreme Court, that is not a defeat. That is a process that you accept at the onset.

I accept that process at the onset to go forward through the lower courts to

get to the Supreme Court, but the challenge isn't so much that, right now. The immediate challenge is this:

There are four windows that we have to get Heartbeat, H.R. 490, through if we are going to save the lives of these babies with the beating heart. The first window—by the way, these windows have to be opened in the right sequence. There are four windows, and I will name them: the House, the Senate, the Presidency, and the Supreme Court.

If the Supreme Court opens up and we lose pro-life majorities in the House or Senate, if the Supreme Court opens up, it isn't going to do us any good because we can't get there with the case—at least, out of this Congress we can't.

If we lose the Presidency, say we wait until the year 2020 and lose the Presidency and we end up with a pro-abortion President again, it isn't going to do us any good. Remember, President Obama said he didn't want to see his daughters punished with a baby.

□ 1300

If we end up with a pro-abortion President, again, it won't matter if there is a pro-life majority in the House or the Senate, because the President would veto it.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we do have a pro-life majority in the Senate today. It is a bare pro-life majority. It is a 51-49 pro-life majority in the Senate. That was proven with the 20-week bill that did not defeat the cloture vote over there, but it had a bare majority of votes. So it is close, but a pro-life majority in the Senate.

We have a pro-life majority in the House of Representatives. That is clear here. I believe we have the votes to pass H.R. 490, the Heartbeat bill, off the floor.

Window number one, pro-life majority in the House. We have it. Let's move H.R. 490. Let's move it now.

The second window is the pro-life majority in the Senate. Questionable. But if they suspended their rules, they could pass Heartbeat in the Senate. If that happened, H.R. 490 then would go to the President. The President will sign H.R. 490, the Heartbeat bill. He will sign it, and one of the things that I guarantee is that Vice President MIKE PENCE, who has a terrifically good heart himself, would be standing next to the President of the United States at that time.

The President would sign that bill. Now we can count on it, at that point. That is window number three.

Window number one, pro-life majority in the House; window number two, pro-life majority in the Senate; window number three, a pro-life President that will sign the bill.

Window number four is the Supreme Court. We have to walk through the swamp and the quagmire of the lower courts to get there, but we would get there at that point. A Heartbeat bill passed by this Congress would get to

the Supreme Court, and they would have a very difficult time refusing to grant cert and they would hear the case, I believe, and it would be a landmark case.

We would be in a position to see *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* reversed, *Doe v. Bolton* reversed, *Roe v. Wade* reversed, and to see life respected in America again, as it was before 1973. That is the path we need to follow.

What is obstructing this path, Mr. Speaker?

I know that you are asking that yourself, but for me, I am prepared to answer the question that you are thinking.

There seems to be a perhaps long-standing rule, one that was probably continued by Speaker Boehner or created by him. It seems that it goes back further than the current leadership in the House, but I have talked to each one of the top three Republican leaders in the House and each have told me: We won't bring pro-life legislation to the floor of the House unless it is supported by the top three pro-life organizations in the country, that being Family Research Council, Tony Perkins; Susan B. Anthony List, Marjorie Dannenfelser.

Both of those people are good friends and powerful, committed pro-life workers. I have great respect for them and all of their organizations they have put together, and many others. By the way, there are 170 cosponsors on Heartbeat, plus 162 pro-life organizations or national leaders that are cosponsors on this. So I have named the two of the three, what some have expressed as the holy trinity of pro-life, so to speak.

The other is the National Right to Life, NRLC. @NRLC would be their Twitter handle. They say: We do not oppose Heartbeat. I say they do not support Heartbeat. They say they don't have veto power, but the Speaker, the majority leader, and the whip say they do. But the Speaker's spokesman said: No, there isn't any such rule. Well, it is being applied.

National Right to Life, when I say to them it is time to lead, follow, or get out of the way, they say: Well, we do not oppose and we don't have that kind of power.

My answer to that is: Then pick up the phone, call the Speaker, and tell Speaker RYAN you don't want to have that veto power; remove yourself from this. And I said specifically: Lead, follow, or get out of the way.

It is probably too late to lead for them. It is probably not too late for them to follow—I hope they do—but at a minimum, get out of the way. Pick up the phone, call the Speaker, tell the public that you don't want to have veto power over Heartbeat, that you want to get out of the way.

If the Speaker wants to pick another organization, let him do that. That would be fine with me. There are plenty of good organizations out there.

Meanwhile, National Right to Life says to me: Why are you dividing the

pro-life community? We can't be pitting ourselves against each other. We will never accomplish anything if we fight among ourselves.

My answer back to that is, Mr. Speaker: Accusing me of dividing?

One hundred seventy Members of the House of Representatives say: I want Heartbeat to the floor for a vote. There are a whole bunch of others who want to vote for it that aren't yet ready to sign on.

The will of we the people is reflected in the votes in this republican form of government which is guaranteed to us in the United States Constitution. It is not what anybody says out here that controls what goes on in here. It influences, but it doesn't control.

We have an obligation, every one of us. All 435 of us owe our constituents our best effort and our best judgment. That best effort and judgment doesn't mean that we let unelected, outside organizations dictate against the will of the majority here in the House of Representatives. But that is what is going on by this rule that hangs up there in the Speaker's office that, unless National Right to Life comes onboard, the pro-life legislation is not coming to the floor of the House of Representatives.

