



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2018

No. 6

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 10, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ADRIAN SMITH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

TAX BILL RAMIFICATIONS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the phrases one often hears is, "I hate to say I told you so." And it is delivered with a feigned sincerity, but usually people actually like to say, "I told you so."

I must confess that I have some of those feelings myself, as repeatedly during the few hours the Ways and Means Committee met, rushing

through the massive tax cut, the largest transfer of wealth in our Nation's history, which will be paid for on the backs of our children and grandchildren with increased debt and benefiting people who in the main don't need it—I said at the time that each week after this bill passed, if it did, we would have a series of embarrassing stories about mistakes and oversight and special interest provisions that were stuck into it.

Well, actually, the fact is that that was somewhat understated because we are seeing, literally, every day people understand what was tucked in the bill: mistakes, oversight, and special interest provisions.

For example, there is a provision in the bill that was, we were told, designed to help small craft brewers. That is important to me and the people I represent, and there is broad support for minor provisions that would be able to help them by reducing their tax liability. But the provision that ended up in the final bill has massive opportunities to benefit large producers—a little bit for small craft brewers, but for large, international distillers, an opportunity to reconfigure how they do business to take advantage of multiple opportunities for that tax break.

There was an article yesterday talking about how the tax rate for American companies that manufacture overseas, the tax on that activity will be half as much as if they were manufacturing in the United States, providing an incentive to offshore jobs at a time when most of us would like to make sure that it is, here at home, at least, a level playing field, not to disadvantage people manufacturing here at home.

And, of course, there is another story in today's Wall Street Journal, "Tax Law's Effect Fuels Farm Outcry," because there was a provision inserted in the bill that would give farmers a more lucrative deduction when they sell ag-

ricultural products directly to farm cooperatives. There is a story about one gentleman in there who felt that this could put him out of business. It is going to sting large agribusinesses like Cargill and Archer Daniels Midland. The new provision could reshape parts of the agriculture economy and sharply reduce many farmers' taxes as well as scrambling these individual businesses.

John Power, a North Dakota accountant who was the accountant for the small grain operator who is going to be hammered, said: "It is kind of hard to imagine they intended to make farming tax free. Fixing it becomes difficult because they don't think it's something that can be fixed with regulation."

There are a variety of these provisions that are a result of not following what we call "regular order," without having hearings on the provision, of allowing lobbyists and staff to be able to draft the bill on the fly without having members of the committee—not just Democrats, but Republicans—fully know what was in it. That is legislative malpractice. It is one of the reasons why, despite giving over \$3 trillion of tax cuts, the bill remains unpopular.

Americans are nervous about increasing our national debt over \$2 trillion, and they know that the benefits for average citizens are going to go away in a few years and some are actually going to see tax increases, but the benefits for the top 1 percent and the largest corporations are permanent.

People know that it is not fair, that it is unnecessary, and that it is going to have more and more problems here, not just in States like mine where citizens are no longer going to be able to fully deduct their State and local taxes, property taxes, resulting in significant inequity, in scrambling property values, not just in Oregon, but it is across the country where people are going to be facing these problems.

□ 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.

H85

CELEBRATING PASSAGE OF THE TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 10 years since the Great Recession officially began, when our economy slumped and unemployment climbed to levels not witnessed since the early 1980s, but last month Congress paved the way to create a tax system that is fair, simpler, and one that establishes an environment where our country can unleash our full potential.

Too many Americans are living paycheck to paycheck and have been for too long. Stagnant wages, growing debt, and the inability to save have plagued so many. That is why our tax overhaul is so important. This truly is a once-in-a-generation opportunity that we could not afford to pass up.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will touch every household in the Nation and every corner of our economy. As soon as February, Americans will see more money in their paychecks. When it comes time to file their 2018 taxes, our tax system will be so simple that 9 out of 10 Americans will be able to file on a postcard. The standard deduction will be doubled for individuals and joint filers. Middle class families will also have a significant increase to the child tax credit to help parents with the costs of raising children.

And, Mr. Speaker, for those pursuing opportunity through education, America's students, the graduate tuition voucher exemption and student loan interest deduction remain in our tax reform package. I, and many of my colleagues, urged the conference committee to keep these provisions intact.

Our Tax Code should provide incentives for greater opportunity. For many, this is realized through higher education. The student loan interest deduction helps make higher education more affordable, and based on the most recent yearly data available, 12 million taxpayers benefited from that deduction.

I advocated keeping this provision as well as the graduate tuition voucher exemption and other higher education tax credits as a part of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act because they truly do make a difference in the lives of so many Americans. It makes financing an education possible for many low- and middle-income individuals.

In addition to education, another great cornerstone of the American Dream is homeownership, and, proudly, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will continue to provide tax relief to current and aspiring homeowners alike.

Mr. Speaker, there are many accomplishments in this historic tax overhaul, including lowering the corporate tax rate, which will put our job creators on a level playing field with their global competitors. This has already led to increased bonuses and pay raises

for millions of workers. Quite simply, this bill provides the kind of tax relief that Americans deserve.

We challenged the status quo and the special interests who said it couldn't be done, and we did it. And the American people won.

CELEBRATING MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the upcoming holiday remembering Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

As a lifelong activist fighting for immigrants, civil and human rights, and now as a Member of Congress, Dr. King has been a deep and central inspiration throughout my life. His work has helped me to make possible the path that I have taken, from being a 16-year-old immigrant girl who came to this country by herself for college, to serving, now, as the first Indian-American woman elected to the United States House of Representatives—and it is the courage and the fight of Dr. King that made my journey possible.

I knew of Dr. King first because of his connection to Mahatma Gandhi, a great leader from my own birth country of India. Like Gandhi, Dr. King was a once-in-a-generation leader. Like Gandhi, the problems that Dr. King tackled were once seen as insurmountable problems, institutional barriers of race and class that seemed as if, if taken on, would topple society as we knew it, tall walls of tradition and practice that kept our society segregated and divided.

But that did not stop him from speaking out, organizing, and leading a growing movement that reminded the leaders of our country of the very dream that made America possible: that all men and women were created equal and that we should be judged by the content of our character and not the color of our skin.

Dr. King's gift was in his unique ability to bring truth, compassion, and justice together for a better future and to remind us of how much we share even across our differences. He followed Gandhi's principles of nonviolent resistance, also known as satyagraha: "satya" meaning truth, and "graha" meaning adherence to truth.

Satyagraha then meant insistence on truth, and that is what Dr. King preached and acted upon: truth about ending segregation and discrimination, truth about ending the war in Vietnam, truth about lifting up sanitation workers and ending poverty, truth, ultimately, that it is love and not hate that builds our character and our collective society.

If Dr. King were here with us today, he would call on us to have faith in our fight for justice and to substitute courage for caution. He would call on us to

work passionately and unrelentingly for the very vision of our country that inspires so many around the world, for that more perfect Union that we know is still ahead of us, for that society that remembers that we are all better off when we are all better off.

Dr. King would remind us that justice is what love looks like in public. He would call on us to move into that plane of higher education, that plane of moral consciousness where we simply cannot stand by as injustice occurs around us.

He would call on us to address economic inequality by raising the minimum wage and enacting real tax reform whose benefits accrue to the masses and not to the top 1 percent and the wealthiest corporations.

Dr. King would call on us to pass the Dream Act and support the futures of 1.5 million young people across the country. He would call on us to expand and support the Affordable Care Act and healthcare for everyone so that no one is one healthcare crisis away from bankruptcy.

Our work is still to fight for justice and build that beloved community where each of us has a place to stand regardless of the color of our skin or where we live or how much money we have in our pockets, and in this beloved community, we would tackle the legacies of racism and implicit bias that we all carry with us with courage and with fortitude. We would work together to build that community that inspires us and to leave a world to our children that makes us proud, and, most importantly, we operate always from a place of generosity and abundance rather than fear and scarcity.

From that jail cell in Alabama, Dr. King wrote: "We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny," or, as the great civil rights leader Reverend Joseph Lowery once said to me during the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride: "We may have come over on different ships, but we are all in the same boat now."

To make a difference, to truly serve the people, it only takes courage and coming together as a collective, across the aisle, across rural and urban, across Black, White, and Brown. Dr. King showed us what that really looks like, and he died because he was compelled to stand for making a reality from a dream of what was possible only in a country as great as the United States of America.

Today, as we remember and honor Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., we remember, too, that if we are courageous, if we put people over politics, our actions have the power to change lives, to push that moral arc of the universe more quickly towards justice. As Dr. King said: "We must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back."

□ 1015

CONGRESSMAN TIBERI'S
FAREWELL ADDRESS

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, it has truly been the most remarkable honor to serve the people of Ohio's 12th Congressional District in central Ohio.

It all started in 1999, on my parents' front porch, the house that I grew up in, in a middle class neighborhood in Columbus called Forest Park. There, as the son of Italian immigrants, I learned how blessed I truly was to be an American; first in my family to graduate from high school, to go to high school, work my way through college at The Ohio State University.

See, my mom and dad believed that America was an incredible opportunity. With hard work and a good education, you could do anything. With their sacrifices and their hard work, I am here before you today, and for their sacrifices, I am forever grateful.