I do not think that that is a defensible position. It is not defensible for National Right to Life, whose mission statement says they protect life from the beginning of life until natural death. If you look a little further on their website—because I wanted to know the technicalities—when they believe life begins, posted on their website: at the moment of fertilization.

I agree with them completely, with their mission statement, that we should protect life from the moment of fertilization until natural death, because human life is sacred in all of its forms. It begins at the moment of fertilization. It begins at the moment of conception.

In fact, former Governor Bob Casey, whom I spoke of earlier in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, said years ago—I clipped it out and put it on my bulletin board—before we had electronics, everything had to be saved; you couldn't go search on the internet—pre-internet, Governor Bob Casey said: Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

Think of that. What is a life worth?

It can't be quantified because it is the measure.

When the Frenchmen created the metric system, they did a calculation of the distance either around the Earth or pole to pole—who knows if it is right or not—and they divided it down into increments and came up with the meter. Well, the meter is a standard for distance of measure.

How long is a meter?

Well, it is whatever the distance is that is identical to the platinum strap, I will call it, the platinum meter stick that is stored at standard temperature and pressure so that it doesn't expand

or contract and it is always a standard length. They created it in kind of an odd fashion, but they established it as the measure.

That measure, that platinum stick at standard pressure and temperature that is a meter is the distance against which all other distances are measured and made within the metric system.

Well, that gives you an idea of what human life is. Human life is sacred in all of its forms. It is the measure itself against which we measure every other value that we have.

So how can we say that this life is not worth it when it is sacred and it is the measure?

We are here with the National Right to Life resisting—and I use that word as an informed word, not just a random one off the shelf—resisting the movement of Heartbeat, because they believe that if we challenge the Supreme Court, then Kennedy would be—and I will use these words—Justice Kennedy, because I do respect him—using their words, would be forced to vote against Heartbeat and would be in a position to assign Justice Ginsburg to write the majority opinion, in which case she would likely take away all things that we have gained.

I say: What? What do we have to lose? What could we possibly lose?

All we know is this: 45 years of incrementalism has piled up 60 million dead babies. And we are afraid to challenge the Supreme Court, when every time we knock on their door, we have gained something rather than lost something?

Furthermore, society is moving. Society is moving in the direction of life, because we see the ultrasounds. We know.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, I always knew. I knew when I picked up my first little baby, little David King, on March 24, 1976, and I looked at him, that little miracle. There was an aura about him. I was so amazed at the miracle of that child, you could have convinced me that he was the second coming of Jesus Christ himself, that aura about him.

I was stunned. I was so drawn to him, drawn to that miracle. I had to go to work later on that day, and I was sitting there working and I was thinking: Could anybody take that little baby's life now, now that he is these few hours old? Could they take his life when he is an hour old? Could they take his life at the moment he was born when he burst forth into the delivery room and began to cry and gurgle and scream and experience the harshness of birth, which has got to be a stunning thing—I am kind of glad, maybe, I don't remember that myself—but I remember his. An absolute miracle.

If they couldn't take his life the minute after he was born, why could they take it the minute before he was born or the hour or the day? Or could we take his life the week before he was born or the month or the trimester or another trimester?

You can follow that all the way back to conception. There is no distinct mo-

ment in development of an innocent little baby. Once the sperm fertilizes the egg and you have that unique combination of DNA, from there on, there is no distinct moment or instant.

I would like to protect those babies from that moment on, but we can't prove that fertilization, conception today, medically, in that instant, but we can with a heartbeat. Anyone that has heard a heartbeat knows that that beating heart tells us there is life. It speaks to our hearts and it speaks to our consciences.

It is impossible to be a moral human being and make an argument that taking the life of a little baby with a beating heart somehow is justifiable, when we know the potential for that little baby is as great as our own in almost every case.

Even if they are not, we have a case that looks like its going before the Supreme Court that bans the abortion of a baby that might be diagnosed with a disease, particularly—an affliction, I should call it—Down syndrome. In Indiana, now-Vice President MIKE PENCE signed the bill. These are some of the most lovable human beings on the planet. They have a heart in them that seems to have more love than the average heart in the rest of us. They have banned the abortion of Down syndrome babies in Indiana.

Now, what is curious is, the way that is left, maybe that is upheld in the Supreme Court, maybe it is not, but if it is upheld in the Supreme Court, it leaves the door open for abortion on demand for others who are not diagnosed.

So does it say that there will be babies of whom they will deny the diagnosis of the affliction of Down syndrome so they can be aborted?

These moral questions should not be answered at all by a civilized society. They should be answered by this: a unique human being created at the moment of conception. We can be certain of that when that baby has a beating heart. If we stop that beating heart, we are ending an innocent human life. That is the question. I would like to start it at the moment of conception, but from a beating heart, that is the time that we can prove it.

Now, everybody knows it. Everybody knows it because we have ultrasounds and the audio of that 161 beats a minute. That little granddaughter of mine that, Lord willing, we are expecting her arrival the last week or so in July, that strong, purposeful heart is beating at 161 beats a minute. We can't stop that life because it is inconvenient, because somebody is inconvenienced by a pregnancy.

Why is it that abortion came along shortly after the contraceptives became so available everywhere, all the time, to anybody?

□ 1315

I remember when birth control pills came in, about the mid-sixties. Shortly after that, here is abortion on demand in 1973. If ever there was contraception

available on demand, they became available within the decade before *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*.

Why did that happen? The least excuse possible was when contraceptives became the most available possible. That all happened almost simultaneously.