Leaving this Congress was not an easy decision. The speech that I made in 1999, on their front porch, still holds true today, the reason why I ran, to help those constituents, not only help them here in Washington, but help them cut through the red tape, to help that veteran, to help that widow on Social Security.

But leaving was important for my family. It was important to support them, to be with them more. My colleagues understand that. The sacrifices that we make, they make more. We put our names on the ballot, our spouses don't, our children don't.

To my colleagues, thank you for your friendship, your mentorship, and, certainly, your wisdom over the years. I will miss you.

To my supporters, who spent countless hours knocking on doors, putting up signs, going on bus tours, I couldn't have done it without you. Thank you.

To my team, both back in Ohio and here in D.C., both past and present, thank you for helping me serve and succeed for the people of Ohio's 12th District.

The late, great Woody Hayes said: "You win with people." You are my people, and we have won together so many battles. I could not have done this without you. Forever Team Tiberi you all will be.

Most importantly, for my wife, Denice; our four daughters, Angelina, Cristina, Daniela, and Gabriela, thank you for all your support over the years. I will look forward to seeing you much more.

Finally, to the constituents of the 12th Congressional District, what an honor, a humbling honor, to serve you for the last 17 years. For a kid who grew up in Columbus, Ohio, in a middle class family, it has truly been an amazing journey. This speech is not good-bye; this speech is see you soon around the corner.

And to that, I wish you all the best here in the United States Congress. God bless you, and God bless America.

SHIELD OUR DREAMERS FROM
DEPORTATION

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we will all certainly miss the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI). He is a wonderful Member, and we have enjoyed his service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, last night, a U.S. District Court Judge ordered the administration to continue accepting renewal applications for DACA recipients. Although this is welcome news, this should not undercut the urgency for us here in Congress to pass a permanent legislative solution to shield our DREAMers from deportation.

This week, I, again, had the great honor of meeting another great group of bright and hardworking young immigrants from my district whose DACA permits will expire in the coming weeks and the coming months. Despite their circumstances, despite living in fear and uncertainty about what their future holds, each one of these individuals has demonstrated great resolve and perseverance to continue the fight.

They visit Members of Congress, they share their unique stories, they provide the facts about their contributions in our communities, and they implore us to give them the opportunity to stay in what they consider to be their home, the United States.

Our DREAMers have suffered long enough, Mr. Speaker, and it is time that we act and take this issue to the finish line. Human lives are, indeed, at stake. Our DREAMers can't live from court decision to court decision.

As Congress has returned this week to begin our second session, I am here, once again, to urge us all to bring to the floor a legislative solution to give our DREAMers the opportunity to work here, to study here in this great country that they know as home. I am confident that we have the votes, Republicans and Democrats, for the House and the Senate to pass this permanent legislative fix. We can, and we must, make this happen now. Let us not wait any longer.

CELEBRATING THE GROUNDBREAKING FOR THE
ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY GUS MACHADO
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate St. Thomas University as it breaks ground on January 24 on the new home for the Gus Machado School of Business. This new facility will empower St. Thomas University to continue its decades-long commitment to providing an excellent, yet affordable, business education to students in south Florida.

The new business school complex will include a state-of-the-art trading room,

cybersecurity center, an entrepreneurship and innovation hub, and many other more exciting spaces. It will also empower the business school to offer 48 undergraduate and graduate degrees.

Most importantly, with its expanded classrooms and robust technology infrastructure, this new facility will keep St. Thomas at the forefront of business education and will enable the university to continue preparing new generations of south Florida business leaders.

I thank Gus Machado for his generous gift and every member of the St. Thomas family who has worked so hard to make this dream a reality.

RECOGNIZING THE LEGACY OF PARKER THOMSON

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Parker Thomson, a renowned attorney and civic leader from Miami who recently passed at the age of 85. Mr. Thomson was known for his work defending the First Amendment during his time with his law firm, Paul & Thomson.

Parker was a leader in advocating for our south Florida environment, involved in cases to protect the Everglades and our pristine beaches.

As the founding chair of the Miami-Dade Performing Arts Center Trust, Mr. Thomson helped lead the charge for the creation of the state-of-the-art Adrienne Arsht Center for the Performing Arts. Parker's commitment to his community was also visible through his advocacy for The Underline project to renovate public spaces in Miami, which is led by his daughter, another pillar of our community, new generation, Meg Daly.

Mr. Thomson represented the spirit of hard work and served as a mentor to coworkers and friends. Parker Thomson has left a legacy of service to his community, one that future generations should seek to emulate.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, this week, we celebrate National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. Law enforcement officers answer the call to public service. They enter into situations that put their lives on the line. When the natural human response to danger is to run away, these brave men and women run toward it, and they do this to protect their communities.

Our law enforcement officers occupy that thin blue line between good and evil. They stand between us and those who wish to do us harm and harm to our families.

To the 780,000 police officers across this country who put on the badge every day, thank you, and God bless.

CONGRATULATING HELEN HAWKINS

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to congratulate Helen Hawkins of Edwardsville, Illinois, for being inducted into the Senior Illinoisans Hall

of Fame. The recognition commemorates the achievements and contributions of citizens age 65 and older. Inductees are selected through a statewide nomination and judging process. The program distinguishes individuals in the areas of community service, education, the work force, and the arts.

Helen is a true public servant who has devoted many years to serving the residents of Madison County and Nameoki Township. Her no-nonsense style may have ruffled some feathers throughout the years, but she has never been afraid to fight for her constituents.

Helen, thank you for your public service.

HONORING BOB BUTLER

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to honor the longest serving mayor in the State of Illinois, Bob Butler, who is a very good friend of Marion. Now, he is a very good friend, but, whenever he first took office, he didn't know me well because I was only 2½ years old. He was first elected in April of 1963, and Bob is retiring this month after 55 years of service.

Bob has always been a straight shooter and a good public servant. His progrowth agenda has helped turn Marion into a regional powerhouse along I-57 in the State of Illinois. In fact, the industrial park in Marion is named after him, and Bob fondly refers to the city of Marion as the hub of the universe. He represents the dedication to public service that should serve as an inspiration to all of us.

Mayor Bob Butler, we honor you, and wish you a happy and well-deserved retirement.

RECOGNIZING SAM AND EVA JONES

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to recognize Sam and Eva Jones of Marion, Illinois. This remarkable couple was first married on September 27, 1936. Now, if you think about that, that was 80 years ago.

Sam worked for Central Illinois Power Service until he retired in 1978. Eva worked at Norge in Herrin and later as a cook for Washington Elementary School. Pillars of the community, they were longtime members of First Baptist Church in Marion and the Williamson County Farm Bureau. In 1993, their farm was honored as Family Farm of the Year by the Farm Bureau.

Sadly, Eva passed last month, at the age of 101. My prayers are with Sam and the entire Jones family. Thank you for making southern Illinois a wonderful place to live. God bless you.

PUERTO RICO'S SHADOW DELEGATION TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) for 5 minutes.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today, after almost 120 years under the American flag, Puerto Rico remains as a colony of the

United States, or under the Territorial Clause, to use the constitutional term.

Our residents are subject to a second class citizenship. For all these years, the Federal Government has denied equal rights to all Puerto Ricans who have, in war and peace, made countless contributions to our Nation; who have bravely fought in every conflict since the Great War, defending our democratic values, yet they are being denied the right to vote for their Commander-in-Chief and have full representation in this Congress.

A large number of them have made the ultimate sacrifice, and when they do, their casket is flown back, covered in an American flag with 50 stars, and without the one representing them.

Puerto Rico has experienced longstanding inequities under Federal laws, which now the whole world has been able to witness firsthand following the devastation caused by Hurricane Maria.

□ 1030

Before that, hundreds of thousands of Puerto Ricans have already rejected this discrimination, choosing, instead, to buy their equality with a one-way airline ticket to Florida or simply changing their State ZIP Code.

Without the equal rights and responsibilities that are only available through statehood, Puerto Rico will never truly recover and prosper from the hurricane effects. That is the reason we demand and deserve statehood for Puerto Rico now. The islands overwhelmingly voted for statehood in 2012 by a margin of 61 percent, and in June of last year, 97 percent of the islands voted again for statehood.

That is the request that brought me here. That is what brings, today, the Governor of Puerto Rico, Ricardo Rosselló, Puerto Rico Senate President Thomas Rivera Schatz, House Speaker Johnny Mendez, and all other elected officials from the island who have come here to witness today's historic introduction of the Puerto Rico shadow delegation to this Congress. That delegation will demand that the United States recognize the will of the people of Puerto Rico to become a State.

This long-awaited action is in accord with the precedents set forth by the Tennessee Plan, adopted by the territories of Tennessee, Michigan, Oregon, California, Iowa, Kansas, and Alaska, which followed a similar path to eventual admission as States.

It is my honor to introduce this delegation of seven members—three Republicans, three Democrats, one Independent, divided into two Senators, five Members to the House—as we become a State.

Pedro Rosselló, former Governor of Puerto Rico, serves as the chair of the delegation; Carlos Romero Barceló to the senate, former Governor and a former Member of the house; Luis Fortuño, former Governor and a former Member of this House; Zoraida Fonalledas, Puerto Rico national com-

mitteewoman and businesswoman; Charlie Rodriguez, State chairman for the DNC and former senate president; Alfonso Aguilar, president of the Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles; and Ivan "Pudge" Rodriguez, a Major League Baseball player inducted into the Hall of Fame.

Puerto Rico has come to this House today to claim the American Dream and to fulfill its destiny, to obtain equality within the Nation, and to unleash our full potential. Statehood will make Puerto Rico stronger, but we, together, will make the United States a more perfect Union.

HONORING SERGEANT MAJOR ROBERT HAWKINS

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Major Robert Hawkins of the United States Army for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to our Nation. Sergeant Major Hawkins will soon transition from his current assignment as an Army Congressional Legislative Liaison Officer in the House of Representatives to serve in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology.

A native of Alexandria, Virginia, Sergeant Major Hawkins began his military career as an airborne infantryman in 1990. He subsequently served in assignments to the Republic of Panama; Fort Myers, Florida; Schofield Barracks, Hawaii; Fort Polk, Louisiana; Fort Bliss, Texas; Fort Campbell, Kentucky; and three times at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Sergeant Major Hawkins has served in multiple leadership and staff positions throughout his distinguished career. His combat deployments include one tour in Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and three tours of combat in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

In 2014, Sergeant Major Hawkins was selected as a fellow in the Army Congressional Fellowship Program. He subsequently served 12 months as a defense legislative fellow in my congressional office, representing the First Congressional District of Minnesota.

While working on our team, I came to know Sergeant Major Hawkins as a shining example of the Army values set forth in the Noncommissioned Officer's Creed. "Competence" is indeed Sergeant Major Hawkins' watchword, and his commitment to doing what good NCOs do, accomplishing every mission, while taking care of his teammates, was second to none.

For the next 2 years, Sergeant Major Hawkins served as a Congressional Legislative Liaison Officer in the United States Army House Liaison Division. As the primary link between House Members, their staff, and the committees, along with the Army, he has provided insight and understanding

of Army policies, actions, operations, and requirements. His firsthand knowledge of the military, its culture, and its tradition has been of tremendous value to congressional offices.

Sergeant Major Hawkins was especially effective in his service to Members and staff as he escorted them on fact-finding and oversight delegations within and outside the United States. Members and staff found him to be a thoughtful, intelligent, dedicated soldier in the very best traditions of America's Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to know and serve with Sergeant Major Hawkins during his time as Army Congressional Fellow and Congressional Legislative Liaison Officer in the House of Representatives.

On behalf of a grateful nation, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service and sacrifice of Sergeant Major Robert "Bobby" Hawkins and his family. I wish Sergeant Major Hawkins the very best as he begins a new chapter of dedicated service to our Nation in the United States Army.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN LARRY WINN, JR.

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the life of a long-time public servant in this body, one of my predecessors, former Third District Congressman from Kansas, Representative Larry Winn.

Larry passed away on New Year's Eve at the remarkable age of 98, and he will be dearly missed by his family and the people of the Third District. Larry will long be remembered in our community and in the Halls of Congress as a devoted public servant.

Representative Winn served in this body for 18 years, from 1967 to 1985. His time in the House spanned across nine Congresses and five Presidential administrations, from Lyndon B. Johnson to Ronald Reagan. He served alongside some of the great statesmen of his time.

Larry's freshman class in the House included later President George H.W. Bush. Larry and his wife, Joan, became good friends with the Bushes, and Joan and Barbara Bush were proud members of a club for congressional spouses called the 66 Club.

Larry became close friends with and greatly respected President Gerald Ford, who once visited the Third District and drew a huge crowd in my hometown of Overland Park.

Larry also represented our State, along with one of our most prominent Kansans ever, Senator Bob Dole.

Larry was known as a congenial Member who worked to find consensus and develop strong relationships with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. While he spent his entire time in Congress in the minority party, he made a priority of seeking out opportu-

nities and friends on both sides of the aisle.

Representative Winn served on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for many years, ultimately becoming the ranking member on the committee. During his time working on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the United States grappled with major world events such as the Cold War, the Vietnam war, and conflict in the Middle East. In addition to his role on the Foreign Affairs Committee, he also represented the U.S. as a congressional representative to the United Nations, appointed by President Reagan. In all of these roles, he was an excellent representative of our country to the rest of the world.

Larry took tremendous pride in serving the people of the Third District. Constituent service was always one of his top priorities, and he believed that solving problems for his constituents was one of his most important responsibilities. If someone had an issue with a Federal agency, Larry and his staff would make sure that it got resolved. This principle of valuing and serving each individual constituent in the district is one that I try to follow to this day trying to fill his shoes.

He lived a great life outside of Congress as well. Larry was an alumnus of the University of Kansas school of journalism and a proud Jayhawk. I have even heard that he taught lifelong Wildcat current Senator PAT ROBERTS how to "Wave the Wheat."

When World War II began, he was unable to join the military due to the loss of one of his legs in an accident; however, he still served his country admirably by building airplanes in Kansas City. Other accomplishments of his included serving as the director of the National Association of Home Builders and the founding of the Kansas City, Kansas, Chamber's Congressional Forum, which I have the privilege of regularly addressing and is still going on today, starting its 50th year.

Larry was a mentor to me and so many aspiring elected officials in Kansas, dispensing valuable advice, and old war stories to help guide us along. He had a gift for humor and an ease with people that served him well in all of his endeavors. And most of all, he was a great man.

While we will mourn the loss of Larry, I take comfort knowing that he is now being reunited with Joan, his beloved wife of 73 years, who passed away in 2015. Larry also leaves behind a large and loving family. His legacy will live on through his four children—Larry Winn III, Douglas Winn, Janet Payne, and Cynthia Burr—plus 8 grandchildren and 16 great-grandchildren.

Larry's legacy will live on in other public servants whom he mentored and inspired. He left an indelible mark on this body, and because of his leadership here, Kansas and the United States is better off for it.

On behalf of the United States Congress, we are thankful for Larry Winn's

service to our country. He is in God's hands now. May he rest in eternal peace.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the well of the Congress of the United States of America as a proud, liberated Democrat. A liberated Democrat, by my definition, is one who cannot only speak truth to power, but can also speak about power.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to honor and celebrate the life and legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King. And in so doing, I want to encourage persons to not only read the masterpiece that Dr. King wrote when he was in the Birmingham jail, but also read the letter that he was responding to.

This letter was written by eight persons, in my opinion, none of whom were bigots, none of whom taught or preached hate; eight persons who were of the religious community; eight persons who were beyond reproach, high moral standards, impeccable character.

You need to read the letter that Dr. King was responding to, the letter that was written by eight members of the clergy. And when you read this letter, as you go through it, you will get to the last paragraph.

I shall read the last paragraph and excerpt from it, if you will, not in its entirety, but I shall read an excerpt from the last paragraph, and then I want to contemporize the excerpt from the last paragraph.

Read it in its entirety. Read the letter from the Birmingham jail. But, my friends, please read the letter that he was responding to. If you do not read this letter, you cannot totally appreciate the message that Dr. King was conveying.

Here is what I shall read as an excerpt. It reads: "When rights are consistently denied, a cause should be pressed in the courts and in negotiations among local leaders, and not in the streets."

I just want to contemporize that sentence.

In the courts, let somebody else take care of this problem. There are other people who are prepared for this. They know best how to handle this. Let someone else do what we could take upon ourselves the duty to do. Let someone else be responsible for liberty and justice for all. Let someone else be responsible for government of the people, by the people, for the people. Let someone else do it.

Contemporizing this language, let the special prosecutor do it. The special prosecutor will give us a decision that we can appreciate, that we can take forth, that we can then claim has given us the foundation to do something significant.

Mr. Speaker, these were persons of honorable standing, great stature.

They meant well, but they wanted to let someone else do what they themselves could have had a hand in doing.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. King was a man who believed that bigotry and hatred must be confronted, and he understood this one basic premise: those who will tolerate bigotry and hatred, they will do very little to change it. They will find reasons why they can't change bigotry and hatred when given the opportunity.

There is always an excuse. It won't be the Good Samaritan response: If I don't help people who are being discriminated against, who are being kicked off of jobs because they are LGBTQ, who can't get loans because of their ethnicity, because of religiosity—invidious religiosity, I might add. They are being barred, banned.

□ 1045

They won't look to see what is happening to them. What they will do is ask: What will happen to me if I step out there and try to help them?

I don't think they are persons of ill will. I think that they are persons who mean well. But I ask people to understand the context of this time by understanding and reviewing the context of the time that Dr. King lived in and review that letter from the Birmingham jail—the masterpiece—but also read the letter that he was responding to.

Those who will tolerate bigotry will do little to change it.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, there is a major story on the front page of the Style Section about a young woman name Sarah Pool.

One of the headlines says: "Sarah Pool, 31, has a baby and a job, and loves them both, but she fears she will be paying off student loans till the day she dies."

She got loans totaling \$60,000 but now owes \$69,000. She is quoted as saying: "I keep paying, but it is like pouring into a bucket with no bottom."

Mr. Speaker, for several years, I have been speaking out about how harmful the Federal student loan program has become for many, many hundreds of thousands of students and families around this country.

In May of 2015, I wrote an article for the Washington Examiner newspaper with ideas about how to bring down the cost of college. In that article, I quoted hedge fund manager James Altucher, who wrote: "We are graduating a generation of indentured students."