And by the way, it was my generation coming of age at the time that that happened, Mr. Speaker.

So I urge National Right to Life to lead, follow, or get out of the way. I would be awfully happy if you join in and follow, because we know this: there will be a turnover in the United States Supreme Court. We know that the President of the United States has pledged that he will make nominations to the Supreme Court off of the list of 21 that was approved by The Federalist Society, by The Heritage Foundation, and, if it matters, also by me.

The first appointment out of that list of 21 is Neil Gorsuch. I think we can be very optimistic about the decisions that he will bring down, from what I know of him and his history and the conversations I have had with the people who have known him for a lifetime. I am very, very impressed with Neil Gorsuch. I might have disagreed with him already on a case a week ago, but I am very impressed with him, with his jurisprudence, and with the principles that he carries within him.

I would like to let the world know, Mr. Speaker, that when they interviewed the other candidates for Supreme Court, which I learned from White House counsel, they interviewed all 21 on The Federalist Society's list. And of those 21, they asked them all the same question, a whole series of questions, but they all got one same question, at least, and that was: If it is not to be you who would be nominated for the Supreme Court, who should it be? And of the other 20 who were interviewed, every one answered Neil Gorsuch. What a powerful endorsement of a man's jurisprudence, of a man's character, of a man's support among his peers.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that I could easily find 20 Members among this Congress who would say those same things about me, but I would have to hand-pick them. Neil Gorsuch didn't hand-pick those 20. They were listed by The Federalist Society and supported by The Heritage Foundation. His peers, universally, said Neil Gorsuch is the best pick. "If you can't pick me, Neil Gorsuch is the best pick," was their answer.

I would like to know what Neil Gorsuch said when he was asked that question. We may never know that, or perhaps that will be the next appointment to the Supreme Court.

But the rumors about Justice Kennedy retiring, not substantiated. They have been coming back a little more all along. We don't know what he might do, but we do know that time moves on. Turnovers do happen in the Supreme Court. They are eventually

inevitable. When that happens, we need to be ready.

It won't do for us to sit on our hands in the House of Representatives, for the Senators to sit on their hands and to wait for a configuration of the Court to come around in such a way that we have great confidence that they will find in favor of life, no. Instead, we need to do our job; and our job is to move the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490, off the floor of the House of Representatives and send it over to the Senate.

It will take some serious work to get that done over there at the Senate, Mr. Speaker, and I think we can get there. But if we are knocking on the door in the Senate, then the Senators who are running for office, and especially a good number of them who are, some say, vulnerable in conservative States, States that Donald Trump won—they have been getting a little more conservative the closer they get to their reelection, and we have got a shot.

We have got a shot to put together, maybe after this next election, the 60 votes necessary; and we have got a shot, also, at the Senate changing the rules so they are no longer handcuffed by the filibuster rule and the requirement of 60 votes for cloture in the Senate. We can't control that, the other side of us. We can influence it perhaps, but we can't control it.

We can control what we do here. That means we have to bring Heartbeat to the floor of the House of Representatives, and we need to get the votes on it to do it. We need to send it over to the Senate. And a way to do that now is for National Right to Life to pick up the phone, call the Speaker, and say: Mr. Speaker, take this cup from me; I don't want this responsibility. The guilt will be too heavy if there is an appointment to the Supreme Court and the Heartbeat bill hasn't gotten there because we wouldn't let it come to the floor of the House of Representatives.

That is the guilt they have to carry.

By the way, this configuration hasn't existed in 45 years, where we had the windows open of a pro-life majority in the House and in the Senate and a President who will sign it and a Supreme Court that we have confidence will find in favor of life. It hasn't existed in 45 years. So, if we wait for a Court to get lined up in a way that pleases us, we might well wind up with no way to open up one of the other three windows necessary to get it to the Court.

So why wouldn't we move the ball down the road as far as we can get it, get this thing out of the House of Representatives. Sit it on the desk of MITCH MCCONNELL. If MITCH can't get that up this year before the elections in November, or even before the transition takes place in lame duck session, fine. We will start again next January. We will bring Heartbeat here again. We will send it to the Senate again, and the new Senators can deal with it.

And maybe they change the rule at that point so that a simple vote—even

a 50-50 tie with MIKE PENCE there resolves this thing, sends it to Donald Trump. Donald Trump signs it with MIKE PENCE standing by his side. We send it to a Court that, by then, perhaps, has a new Supreme Court Justice there who would support our Constitution, the rule of law, we the people, the will of the people, and defend the obligation which we have, which is an obligation to defend life first, liberty second, pursuit of happiness third, or, according to the 14th Amendment, property third—those priorities.

It is our obligation by Declaration of Independence, it is our obligation by Constitution, it is our obligation by the 14th Amendment, it is our obligation by every measure of humanity that I know of to protect life.

I'll get to this closer, here, before I yield to Mr. CARTER.

I was listening to Father Jonathan Morris of New York on FOX News one morning. He was talking about how, when he is celebrating mass in his home church, when the mothers who bring their babies in, when the babies start to cry, they get up and carry the babies out of the church. And he said: I don't know why they would carry those babies out of the church. They think those crying babies annoy me for some reason. But we should always remember, those babies, those gurgling babies, those crying babies, are the only innocent voices in the entire church.