An Ohio University economist, Richard Vedder, wrote a book several years ago entitled "Going Broke By Degree."

In the February issue of Chronicles magazine, which will be out in just a few days, I have another article; and in

that article I say that student loan debt in the United States is now \$1.48 trillion. That incredible sum is a heavy drag on the economy and a burden on young people, and Federal intervention in education is the cause.

It wasn't always this way.

In June of 1965, I began working as a salesman at the Sears store in Knoxville, receiving a 10-cents-an-hour raise over my job as a bag boy at the A&P. At Sears, my wage was \$1.25 an hour. I was required to wear a suit and tie, and I was very proud of that job.

I worked full time that summer and usually around 20 hours a week after I began my freshman year at the University of Tennessee in late September.

After I had worked at Sears for 6 months—I didn't realize I had been there 6 months—I was called to the office for the first time. I was very concerned, to put it lightly. I met David Weaver, who was my same age, 18, at the escalator. I told him: I bet I was hit by one of those Hallmark shoppers—one of the mystery shoppers Sears had at the time. He told me he had just been called by a very angry woman to whom he had sold the wrong color of paint. David said that he was scared and that he had diabetes, and when he got too nervous, he would pass out. I can remember that conversation as if it happened yesterday.

Much to our relief, we had been called to the office so management could give us good news: because we had been working at Sears for 6 months, they were giving us a nickel-an-hour raise.

It shocks students at the University of Tennessee today when I tell them that tuition my freshman year was \$90 per quarter, \$270 for the academic year. By my senior year, it was \$405. I remember hearing our minority leader, Mr. HOYER, say that when he started at the University of Maryland, it was \$87 a semester. Almost no one left college in those days with debt unless they had bought a car or made some other major purchase. Students certainly did not go into debt for tuition because they could all work part time, as I did, and pay all their school expenses.

Now, over 44 million Americans carry student loan debt—some of those debts reaching into the six figures.

Readers Digest recently published an article in the December/January issue entitled "The Student Debt Racket." The authors quote one student who owes \$90,000 as saying: "My loans are a black cloud hanging over me. I am a student debt slave."

Colleges and universities began heavily promoting student loans in the late sixties and early seventies. They were able to tamp down opposition to tuition and fee increases by telling students: Don't worry, we will just get you a loan.

Then, because loans were available, many schools began raising tuition at two and three times the rate of inflation each year, and have continued to do so.

I remember reading an article about 3 years ago in The Post which said that student tuition had gone up 4½ times the rate of inflation since 1985. Now the cost of higher education has soared to such great heights that universities are bragging if they hold the annual increases to 2 or 3 percent. They never consider reductions, not even miniscule ones. Thus we have another example of how Big Government liberalism helps the few at the top while harming the many down below.

The Federal student loan program has made the owners of some loan servicing companies very wealthy and has been a boon to most college administrators and tenured professors; and all of this at great expense to students and their families.

When the Knoxville News Sentinel lists the highest paid people in east Tennessee each year, they are almost all at TVA or UT. Yet the pattern continues to repeat: Liberals find a very small group of people who are having trouble paying for something, then insist that the only solution is to let the Federal Government "help." But whenever the Federal Government subsidizes something, the costs simply explode because most of the incentives or pressures to hold costs down vanish.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would say this is why Mark Cuban, the Shark Tank star, has said: If you want to make college really expensive, make it free.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions and difficult times, with many forces and interests demanding their attention.

In these days, give wisdom to all Members, that they might execute their responsibilities to the benefit of all Americans.

Bless them, O God, and be with them and with us all this day and every day to come. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. 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. 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. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ESPAILLAT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IN MEMORY OF ROCKY FAWCETT

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Lewis County Legislator Rocky Fawcett. Rocky was a dedicated public servant who never stopped believing in the potential of Lewis County. Rocky was involved in many local causes and organizations, such as the Cornell Cooperative Extension, the Lewis County Chamber of Commerce, and the Lewis County Development Corporation.

To all who knew him, Rocky was intelligent, driven, and deeply devoted to public service. Simply put: Rocky Fawcett set the gold standard for what it means to be a legislator.

Rocky was a dear friend and he always greeted me with a huge smile and a hug during my many constituent outreach events throughout Lewis County.

I invite Members to join me in keeping his wife, Mary, and his family in your thoughts and prayers. May we continue to honor his memory by being passionate advocates for our communities in Lewis County and beyond.

LET'S TAKE CARE OF AMERICA'S CHILDREN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater responsibility that we have than the health and well-being of America's children. The Children's Health Insurance Program has been a huge success. In just a few weeks, funding for this program will run out in my home State of Rhode Island.

This is a program that has provided health insurance to 9 million children from working families in this country, 27,000 children and pregnant women in my home State of Rhode Island. It has always been a bipartisan issue. This program has been a huge success. It brought the rate of uninsured children down from almost 14 percent when the program began to 4½ percent today.

And why haven't we reauthorized this program yet that ensures the health and well-being of America's children?

We just passed—or the Republicans just passed—a \$1.5 trillion tax cut for the richest people in this country, the biggest corporations, unpaid for. But we can't manage to find money to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program?

I urge the Republican leadership in this Chamber to bring a clean reauthorization bill to the floor so we can reauthorize this effective and important program and take care of America's children.

WASHINGTON BUSINESSES GIVING BACK

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, we are already seeing the positive impact of tax reform. More than 100 businesses and corporations are giving back to their employees and their communities as a direct response to the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

This historic tax reform legislation has paved the way for a better American business environment, and hard-working people are benefiting from the contributions of major employers and service providers, including in my home State of Washington.

Boeing announced a total investment of \$300 million dedicated to corporate giving, employee training, and infrastructure improvement. Alaska Airlines provided \$1,000 bonuses for more than 20,000 employees. Washington Federal is increasing salaries by 5 percent for employees making under \$100,000, investing in training, technology upgrades, and making a \$5 million philanthropic contribution. Pacific Power has committed to passing the company's benefits on to their consumers, which include ratepayers in the Fourth Congressional District.

These benefits and tax relief will have a lasting effect on Washington

families, and I look forward to continuing to work toward bigger paychecks, more jobs, and a prosperous economy.

COMPACT IMPACT RELIEF

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to reintroduce my Compact Impact Relief Act with my colleagues from Hawaii and the Northern Marianas as original cosponsors. Our bill would provide relief to Guam and other States and territories required by the Federal Government to provide local public services to more than 76,000 migrants under the Compacts of Free Association.

Guam remains the top destination for Compact migrants from the three freely associated States. Our island accommodates nearly 18,000 out of a population of just 175,000.

As the United States looks to renew the Compacts after 2023, Congress must increase mandatory Compact impact funding to affected jurisdictions like Guam. Congress should provide the funding level recommended by the Government Accountability Office, as I have called for repeatedly.

In the meantime, I hope this House will act on the practical policy changes included in my Compact Impact Relief Act.

HIGHLIGHTING THE COURAGE AND PERSEVERANCE OF SONIA WARSHAWSKI

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the courage and perseverance of Sonia Warshawski, one of the few remaining Holocaust survivors in the Kansas City community and a constituent of mine. Now 91 years old, as a Polish teenager, she was forced into concentration camps, ripped from her family, and even had to watch as her mother walked into the gas chamber.

Her life is being highlighted in a recent documentary showing in American movie theaters called "Big Sonia," co-directed by her granddaughter, Leah Warshawski. This beautiful film tells the story of her struggle and heartbreak and the power of love to overcome hate.

I have known Sonia for years as a friend, but also as a customer, as she runs the small tailoring business started by her husband, John, who is also a Holocaust survivor.

Sonia's story reminds us of the unspeakable evil that she and others in the Holocaust had to endure and that we must never forget today. But her story as a survivor also reminds us of humanity's beauty and kindness and the power to endure and overcome unspeakable tragedy.

Thank you for sharing your inspirational story with America, Big Sonia.

STAND WITH THE DREAMERS

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say to DREAMers, their parents, and TPS holders from El Salvador, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Honduras: I stand with you.

To date, over 15,000 young people have lost DACA due to congressional inaction, and the lives of over 800,000 young people are being used as a bargaining chip.

For what? A wall?

So stop playing with the people's lives. Enough is enough. Let's pass the Dream Act now.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 51, nays 331, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—51

| | | |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Bonamici | Grijalva | Rice (NY) |
| Brady (PA) | Gutiérrez | Richmond |
| Capuano | Hastings | Rosen |
| Castor (FL) | Jackson Lee | Sánchez |
| Castro (TX) | Jayapal | Sarbanes |
| Clarke (NY) | Jeffries | Schakowsky |
| Correa | Johnson (GA) | Serrano |
| Courtney | Johnson, E. B. | Sewell (AL) |
| Crowley | Khanna | Shea-Porter |
| Doyle, Michael F. | Lee | Slaughter |
| Ellison | McGovern | Suozi |
| Engel | Meng | Takano |
| Espaillat | Moore | Thompson (MS) |
| Galleo | Nadler | Tonko |
| Gomez | Napolitano | Velázquez |
| Gonzalez (TX) | Norcross | Waters, Maxine |
| Green, Al | Pallone | |
| | Pelosi | |

NAYS—331

| | | |
|-------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Abraham | Black | Carbajal |
| Aderholt | Blackburn | Cárdenas |
| Aguilar | Blum | Carson (IN) |
| Allen | Blumenauer | Carter (GA) |
| Amash | Blunt Rochester | Carter (TX) |
| Amodel | Bost | Cartwright |
| Arrington | Boyle, Brendan F. | Chabot |
| Babin | Brady (TX) | Cheney |
| Bacon | Brat | Chu, Judy |
| Banks (IN) | Bridenstine | Cicilline |
| Barletta | Brooks (AL) | Clark (MA) |
| Barr | Brooks (IN) | Clay |
| Barragán | Brown (MD) | Clyburn |
| Barton | Brownley (CA) | Coffman |
| Beatty | Buchanan | Cohen |
| Bera | Buck | Cole |
| Bergman | Bucshon | Collins (GA) |
| Beyer | Budd | Collins (NY) |
| Biggs | Burgess | Comstock |
| Bilirakis | Bustos | Connolly |
| Bishop (GA) | Byrne | Cook |
| Bishop (MI) | Calvert | Cooper |
| Bishop (UT) | | Costa |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Costello (PA) | Kelly (PA) | Raskin | Larsen (WA) | Messer | Tsongas |
| Cramer | Kennedy | Ratcliffe | Larson (CT) | Payne | Turner |
| Crawford | Kihuen | Reed | Lewis (GA) | Pocan | Wagner |
| Crist | Kildee | Reichert | Lucas | Posey | Walker |
| Cuellar | Kilmer | Rice (SC) | Lynch | Renacci | Walz |
| Curbelo (FL) | King (IA) | Roby | Mast | Rooney, Thomas J. | Watson Coleman |
| Curtis | King (NY) | Roe (TN) | McHenry | Russell | Wilson (FL) |
| Davidson | Kinzinger | Rogers (AL) | McNerney | Scalise | Young (AK) |
| Davis (CA) | Knight | Rogers (KY) | Meeks | | |
| Davis, Rodney | Krishnamoorthi | Rohrabacher | | | |
| DeGette | Kuster (NH) | Rokita | | | |
| Delaney | Kustoff (TN) | Rooney, Francis | | | |
| DeLauro | Labrador | Ros-Lehtinen | | | |
| DelBene | LaHood | Roskam | | | |
| Demings | LaMalfa | Ross | | | |
| DeSantis | Lamborn | Rothfus | | | |
| DeSaulnier | Lance | Rouzer | | | |
| DesJarlais | Langevin | Roybal-Allard | | | |
| Deutch | Latta | Royce (CA) | | | |
| Diaz-Balart | Lawrence | Ruiz | | | |
| Dingell | Lawson (FL) | Ruppersberger | | | |
| Donovan | Levin | Rush | | | |
| Duffy | Lewis (MN) | Rutherford | | | |
| Duncan (SC) | Lieu, Ted | Ryan (OH) | | | |
| Duncan (TN) | Lipinski | Sanford | | | |
| Dunn | LoBiondo | Schiff | | | |
| Emmer | Loeb sack | Schneider | | | |
| Eshoo | Lofgren | Schrader | | | |
| Estes (KS) | Long | Schweikert | | | |
| Esty (CT) | Loudermilk | Scott (VA) | | | |
| Evans | Love | Scott, Austin | | | |
| Farenthold | Lowenthal | Scott, David | | | |
| Faso | Lowey | Sensenbrenner | | | |
| Ferguson | Luetkemeyer | Sessions | | | |
| Fitzpatrick | Lujan Grisham, M. | Sherman | | | |
| Fleischmann | Luján, Ben Ray | Shimkus | | | |
| Flores | MacArthur | Shuster | | | |
| Fortenberry | Maloney, | Simpson | | | |
| Foster | Carolyn B. | Sinema | | | |
| Fox | Maloney, Sean | Sires | | | |
| Frankel (FL) | Marchant | Smith (MO) | | | |
| Frelinghuysen | Marino | Smith (NE) | | | |
| Gaetz | Marshall | Smith (NJ) | | | |
| Gallagher | Massie | Smith (TX) | | | |
| Garamendi | Matsui | Smith (WA) | | | |
| Garrett | McCarthy | Smucker | | | |
| Gianforte | McCaul | Soto | | | |
| Gibbs | McClintock | Speier | | | |
| Gohmert | McCollum | Stefanik | | | |
| Goodlatte | McEachin | Stewart | | | |
| Gottheimer | McKinley | Stivers | | | |
| Gowdy | McMorris | Swalwell (CA) | | | |
| Graves (GA) | Rodgers | Taylor | | | |
| Graves (LA) | McSally | Tenney | | | |
| Graves (MO) | Meadows | Thompson (CA) | | | |
| Green, Gene | Meehan | Thompson (PA) | | | |
| Griffith | Mitchell | Thornberry | | | |
| Grothman | Moolenaar | Tiberi | | | |
| Guthrie | Mooney (WV) | Tipton | | | |
| Handel | Moulton | Titus | | | |
| Harper | Mullin | Torres | | | |
| Hartzler | Heck | Trott | | | |
| Hart | Murphy (FL) | Upton | | | |
| Heck | Neal | Valadao | | | |
| Hensarling | Newhouse | Vargas | | | |
| Herrera Beutler | Noem | Veasey | | | |
| Hice, Jody B. | Nolan | Vela | | | |
| Higgins (LA) | Norman | Visclosky | | | |
| Hill | Nunes | Walberg | | | |
| Himes | O'Halleran | Walden | | | |
| Holding | O'Rourke | Walorski | | | |
| Hoyer | Olson | Walters, Mimi | | | |
| Hudson | Palazzo | Wasserman | | | |
| Huffman | Palmer | Schultz | | | |
| Huizenga | Panetta | Weber (TX) | | | |
| Hultgren | Pascrell | Webster (FL) | | | |
| Hunter | Paulsen | Welch | | | |
| Hurd | Pearce | Wenstrup | | | |
| Issa | Perlmutter | Westerman | | | |
| Jenkins (KS) | Perry | Williams | | | |
| Johnson (LA) | Peters | Wilson (SC) | | | |
| Johnson (OH) | Peterson | Wittman | | | |
| Johnson, Sam | Pingree | Womack | | | |
| Jones | Pittenger | Woodall | | | |
| Jordan | Poe (TX) | Yarmuth | | | |
| Joyce (OH) | Poliquin | Yoder | | | |
| Kaptur | Polis | Yoho | | | |
| Katko | Price (NC) | Young (IA) | | | |
| Keating | Quigley | Zeldin | | | |
| Kelly (MS) | | | | | |

NOT VOTING—49

| | |
|--------------|---------------|
| Davis, Danny | Granger |
| DeFazio | Hanabusa |
| Denham | Harris |
| Dent | Higgins (NY) |
| Doggett | Hollingsworth |
| Fudge | Jenkins (WV) |
| Gabbard | Kelly (IL) |
| Gosar | Kind |

□ 1239

Messrs. BIGGS, GROTHMAN, EVANS, CARBAJAL, KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mses. BLUNT ROCHESTER, PINGREE, and Mr. HECK changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. CROWLEY, AL GREEN of Texas, CORREA, NADLER, and SERRANO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to make votes due to an off Hill meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall No. 5.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "No" on Mr. ESPAILLAT's Motion to Adjourn. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall No. 5.

ABOLISH HUMAN TRAFFICKING DAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Keisha was 16 years old when she ran away from a foster family to avoid being sexually assaulted by that family. She thought she was finally safe from abuse when she met a man named Mastur D.

Mastur D promised her that he would return her to her biological family. But he lied. He forced her to have sex with other men for money. Now she found herself to be a trafficked victim of the sex slave trade.

Mr. Speaker, she was arrested for prostitution. After her second arrest, authorities finally rescued her from the trafficking scourge and provided her a way out of that situation.

My legislation, the Abolish Human Trafficking Act, will increase prosecutions for perpetrators of human trafficking, like Mastur D, and hold those accountable for their crimes of sex slavery.

We must support victims of human trafficking and put their predators where they belong: behind bars. Tomorrow is Abolish Human Trafficking Day, our society must prosecute the traffickers and rescue victims of this scourge on America.

And that is just the way it is.

ANNIVERSARY OF APPROVING WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today, this House passed a constitutional amendment granting women the right to vote. 274 Members voted for it, but 136 voted against it. One Representative said: "Important issues cannot be decided by women's fears and tears and emotions. They have to be decided by the real, manly men of America."

One hundred years later, unfortunately, we hear similar comments. To get our rights and to protect our rights, the battle continues. But 2018, Mr. Speaker, is the year of the women. We will never give up our rights, we will never give up our votes, and we will never, ever give up our voice.

Mr. Speaker, we have history slapping us in the face. We, as a body, need to recognize and respect women's rights in this House and in America.

MORE MONEY, LESS PROBLEMS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was grateful to learn that Tidewater Boats is investing \$8.3 million to expand their manufacturing facility in Lexington, South Carolina, creating 100 new jobs.

This news is on top of Aflac announcing they will be expanding their 700 employees in Columbia, South Carolina, and doubling their employee 401(k) matching funds.