And these babies are the most innocent among us, except the unborn babies don't have a voice. They can't cry out to us from anywhere except from Heaven. And they do cry out to us from Heaven, and we do have an obligation to hear them and to ask for forgiveness for what we have done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my part of this, at least for the moment, and am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER). And I would note that the clock runs out at about 1:32, for the gentleman's information.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. BUDDY CARTER.

HONORING PATRICIA "TRISH" DEPRIEST

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Patricia "Trish" DePriest, who will be retiring this week as a case-work manager after 34 years of working for the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Ms. DePriest has been referred to as the dame of Savannah's political scene but is, frankly, so much more than that. She has worked for three consecutive Members of Congress from Georgia's First Congressional District. She started working in 1983 for Congressman Lindsey Thomas. After that, she worked for Congressman Jack Kingston. Now she works for me.

One of the first questions that I got when I was elected to this office came from a lot of constituents who said, "Are you going to keep Trish?" And I

would just think to myself, “A better question is: Is Trish going to keep me?”

Well, fortunately, she did, and I am glad she did. Throughout the First Congressional District of Georgia, if you say Trish's name, nearly everyone you speak to will have either a story about how she helped them or at least know someone whom she had helped.

She has pushed passport applications. She is a passport expert. No one knows the passport system better than Trish DePriest, I assure you. She has passed through passport applications with lightning speed.

She has pulled veterans benefits out of the most unlikely situations and cleared up entanglements in Social Security checks in order to get constituents back on their feet, and oftentimes at a low point in their lives.

Constituents who come to Ms. DePriest often have nowhere else to turn, yet she is the secret weapon that always seems to come through in the most desperate situations.

One of her most famous cases includes helping a man who, quite literally, woke up next to a dumpster in Richmond Hill, Georgia, with no memory at all of any friends, of any family, or of his past life. Trish was tasked with helping build it back again from ground zero. To give you a sense of her blunt personality, she told the Savannah Morning News: “It’s like he appeared here from another planet.”

After 34 years of working for Congress, she has developed personal relationships with all the relevant staff members at each government agency, allowing her to perform her mighty tasks for constituents that other caseworkers may take years to develop.

She has learned throughout her years to always ask constituents for the other side of the story, which she has become famous for drawing out, while using this to her advantage in performing casework. A countless number of constituents whom she has helped out over the years come in and out of the Savannah office each day just to chat with Trish, update her on their lives, and become her friend.

Her bluntness and wit, her intelligence and sense of caring not only keep constituents coming back for her friendship, but keep her own work colleagues with a high level of morale.

But Ms. DePriest, Trish, is more than just an excellent caseworker and staple of government in the First Congressional District of Georgia. Trish was a loving spouse of 50 years to her husband, Joseph Roy DePriest, Jr., who passed away in 2012. She is a caring mother to Lisanne and Jamey.

She is also a breast cancer survivor, a testament to her strong will. In fitting fashion, when Trish was told of her diagnosis of breast cancer, she says she was more mad than scared and decided to jump in feet first and attack the problem—and that she did.

There will never be another Trish DePriest for the First Congressional

District of Georgia, but I know she will be around, helping other people wherever she can, and I hope everyone learns from her abundance of knowledge and her outlook on life.

Trish, we are going to miss you in the office. We are going to miss you a lot. We want you to have a happy and a well-deserved retirement. Thank you for your service to the people of the First Congressional District of Georgia.

God bless you, Trish.

□ 1330

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASO). 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, it is always an honor to speak here, and especially to follow friends—very dear friends—hear STEVE KING talk about the importance of life.

I know there is historical accounts in the Old Testament when it talked about different kings and what went on while they were there. It normally says something like: “and he did evil in the eyes of the Lord,” or “he did right in the eyes of the Lord.”

And every now and then, there is an addition to emphasize just how evil the people were. A society was under a particular king in Israel, and that addition was whenever—now and then, it would mention that mothers and fathers were sacrificing their babies on the altar of some idol.

And only if you believe the Old Testament, like the majority of Americans have for all our history, that ought to be quite an awakening when you realize that we have killed over 60 million babies.

I have talked to so many women who are brokenhearted, and they have got to learn to give it up and move on, but it eats away at them, the thought that they allowed a precious life to be taken that nature had entrusted them with. So, anyway, I just hate to see any women eaten up with guilt.

And it is not because there is a pro-life movement. It was there long before a pro-life movement. I hope that we can get the Heartbeat bill that my friend STEVE KING was advocating, I hope we could get that passed and get it to the Supreme Court.

Some of the rulings over the years have had to do with the ambiguity, the vagaries in at what point an abortion was no longer allowed. But any of us, if you see someone hurt and you want to find out if they are alive, you run up and you check. And if you find a heartbeat, then you call an ambulance—you call 911 and ask for an ambulance. If there is no heartbeat, then you report a dead body, and there is no lifesaving effort at all made if there is no heartbeat.

So I thought it was brilliant to have an approach like that. There are still

some vagaries as to when a child first starts feeling pain in the womb, but there is no question, if you have on videotape evidence of the heartbeat, you see it, you hear it, then that is not so obscure that even some of the dense heads at the Supreme Court would be able to realize, yup, that is proof positive, that is hard, objective proof that there is a life and being worth protecting.

So I really applaud and join in with my friend STEVE KING's efforts, and we hope that even the last holdout pro-life groups, the National Right to Life, would get onboard. Most of us here that are pro-life, if we hear that there is any bill that will save innocent lives, we get onboard; count me in; I want to be part of it; I want to support it. So it is really intriguing when we have a bill that will save lives, even more than bills that that person or that group is already sponsoring.