On the same day Republicans passed historic tax cuts, AT&T, led by Pam Lackey, announced they are providing 200,000 employees a \$1,000 bonus. Comcast will be providing \$1,000 bonuses to 100,000 employees. BB&T, a valued corporate citizen led by Mike Brennan, will be raising their employee wages to \$15 an hour and providing a \$1,200 bonus for 27,000 employees.

Boeing of Charleston announced they will be donating \$100 million to charities that focus on education, local communities, veterans, and military personnel.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is not only for businesses. I appreciate that next month American families will see more of their own money in their paycheck.

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

Best wishes to DARRELL ISSA and Kathy Issa for their dedicated service as they announce retirement. We look forward to their continued service for the American people.

□ 1245

FIX OUR TAX CODE

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the tax scam that was voted for by 100 percent of Republicans and signed by President Trump.

We all know that this bill puts middle class families out in the cold. This tax scam raised taxes on 86 million American families. It robs our ability to help American veterans, children, and seniors. Republicans have slashed taxes on the wealthiest among us, and now they want us to slash, cut, decimate Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Some of my colleagues would have us believe that this bill is about prosperity for all.

Prosperity for whom?

It is a tax giveaway to billionaires and millionaires.

Does slashing tax revenue create prosperity for communities like Flint, Michigan, where American families continue to suffer through a water crisis, a crisis that my Republican colleagues claim they can't find the funding to help our American brothers and sisters who are suffering?

Republicans want us to believe this bill is fiscally responsible, but we all know there is nothing fiscally responsible about taking healthcare away from millions of Americans while ballooning our country's deficit by as much as \$2 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, we need to fix our Tax Code, not leave American families out in the cold.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT THOMAS REID, JR.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank Sergeant Thomas Reid, Jr., for his 45 years of service with the Cincinnati Police Department.

A lot has changed since he joined the department back in 1972, after serving in Vietnam, but one thing has remained the same. For 4½ decades, Sergeant Reid continued to dedicate himself to keeping our community safe.

During his time on the force, Sergeant Reid led by example and passed his knowledge and experience on to his fellow officers, often advising them to "treat others as you want to be treated."

Sergeant Reid retired at the end of December as the Cincinnati Police Department's longest-serving member, and his leadership and guidance will be missed. The city of Cincinnati is a better place because of his service, and his legacy and impact will be felt in our community for years to come. For that, Mr. Speaker, we Cincinnatians

are deeply grateful and indebted to him.

Thank you, Sergeant Reid.

BRING DREAM ACT TO HOUSE FLOOR

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, college students everywhere are enjoying the last days of vacation before heading back to school. But for thousands of people, this break was spent trying to figure out how to stay in the only home they have ever known.

There have been multiple stories of young DREAMers being detained over this holiday break. These are stellar students who attend elite schools, like UC San Diego and UC Berkeley. They are now sitting in detention facilities, unable to go back to school and continue their education.

Is this the America that our forefathers fought for, one where bright students sit in detention facilities instead of classrooms, questioning if they can ever make the contribution to our United States of America that they dream of?

Mr. Speaker, I once again plead with you, with all due respect, to please bring the Dream Act to the floor. The American people overwhelmingly support it.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THOMAS S. MONSON

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a beloved worldwide leader, Thomas S. Monson, who served as the president and prophet of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints until his passing last week.

From an early age, President Monson led a faithful life serving those most in need and seeking out those who often went unnoticed. His loving service spanned over half a century.

On a personal note, while I was mayor of Provo, our historic tabernacle burned down in a tragic fire. The devastating loss of such a treasured building in our community was palpable.

But President Monson had the unmistakable foresight to know that something even more remarkable could one day stand in its place. I will never forget the audible gasp from thousands of church members when President Monson announced that, from the ashes of the tabernacle, a new temple would be built in its stead.

Today, that temple stands as an extraordinary reminder of his unmatched leadership that led us from loss and sorrow to hope and joy.

My wife, Sue, and I express our deepest condolences to President Monson's family and the many members of the

church around the world that grieve at the loss of this important leader.

SUPPORTING PROTECTED STATUS

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, President Trump took action to undocumented 200,000 immigrants from El Salvador, who have TPS and have been working regularly and renewing their documents in the U.S. for more than 20 years. He said the same thing to 58,000 Haitians. They need to leave in another 16 months. This is the same thing that happened with the DREAMers. He made them undocumented, 800,000 of whom are working.

Mr. Speaker, I am tired of coming to work here and meeting people in the cafeteria and people who are sweeping floors and doing all kinds of work here in the Capitol who now are in fear of losing their legal protected status and being able to work here in this country because they are undocumented. They want to make people who are working, yes, right here in the Capitol of the United States undocumented.

For that, I call upon us to do the work that we were sent here to do and to protect people. We shouldn't be sending 58,000 Haitians back to the poorest country in this hemisphere from the richest country. That is unfathomable and unconscionable and we shouldn't do it.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 54, nays 311, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—54

| | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Bonamici | Hastings | Pocan |
| Brady (PA) | Jayapal | Rice (NY) |
| Capuano | Johnson, E. B. | Rosen |
| Castor (FL) | Kaptur | Sánchez |
| Castro (TX) | Khanna | Sarbanes |
| Correa | Kihuen | Schakowsky |
| Courtney | Lawrence | Serrano |
| Crowley | Lee | Sewell (AL) |
| Doyle, Michael F. | Lowey | Shea-Porter |
| Ellison | Maloney | Slaughter |
| Engel | Carolyn B. McGovern | Suozi |
| Espallat | Meng | Takano |
| Galleo | Moore | Thompson (MS) |
| Gomez | Nadler | Tonko |
| Gonzalez (TX) | Napolitano | Tsongas |
| Green, Al | Norcross | Velázquez |
| Grijalva | Pallone | Waters, Maxine |
| Gutiérrez | Pelosi | Watson Coleman |

NAYS—311

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Fox | McMorris |
| Aderholt | Frankel (FL) | Rodgers |
| Aguilar | Frelinghuysen | McSally |
| Allen | Gallagher | Meadows |
| Amash | Garamendi | Meehan |
| Amodei | Garrett | Mitchell |
| Arrington | Gianforte | Moolenaar |
| Babin | Gibbs | Mooney (WV) |
| Bacon | Gohmert | Moulton |
| Banks (IN) | Goodlatte | Mullin |
| Barletta | Gosar | Murphy (FL) |
| Barr | Gottheimer | Neal |
| Barragán | Gowdy | Newhouse |
| Barton | Graves (GA) | Noem |
| Bera | Graves (LA) | Nolan |
| Bergman | Graves (MO) | Norman |
| Biggs | Griffith | Nunes |
| Bilirakis | Grothman | O'Halleran |
| Bishop (MI) | Guthrie | O'Rourke |
| Bishop (UT) | Handel | Olson |
| Black | Harper | Palazzo |
| Blackburn | Harris | Palmer |
| Blum | Hartzler | Panetta |
| Blumenauer | Heck | Paulsen |
| Bost | Hensarling | Pearce |
| Brat | Herrera Beutler | Perlmutter |
| Bridenstine | Hice, Jody B. | Perry |
| Brooks (AL) | Higgins (LA) | Peters |
| Brooks (IN) | Hill | Peterson |
| Brownley (CA) | Himes | Pingree |
| Buchanan | Holding | Pittenger |
| Buck | Hollingsworth | Poe (TX) |
| Bucshon | Hoyer | Poliquin |
| Budd | Hudson | Polis |
| Burgess | Huffman | Posey |
| Bustos | Huizenga | Price (NC) |
| Byrne | Hultgren | Raskin |
| Carbajal | Hunter | Ratcliffe |
| Cárdenas | Hurd | Reed |
| Carter (GA) | Issa | Reichert |
| Carter (TX) | Jeffries | Rice (SC) |
| Cartwright | Jenkins (KS) | Roby |
| Chabot | Johnson (LA) | Roe (TN) |
| Cheney | Johnson (OH) | Rogers (AL) |
| Chu, Judy | Johnson, Sam | Rogers (KY) |
| Cicilline | Jones | Rohrabacher |
| Clark (MA) | Joyce (OH) | Rokita |
| Clay | Katko | Rooney, Francis |
| Coffman | Keating | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Cohen | Kelly (MS) | Roskam |
| Cole | Kelly (PA) | Ross |
| Collins (GA) | Kennedy | Rothfus |
| Collins (NY) | Kildee | Rouzer |
| Comer | Kilmer | Roybal-Allard |
| Comstock | King (IA) | Royce (CA) |
| Conaway | King (NY) | Ruiz |
| Connolly | Kinzinger | Ruppersberger |
| Cook | Knight | Rutherford |
| Cooper | Krishnamoorthi | Ryan (OH) |
| Costa | Kuster (NH) | Sanford |
| Costello (PA) | Kustoff (TN) | Schiff |
| Cramer | Labrador | Schneider |
| Crawford | LaHood | Schrader |
| Crist | LaMalfa | Schweikert |
| Cuellar | Lamborn | Scott, Austin |
| Culberson | Lance | Sensenbrenner |
| Curbelo (FL) | Latta | Sessions |
| Curtis | Levin | Sherman |
| Davidson | Lewis (MN) | Shimkus |
| Davis (CA) | Lieu, Ted | Simpson |
| Davis, Rodney | Lipinski | Sires |
| DeGette | LoBiondo | Smith (MO) |
| Delaney | Loeback | Smith (NE) |
| DeBene | Lofgren | Smith (NJ) |
| DeSantis | Long | Smith (TX) |
| DeSaulnier | Loudermill | Smith (WA) |
| DesJarlais | Love | Smucker |
| Deutch | Lowenthal | Soto |
| Diaz-Balart | Lucas | Speier |
| Dingell | Luetkemeyer | Stivers |
| Donovan | Lujan Grisham, | Swalwell (CA) |
| Duffy | M. | Tenney |
| Duncan (SC) | Lujan, Ben Ray | Thompson (CA) |
| Duncan (TN) | Lynch | Thompson (PA) |
| Dunn | MacArthur | Thornberry |
| Emmer | Maloney, Sean | Tiberi |
| Eshoo | Marchant | Tipton |
| Fitzpatrick | Marino | Titus |
| Fleischmann | Marshall | Torres |
| Flores | Massie | Torres |
| Fortenberry | Matsui | Upton |
| Foster | McCarthy | Valadao |
| | McCall | Vargas |
| | McClintock | Veasey |
| | McCollum | Vela |
| | McEachin | Visclosky |
| | McKinley | Wagner |
| | | Walberg |
| | | Walker |