And if anybody holds back, I don't know—there is not a good reason for holding back, and hopefully, it is not just for selfish reasons. Because the real pro-life folks, we support anybody's bill. We don't care. If one of my Democrat friends bring it, it doesn't matter. If it is a good bill, we want to be there for it.

I have just finished filing, just moments ago, a new bill, and it has come over a long period of time—agonizing. Especially having been a felony judge, handled major civil litigation as well, and then having been briefly a chief justice of a court of appeals, when I see judges that are so immoral and outrageously unconstitutional that they become monarchs in their own little kingdoms, and they refuse to follow the Constitution like I did—I wanted to legislate. I disagreed with laws that existed, and especially some Federal laws that existed, so when my term was up, I didn't—the Governor offered to appoint me to another appeals position, and I said: “No, I want to legislate.”

And to legislate, I have to run for office to do that as a legislator. So I ran for Congress, and it was—it required financial sacrifice of basically everything my wife and I had, except our home and our cars, but, hopefully, before long, we will finish paying off our kids' college loans. They shouldn't have to pay them because, before I went on the bench, we had money set aside to deal with that.

But in the major financial adjustment from what I was making to what I made on the bench as a judge, that was part of the sacrifice, and I didn't want my kids to have to suffer—my wife and I didn't—because I chose to be a public servant.

But coming to legislature, here is the way you legislate. And we have too many judges that have not only been legislating, but on the issues of immigration, asylum, naturalization, DACA, we have had judges become all three branches. To me, that means they need to be removed from office—just removed. They need to be impeached and removed from the bench.

Doing that much damage to our constitutional system of restraint, of checks and balances, they have blown away all the checks and balances, and the only check on them, they think, ought to be in a higher court.

Unfortunately, we have people on the Supreme Court that are violating the Constitution, violating their oath, which, of course, would be a basis for removal. But they have become legislators, and anyone who can read, can read the Constitution and see where the power is on naturalization, immigration: it is in the Congress.

And there are certain executive powers that are newer to the executive branch, to the President—through the President to the immigration authorities, and we have judges that have usurped executive power, congressional power. And Congress has given certain authority to the President that we have the power to do.

And then to have judges come in and make national security decisions when they have a fraction, a tiny, tiny fraction of the information needed to make adequate national security decisions, that is why the Constitution did not put national security decisions in the hands of the courts.

So under our immigration laws that Congress had full authority to pass and did, immigration courts were set up. Now, I had quite significant concerns when I realized that Eric Holder, as Attorney General, then Loretta Lynch, they appointed all of the immigration judges without any other confirmation requirement. They just could pick them, and they served. That was a bit alarming.

And in previous legislation, I had assurances that my concerns would be fixed and we would come up with a way to confirm immigration judges. We still don't have a consensus on that. But nonetheless, in view of some of the decisions in recent days where a district judge in a small district in the United States, one little district in one State decides a national security issue for the whole country, it is outrageous.

Putting this Nation at risk because of their constitutional violations, which means their violations of their oath—and I agree with my friends here in Congress that say it is time to start bringing those people—I believe my friend, JEFF DUNCAN, was mentioning it earlier today. It is time to bring judges like that before our Judiciary Committee and vote to impeach them for violating their oath, violating the Constitution. Violating an oath is, I think, quite a significant charge in and of itself. It is a crime. But we have got to do something to rein in the runaway judiciary.

You know, the Founders, numerous of them had commented the judiciary will be the least threat to our checks and balances because they will have the least power. But somehow, all these years later, since 1789, when the Constitution was ratified, the judicial part of our government has become

really the biggest threat to checks and balances, to the constitutional restraints on power, which means they are a threat to our ongoing representative form of government.

So we obviously have to have quick decisions, quicker than have been made, regarding immigration status. And of course, the judges that Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch appointed had no problem at all saying: Okay. Here is your notice. We are not going to restrain you. You can go wherever you want, but come back in 4 years for a hearing.

And, of course, most of them never came back. And many of them, turns out, they have gotten taxpayer IDs so they can file tax returns, not for the purpose of paying more tax, but so that they can get back more tax than they paid in by claiming a bunch of children.

There have been TV stations and others that have looked into specific claims and found there is some places where there would be one house, dozens of kids would be allegedly in that house being claimed as dependents, and different families claiming dependents, but there is no telling how much.

I am sure it is billions of dollars that have been paid out to people illegally in the country for claiming that they have children. Some have been found. Okay, they had children, but they were in Mexico or Central America, and yet we are paying them for being here as illegal aliens, and not just through earned income tax credit—or the child tax credit, rather, but also for all kinds of benefits that they sign up for and get—food stamps, right on along the line.

But in order to stop one little district judge in one remote part of the country from deciding national security issues that put American citizens at risk, it is time to do what constitutional law professors have talked about for years—maybe not in some Ivy League schools where they don't really teach the Constitution. They teach how to avoid the Constitution.

But as my constitutional law professor, David Guinn, used to say at Baylor Law School, there is only one Federal court, tribunal of any kind that owes its existence to the Constitution, that is the Supreme Court. Every other Federal court owes its existence and its jurisdiction to the United States Congress. Now, that is the Constitution.

So, as some have said, Congress has the power to bring courts into the world, and we have the power to take them out. We have the power to say: This is your jurisdiction, and no more, or you will take on this area.