| | | |
|---------------|-------------|------------|
| Walorski | Wenstrup | Yarmuth |
| Walters, Mimi | Westerman | Yoder |
| Wasserman | Williams | Yoho |
| Schultz | Wilson (SC) | Young (AK) |
| Weber (TX) | Wittman | Young (IA) |
| Webster (FL) | Womack | Zeldin |
| Welch | Woodall | |

NOT VOTING—66

| | | |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Adams | Doggett | Pascarella |
| Bass | Fudge | Payne |
| Beatty | Gabbard | Quigley |
| Beyer | Gaetz | Renacci |
| Bishop (GA) | Granger | Richmond |
| Blunt Rochester | Hanabusa | Rooney, Thomas J. |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Higgins (NY) | Rush |
| Brady (TX) | Jackson Lee | Russell |
| Brown (MD) | Jenkins (WV) | Scalise |
| Butterfield | Johnson (GA) | Scott (VA) |
| Calvert | Jordan | Scott, David |
| Carson (IN) | Kelly (IL) | Shuster |
| Clarke (NY) | Kind | Sinema |
| Cleaver | Langevin | Stefanik |
| Clyburn | Larsen (WA) | Stewart |
| Cummings | Larson (CT) | Taylor |
| Davis, Danny | Lawson (FL) | Trott |
| DeFazio | Lewis (GA) | Turner |
| DeLauro | Mast | Walden |
| Demings | McHenry | Walz |
| Denham | McNerney | Wilson (FL) |
| Dent | Meeks | |
| | Messer | |

□ 1316

Messrs. POLIQUIN, HUFFMAN, WENSTRUP, and Mrs. NOEM changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

IF YOU DON'T WANT A TAX CUT, YOU CAN MAIL IT BACK TO THE IRS

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, some folks in Washington are upset because we just passed the largest tax cut in American history. They think that this money is Washington's money and that politicians and bureaucrats should decide how to spend it.

I couldn't disagree more. You and I know that this money belongs to the American people. It came out of their wallets.

Under our new law, we put hard-working families first by helping them cope with the costs of raising children by doubling the child tax credit.

We also help small businesses by cutting their taxes so that they can compete with foreign companies and create jobs right here in America.

For those folks who don't think that they need an average extra \$1,500 or more a year to spend, or who think that politicians and bureaucrats can spend their money better, I have a good solution: go ahead and drop your new refund check in the mail. Send it to the Internal Revenue Service. The IRS will be glad to take your money.

TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Trump administration's decision to end temporary protected status, TPS, for more than 200,000 Salvadorans.

TPS holders are thoroughly vetted legal residents who have contributed to our economy and to our communities for almost two decades. Most TPS recipients now call the United States home. Many are parents to children who are American citizens, and tearing these families apart is a heartless and cruel act.

In their decision, this administration claims they reviewed the disaster-related conditions on which the original determination was made; however, they failed to consider the current realities that make El Salvador one of the most dangerous countries in the world. This irresponsible decision will drop hundreds of thousands of people into violence and disaster.

Sending 200,000 Salvadorans, many from my district, to a dangerous foreign country is inhumane. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to immediately pass the American Promise Act so that we can correct this despicable action.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO PHILLIP LYONS

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a member of the Greatest Generation, a Montanan whose service to our Nation and Montana stretched across eight decades.

Born and raised in Butte, Phillip “Herk” Lyons answered the call to serve following the attack on Pearl Harbor. He joined the Navy and served as a submariner in both World War II and the Korean war.

Phil became active with military service organizations in the 1950s, serving in leadership roles in the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans, among others.

Phil was known as “Mr. DAV.” He logged more than 50,000 miles, 16,000 hours, and carried more than 1,700 fellow veterans to appointments.

On behalf of all Montanans, I honor the memory of Phil, and I extend my condolences to his daughter, Debbie, his family, his friends, and all those whom his service touched.

ACT NOW ON A PERMANENT SOLUTION TO PROTECT DREAMERS

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, given that each day that Congress delays action on the Dream Act, 122 people lose their DACA protected status—since September 5, when Trump eliminated

DACA, close to 16,000 young people have lost their protected status and face daily risk of deportation; given the fact that we have pleaded with Republican leadership on the urgency of finding a permanent legislative solution that will protect DREAMers; given the fact that the contradictions and confusion in the negotiations going on to craft a legislative fix continue to abound; and given the fact that this House has the opportunity to vote on a clean Dream Act, we must act now on a permanent solution that will protect DREAMers.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 62, nays 324, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—62

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Bass | Gutiérrez | Pelosi |
| Bonamici | Hastings | Pocan |
| Brady (PA) | Jackson Lee | Rice (NY) |
| Capuano | Jayapal | Richmond |
| Castor (FL) | Johnson (GA) | Rosen |
| Castro (TX) | Johnson, E. B. | Sarbanes |
| Clarke (NY) | Khanna | Serrano |
| Cleaver | Kihuen | Shea-Porter |
| Correa | Lee | Slaughter |
| Courtney | Lewis (GA) | Suozzi |
| Crowley | Lowey | Takano |
| DeFazio | Maloney, | Thompson (MS) |
| Doyle, Michael | Carolyn B. | Tiberi |
| F. | McGovern | Tonko |
| Ellison | Meeks | Tsongas |
| Engel | Meng | Velázquez |
| Espallat | Moore | Wasserman |
| Fudge | Nadler | Jones |
| Gallego | Napolitano | Schultz |
| Gomez | Norcross | Waters, Maxine |
| Green, Al | Pallone | Watson Coleman |
| Grijalva | Payne | Welch |

NAYS—324

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Brady (TX) | Cole |
| Aderholt | Brat | Collins (GA) |
| Aguilar | Bridenstine | Collins (NY) |
| Allen | Brooks (AL) | Comer |
| Amash | Brooks (IN) | Comstock |
| Amodei | Brown (MD) | Conaway |
| Arrington | Brownley (CA) | Connolly |
| Babin | Buchanan | Cooper |
| Bacon | Buck | Costa |
| Banks (IN) | Bucshon | Costello (PA) |
| Barr | Budd | Cramer |
| Barragán | Bustos | Crawford |
| Barton | Byrne | Crist |
| Beatty | Calvert | Cuellar |
| Bera | Carbajal | Culberson |
| Bergman | Cárdenas | Curbelo (FL) |
| Beyer | Carson (IN) | Curtis |
| Biggs | Carter (GA) | Davidson |
| Bilirakis | Carter (TX) | Davis, Danny |
| Bishop (GA) | Cartwright | Davis, Rodney |
| Bishop (MI) | Chabot | DeGette |
| Bishop (UT) | Cheney | Delaney |
| Black | Chu, Judy | DeLauro |
| Blackburn | Cielline | DelBene |
| Blumenauer | Clark (MA) | Demings |
| Blunt Rochester | Clay | DeSaulnier |
| Bost | Clyburn | DesJarlais |
| Boyle, Brendan | Coffman | Deutch |
| F. | Cohen | Diaz-Balart |