□ 1345

So we created immigration courts. We do need them, and we have to have them make decisions much more quickly. That is one of the things I am so grateful to Jeff Sessions for. He is appointing great immigration judges.

They are making decisions as quickly as possible, so they don't leave people in limbo for years, like was done in the past 8, or prior to the Trump administration. So he is making progress there.

But since Congress clearly has the power to set the jurisdiction for every Federal court tribunal of any kind, then it is time to do what my new bill—and I just got the number, and I appreciate the clerk's quick and efficient efforts—but this now will be H.R. 5648. It says:

To amend title 28 of the U.S. Code, to provide for Supreme Court original jurisdiction over certain immigration actions, and for other purposes.

Here is what it says on page 2:

The Supreme Court and any immigration court established under the immigration laws, as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, are the only courts that shall have jurisdiction in which a claimant shall have standing to raise issues of immigration, naturalization, refugee status, asylum, and any other related matter or case involving a claimed right to enter or remain in the United States, or any case or controversy of any provision of the immigration laws, or any order issued or rule made pursuant thereto.

In other words, we need to end these runaway rapsallion judges who got through a confirmation by hook or crook and showed their real colors when they got out on the bench that they want to be little monarchs. It is time to rein in their jurisdiction so they can do no further damage to this Nation to our national security, which was never placed in the hands of the judiciary, it was always to be in the hands of the President and the Congress.

I hope we can get plenty of cosponsors and bring that to the floor. I really believe that, in this election year, if we can get that to the floor and pass it here in the House, then, in this election year, there could be so much pressure brought to bear on Senators down the hall.

We ought to be able to get it passed. It may be a long shot, but it was a long shot that the little 13 colonies could take on the most powerful country in the world, the most powerful Navy, the most powerful Army in the world, and win their independence, but they did. That is the hope that springs internal in the human breast. We have to start somewhere, and that is a start.

Now, it took me weeks to get it done, but I have written an article recently. Giving attribution, there are many other articles and sources I used in accumulating these 48 pages. But after standing up a number of times in our conference and pointing out to the Republicans in conference that any Republican who says they know Robert Mueller will be fair or come to a fair decision or a fair conclusion or be just, they don't know the Robert Mueller I know. Here is where you get into a lot of different opinions, but that is where it is helpful to look at things that he has done in his life.

I had hoped that, because he seemed clearly to be a person who should never have accepted the job of special counsel, that he was recusable. He was not qualified to be the special counsel on anything involving Russia, and certainly not the Trump campaign and Russia. Yet Rod Rosenstein, as the deputy AG, who had been involved in the Russia illegal attempts to gain control of U.S. uranium—and they knew that Russia was committing crimes to try to get our uranium—and Mueller was the head of the FBI, and he was the lead law enforcement person overseeing the operation, there was an informant within the system that was providing information to the Justice Department to Rosenstein and Mueller. Yet they put the kibosh on the investigation and the crimes that were being committed to get U.S. uranium. If they had not, then the sale of U.S. uranium that would end up in the hands of Russia would never have been allowed to go through.

CFIUS that approves sales that are sensitive to our security, they surely could never have approved the sale if Rosenstein and Mueller had just been honest and open that there is an investigation to Russia's illegal attempts to get our uranium. But, if they had spoken up about that, I don't think there is any question that the Clinton Foundation would never have gotten \$145 million in contributions from people involved with the uranium sale. And it is quite likely that Bill Clinton would not have gotten \$500,000 to speak for 20 minutes from Russia.

But I have written an article, 48 pages, entitled: "Robert Mueller: Unmasked." You can go to my website. You can go to Sean Hannity's website, or others. I wouldn't do it on Google because of their dishonesty when it comes to conservatives. But DuckDuckGo. Bing is not as bad as Google. But look up "Robert Mueller: Unmasked" and download this article, read it, and arrive at your own opinion.

This week, I found an article I had not seen before, by Eren Moreno, back in January of this year, entitled "Mueller, Rosenstein, and McCabe Exposed Covering Hillary's Uranium One Scandal." At the end of the article, they reference a succinct recitation of things that have occurred. We don't know who this person is. He has used an anonymous name. But here is the thread. He says: "As we now know, the DOJ have indicted a Mark Lambert on 11 counts related to his role in a bribery, money laundering, and kickback scheme."

Involving the sale of our uranium that would end up in Russian hands.

So they finally indicted somebody over this. There have been others who have been quietly handled, and they are referenced here.

And they reference an article here from the New York Post. It says: "Exec charged with bribing Russian official in uranium deal. There's an indictment in the FBI probe of the Uranium One

scandal, in which the Obama administration cleared a business deal that gave a Russian company control of 20 percent of the U.S. uranium."

"Background and reminder: from at least 2008, Robert Mueller's FBI were investigating Tenam, the U.S.-based subsidiary of Tenex, a subsidiary of Rosatom, the Kremlin's (Putin's) energy company. The same Rosatom that purchased Uranium One."

"Tenam was importing Russian uranium into the U.S. Between 2004–2014, the local manager, Mikerin, engaged with U.S. companies Transport Logistics (TL) and NexGen Security in a racketeering, wire fraud, bribery, and money laundering scheme."

"When a TL insider, William Campbell, blew the whistle on what he was seeing, Mueller's FBI started an investigation that led to at least four indictments by Holder's DOJ."

"Remember—the Tenam investigation is related to the Uranium One (U1) sale. That's because the Tenam investigation was hidden from Congress and CFIUS—the group that analyzes and approves or disapproves foreign investments in the U.S.—'who approved the U1 sale in October 2010. If either had known about it, it's highly unlikely the U1 sale would have been approved.'"

"And the more you analyze the Tenam investigation, the more it appears that the Obama administration and/or Clintons deliberately wanted it hidden. Consider."

"William Campbell—the whistleblower. . . ."

He is the one who was providing information to Mueller's FBI about the illegal acts of Russia.

Now, there are times that the witness wants witness protection, wants to be anonymous, and doesn't want anybody to know who he was, or who she was, and so for those reasons of the informant's safety it is not given. But that was not the case.

Mueller at the FBI, the DOJ took a very unusual step. Instead of preventing others from knowing who this person was, they went after William Campbell and made him sign—under threat that they would come after and prosecute him—made him sign a non-disclosure agreement. Incredible.

They didn't want—Rosenstein, who is the U.S. attorney over the investigation—they didn't want Campbell out telling about all of the crimes committed in Russia's acquisition of U.S. uranium. They have their own informant sign a nondisclosure agreement under threat so he wouldn't let anybody know about all the criminality surrounding Russia's efforts to get our uranium. That doesn't make sense, unless you know how much money came into the Clinton Foundation after the deal was approved.

This goes on. It says: "Now consider this—none of the four indictments ever saw the light of day."

Actually, that is not quite accurate. They just handled it very quietly. It says: "Every one was either quietly

settled under plea agreements, or dropped entirely, as follows."

"Mikerin, the Tenam manager, was sentenced to 48 months under a plea deal, for crimes that had 20-plus year sentences."

That was in: "United States of America v. Vadim Mikerin—Original Indictment 11/12/14. Conspiracy to Interfere with Interstate Commerce by Extortion . . . Forfeiture."

Darren Condrey had a plea agreement regarding his violations of antibribery and conspiracy laws.

Carol Condrey had a plea agreement, and her case was dropped.

Rubizhevsky from NexGen had the case settled with a plea agreement. That is astonishing given the charges.

This stinks to high heaven. Mueller needs to go ahead and recuse himself and step down, and Rosenstein should do the same thing.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of medical reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 1, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

4703. Under clause 2 of rule XIV, a letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-317, "Office of Administrative Hearings Jurisdiction Expansion Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on 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 follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3997. A bill to waive the application fee for any special use permit for veterans demonstrations and special events at war memorials on Federal land, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2152. A bill to require States and units of local government receiving funds under grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds

for pretrial services programs, to submit to the Attorney General a report relating to such program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-659). 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 Mrs. HANDEL (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 5645. A bill to amend the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that the Federal Trade Commission shall exercise authority with respect to mergers only under the Clayton Act and only in the same procedural manner as the Attorney General exercises such authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. STEWART, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 5646. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit to Congress a report on opioids prescribing practices for pregnant women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 5647. A bill to include Hungary in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E1 and E2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of Hungary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 5648. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for Supreme Court original jurisdiction over certain immigration actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 5649. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to amend the Social Security Act, and to direct the Secretaries of Veterans Affairs, Defense, Labor, and Homeland Security, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, to take certain actions to improve transition assistance to members of the Armed Forces who separate, retire, or are discharged from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 5650. A bill to direct the Attorney General to make grants to States that have in place laws that expand the protections offered to victims of sex offenses who are not in a familiar or dating relationship with the perpetrators of such offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. SOTO, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5651. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the foreign insurer excise tax certain insurance policies issued by United States territory and posses-

sion insurers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 5652. A bill to prohibit the transfer of a firearm to a person whose State license to purchase, own, or possess a firearm has been revoked, or a person who has been ordered by a State court to surrender all firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MARINO, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 5653. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that any alien who has been convicted of a felony or two misdemeanors, is deportable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas (for himself and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 5654. A bill to amend the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 to include the rural development voucher program as a covered housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 5655. A bill to establish the Camp Nelson Heritage National Monument in the State of Kentucky as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5656. A bill to clarify the meaning of the term 'prevailing party' with regard to the recovery of attorneys' fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 5657. A bill to establish the registration of violent gun offenders, provide for sufficient notification of their whereabouts, to honor the memory of Gladys Ricart and other gun crime victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 5658. A bill to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to clarify the definition of competitive integrated employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 5659. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to provide relief from the Volcker Rule for community banks; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 5660. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide coverage under such Act for credit cards issued to small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 5661. A bill to improve access by Indian tribes to support from the Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support program (E-rate) of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the charitable mileage rate with the business travel rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTINGER:

H.R. 5663. A bill to cut federal funding of Sanctuary Cities and use those funds for building a wall on the border with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5664. A bill to require a report on the possible exploitation of virtual currencies by terrorist actors, to authorize a competition program to identify regulatory solutions and develop technology with respect to counter terror threat financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 5665. A bill to amend the Labor-management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to clarify the term labor organization; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 5666. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to include the State insurance commissioner as a voting member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5667. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to reauthorize the Acer Access and Development Program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HECK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. MEEKS):

H. Res. 855. A resolution recognizing the Nordic Heritage Museum in Seattle, Washington, as the National Nordic Museum; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 856. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr.

TAKANO, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. VELA):

H. Res. 857. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of April 29, 2018, through May 5, 2018, as “National Small Business Week” to honor the vital role of small business and the passion of entrepreneurs in the United States; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HURD, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H. Res. 858. A resolution recognizing the 300th anniversary of the founding of the city of San Antonio, Texas; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. LEE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. PINGREE):

H. Res. 859. A resolution recognizing the contributions of senior volunteers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. PALLONE, MISS RICE of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. LEE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KILMER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CORREA):

H. Res. 860. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of GLSEN’s 2018 national “Day of Silence” in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Mr. YOHIO):

H. Res. 861. A resolution supporting the President’s diplomatic efforts on the Korean Peninsula; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. BUCK):

H. Res. 862. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of legislation in the House unless the text of the legislation which will be considered has been made publicly available in electronic form for a mandatory minimum review period; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN,

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. KIND):

H. Res. 863. A resolution honoring Velvlea “Vel” Phillips for a life of public service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MENG, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mrs. HANDEL):

H. Res. 864. A resolution recognizing the seriousness of Polycystic Ovary Syndrome (PCOS) and expressing support for the designation of the month of September 2018 as “PCOS Awareness Month”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. LANDEVIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H. Res. 865. A resolution honoring Tracy K. Smith for her selection by the Librarian of Congress as the 22d Poet Laureate of the United States and recognizing her great accomplishments; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

188. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2004, urging the United States Congress and the Arizona Medical Community to Take Action Against State-Sanctioned Organ Transplant Practices in China; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

189. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial 1007, urging the United States Congress to Reauthorize Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act Funding; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois introduced a bill (H.R. 5668) for the relief of Mykhaylo Gnatyuk and Melnik Gnatyuk; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representa-

tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. HANDEL:

H.R. 5645.

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

Article I, Section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5646.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress Under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 5647.

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

Article 1, Section 8 to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 5648.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 5649.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5650.

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

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

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 5651.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; [. . .]

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; [. . .]—And

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.

Moreover, the Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 5652.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 5653.

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

Article 1, section 8, clause 4, (the Naturalization Clause) which gives Congress sovereign control over immigration. In *Chirac v.*

Lessee of Chirac (1817), the Supreme Court affirmed that the Constitution grants Congress Plenary power on immigration policy. Further, in *Galvan v. Press* (1954) the court found “that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and the right to remain here] is entrusted to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government.” Finally, in *Sessions v. Dimaya* (2018), when discussing the aggravated felony definition in section 101(a)(43)(F) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), Justice Neil Gorsuch issued an opinion stating, “Congress remains free at any time to add more crimes to its list. It remains free, as well, to write a new residual clause that affords the fair notice lacking here. Congress might, for example, say that a conviction for any felony carrying a prison sentence of a specified length opens an alien to removal. Congress has done almost exactly this in other laws . . .”

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:
H.R. 5654.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BARR:
H.R. 5655.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: “The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.”

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 5656.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:
H.R. 5657.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or
Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. GROTHMAN:
H.R. 5658.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mrs. LOVE:
H.R. 5659.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: “The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Mrs. LOWEY:
H.R. 5660.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
United States Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:
H.R. 5661.

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

Article I, Section 8
By Mr. NOLAN:
H.R. 5662.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PITTENGER:
H.R. 5663.

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

Article I Section 8 of the US Constitution
By Miss RICE of New York:
H.R. 5664.

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

Article I, Section VIII
By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:
H.R. 5665.

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

Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. ROSS:
H.R. 5666.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—The Congress shall have the Power to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WELCH:
H.R. 5667.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 5668

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

Under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 173: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 547: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 559: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 685: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 792: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 811: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 846: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 930: Mr. DENT and Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 959: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1123: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1212: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1421: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 1444: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1552: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 1606: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1676: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1841: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1864: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 1881: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1910: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1972: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2077: Mr. TURNER and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 2215: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2267: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2310: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 2319: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2482: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 2528: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2561: Mr. BUDD and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2640: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2832: Mr. CURTIS.
H.R. 2860: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 2871: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 3006: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 3023: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3174: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 3197: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 3246: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 3252: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 3440: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 3495: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 3596: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 3671: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3721: Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 3738: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 3792: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3861: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 3931: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3941: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4022: Mr. HIMES and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4083: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 4231: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 4240: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 4265: Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 4311: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4334: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 4349: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4350: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4351: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4352: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4353: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4354: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4355: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4356: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4357: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4358: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4548: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4596: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 4733: Mr. LAMB, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 4796: Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 4843: Mr. SUOZZI and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 4984: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5038: Mr. POCAN and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 5041: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 5042: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 5049: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5108: Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 5113: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 5137: Mr. LAMB and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5173: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 5190: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 5193: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5212: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 5226: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 5256: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 5306: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 5350: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5383: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 5464: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 5476: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 5510: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 5531: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5573: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 5574: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
 H.R. 5593: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 5604: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H.R. 5631: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 5644: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H. Res. 69: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H. Res. 188: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H. Res. 758: Ms. MOORE.
 H. Res. 781: Ms. LEE and Ms. MATSUI.
 H. Res. 789: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. CRIST.
 H. Res. 818: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 827: Mr. POCAN.
 H. Res. 834: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H. Res. 835: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MENG, Mr. MAST, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H. Res. 837: Mr. RASKIN.
 H. Res. 849: Mr. RASKIN.
 H. Res. 850: Mr. POCAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. KAPTUR.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
 PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H. Res. 774: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
 ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 8 by Mr. COHEN on H.R. 4669: Mr. Gottheimer.