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Dingell | Kuster (NH) | Rice (SC) |
| Donovan | Kustoff (TN) | Roby |
| Duffy | Labrador | Roe (TN) |
| Duncan (SC) | LaHood | Rogers (AL) |
| Duncan (TN) | LaMalfa | Rogers (KY) |
| Dunn | Lamborn | Rohrabacher |
| Emmer | Lance | Rokita |
| Eshoo | Latta | Rooney, Francis |
| Estes (KS) | Lawrence | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Esty (CT) | Lawson (FL) | Ross |
| Evans | Levin | Rothfus |
| Farenthold | Lewis (MN) | Rouzer |
| Faso | Lieu, Ted | Roybal-Allard |
| Ferguson | Lipinski | Royce (CA) |
| Fitzpatrick | LoBiondo | Ruiz |
| Fleischmann | Loeb sack | Ruppersberger |
| Flores | Lofgren | Rush |
| Fortenberry | Long | Rutherford |
| Foster | Loudermilk | Ryan (OH) |
| Fox | Love | Sanford |
| Frankel (FL) | Lowenthal | Schiff |
| Frelinghuysen | Lucas | Schneider |
| Gallagher | Luetkemeyer | Schweikert |
| Garrett | Lujan Grisham, | Scott (VA) |
| Gianforte | M. | Scott, Austin |
| Gibbs | Luján, Ben Ray | Sensenbrenner |
| Gohmert | Lynch | Sessions |
| Gonzalez (TX) | MacArthur | Sewell (AL) |
| Goodlatte | Maloney, Sean | Sherman |
| Gosar | Marchant | Shimkus |
| Gottheimer | Marino | Simpson |
| Gowdy | Marshall | Sinema |
| Graves (GA) | Massie | Sires |
| Graves (LA) | Matsui | Smith (MO) |
| Graves (MO) | McCarthy | Smith (NE) |
| Green, Gene | McCaul | Smith (NJ) |
| Griffith | McClintock | Smith (TX) |
| Grothman | McCollum | Smith (WA) |
| Guthrie | McEachin | Smucker |
| Handel | McKinley | Soto |
| Harper | McMorris | Speier |
| Harris | Rodgers | Stefanik |
| Hartzler | McSally | Stewart |
| Heck | Meadows | Stivers |
| Hensarling | Meehan | Swalwell (CA) |
| Hice, Jody B. | Mitchell | Taylor |
| Higgins (LA) | Moolenaar | Tenney |
| Hill | Mooney (WV) | Thompson (CA) |
| Holding | Moulton | Thompson (PA) |
| Hollingsworth | Mullin | Thornberry |
| Hoyer | Murphy (FL) | Tipton |
| Hudson | Neal | Titus |
| Huffman | Newhouse | Torres |
| Huizenga | Noem | Trott |
| Hultgren | Nolan | Upton |
| Hunter | Norman | Valadao |
| Hurd | Nunes | Vargas |
| Issa | O'Halleran | Veasey |
| Jeffries | O'Rourke | Vela |
| Jenkins (KS) | Olson | Visclosky |
| Johnson (LA) | Palazzo | Walberg |
| Johnson (OH) | Palmer | Walden |
| Johnson, Sam | Panetta | Walker |
| Jones | Pascrell | Walorski |
| Jordan | Paulsen | Walters, Mimi |
| Joyce (OH) | Pearce | Walz |
| Kaptur | Perlmutter | Weber (TX) |
| Katko | Perry | Webster (FL) |
| Keating | Peters | Wenstrup |
| Kelly (IL) | Peterson | Westerman |
| Kelly (MS) | Pingree | Williams |
| Kelly (PA) | Pittenger | Wilson (SC) |
| Kennedy | Poe (TX) | Wittman |
| Kildee | Poliquin | Womack |
| Kilmer | Polis | Woodall |
| King (IA) | Price (NC) | Yarmuth |
| King (NY) | Raskin | Yoder |
| Kinzinger | Ratcliffe | Yoho |
| Knight | Reed | Young (IA) |
| Krishnamoorthi | Reichert | Zeldin |

NOT VOTING—45

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Hanabusa | Rooney, Thomas |
| Barletta | Herrera Beutler | J. |
| Blum | Higgins (NY) | Roskam |
| Burgess | Himes | Russell |
| Butterfield | Jenkins (WV) | Sánchez |
| Cook | Kind | Scalise |
| Cummings | Langevin | Schakowsky |
| Davis (CA) | Larsen (WA) | Schrader |
| Denham | Larson (CT) | Scott, David |
| Dent | Mast | Shuster |
| DeSantis | McHenry | Turner |
| Doggett | McNerney | Wagner |
| Gabbard | Messer | Wilson (FL) |
| Gaetz | Posey | Young (AK) |
| Garamendi | Quigley | |
| Granger | Renacci | |

□ 1346

Messrs. MITCHELL and HARPER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 10, 2018, I missed rollcall votes 5–7 on the motions to adjourn from Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. GRIJALVA. I was attending meetings off-campus and was not able to return for these unexpected votes that were not on the House schedule. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted: “Nay” on rollcall vote 5 on the motion to adjourn from Mr. ESPAILLAT, “Nay” on rollcall vote 6 on the motion to adjourn from Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and “Nay” on rollcall vote 7 on the motion to adjourn from Mr. GRIJALVA.

INCLUDE E-VERIFY IN
IMMIGRATION REFORM PACKAGE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congress should include an E-Verify employment eligibility verification program in any immigration reform package. E-Verify is the most effective deterrent to illegal immigration because it shuts off the jobs magnet and saves jobs for hardworking Americans. It is no surprise that E-Verify receives the most public support—82 percent—of any proposed immigration reform.

The E-Verify legislation, the Legal Workforce Act, approved by the Judiciary Committee, has the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and immigration enforcement groups. It provides employers with an efficient and workable system to verify their employees' work status, and the requirement for employers to verify their workers only applies to new employees, not existing workers.

Members should hesitate to support any immigration reform package that does not include requiring employers to use E-Verify. Congress should put the interests of American workers first.

LET STATES REGULATE
MARIJUANA

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I was gravely concerned last week when Attorney General Sessions removed the guidance of the Cole memo regarding the way that the Department of Justice treats marijuana in jurisdictions where it is legal for medicinal or commercial circumstances. I happen to represent one of those States, the State of Colorado, which has a regulatory system for

marijuana that has now been called into jeopardy through a Federal overreach.

Effectively, Attorney General Sessions has left the entire fate of not just the industry and those who work in it but also consumers in my State in the hands of 93 U.S. attorneys, including the one for our State who, if they wake up on the wrong side of the bed one morning, could engage in a mass enforcement action against residents of Colorado who are following our State law.

I call on President Trump to overturn his attorney, and I call upon this body to put the appropriate funding restrictions, based on the McClintock-Polis amendment, into the final funding bill in the next few weeks to prevent the Department of Justice from using funds given to them by Congress to contravene State law in jurisdictions that have chosen to regulate marijuana.

RECOGNIZING THE BICENTENNIAL
OF SPENCER COUNTY, INDIANA

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of an important milestone in Indiana history, the bicentennial of Spencer County, Indiana.

Founded in 1818 by Captain Spier Spencer, this rural county along the Ohio River was the boyhood home of Abraham Lincoln. Years later, when recalling his time in Spencer County, the man who became our 16th President stated quite succinctly: “There, I grew up.”

In addition to the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial and a scenic state park, Spencer County is home to St. Meinrad Archabbey and Indiana's premier tourist destinations, Holiday World and Splashin' Safari. Wildly recognized as the world's first theme park, Holiday World draws hundreds of thousands of visitors to the county each year.

Today, strategically connected to the world by Interstate 64, US 231, rail, and the Ohio River, Spencer County has become a leader in agriculture, manufacturing, maritime and ground logistics, steel production, power generation, and world class family entertainment.

I proudly salute the citizens and the wonderful hometowns of Spencer County on this notable occasion.

CONGRATULATING CENTRAL
PENNSYLVANIA INSTITUTE OF
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
LANDSCAPING STUDENTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the landscaping students at the

Central Pennsylvania Institute of Science and Technology for their fourth consecutive first-place win at the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

CPI students again took home the top prize this year in the agricultural education landscape exhibits. In total, eight schools entered this competition at the Farm Show, which is the Nation's largest indoor agricultural event.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the following students who are a part of the winning team: Charlee Marshall, Alexis Witherite, Landon Wagner, Jarod Williams, Robert Ficarro, and Calen McCool.

The students have learned from CPI's horticulture and landscaping instructor Joe Luther. Just a couple of weeks ago, Mr. Luther was named the National Career and Technical Education Teacher of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am most proud of these CPI students and Mr. Luther for being four-time first-place champions at the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

I congratulate them, and I know that they will continue this fine tradition of being the team to beat at the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF S. 140, AMENDING THE WHITE
MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE
WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION
ACT OF 2010

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 681 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 681

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 140) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-54 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I

may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of a very important measure. The resolution provides for consideration of S. 140, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the White Mountain Apache Tribe Settlement Fund. This bill also includes the text of S. 249, a bill to provide that the pueblo of Santa Clara may lease for 99 years certain restricted land; and H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2017.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, 30 minutes of which will be equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, and 30 minutes of which will be equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the first two items are noncontroversial; however, I am very pleased that within S. 140, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act is included. This language would allow Tribal governments to be excluded from requirements for employers under the National Labor Relations Act. When President Franklin Roosevelt signed the NLRA into law in 1935, Congress wisely excluded governments, all governments, from the definition of “employer.”

At the bill signing of the NLRA, President Roosevelt said: “This Act defines, as a part of our substantive law, the right of self-organization of employees in industry for the purpose of collective bargaining, and provides methods by which the Government can safeguard that legal right.”

The President made clear in his speech at that time that the intent of the law is that it should apply only to workers in the private sector. Tribes are governments and should be treated as such. The intent of the law was and is clear: Tribal governments supervise the employees within their governments and enterprises, not the Federal Government.

From 1935 until 2003, nearly seven decades, the National Labor Relations Board agreed and interpreted the statute in a way that did not apply to Indian Tribes because they were governments. In 2004, the NLRB abruptly changed course and, for the first time, held the act applicable to Indian Tribes. The NLRB did this by highlighting the fact that the act did not expressly include Tribal governments

among those excluded from the phrase “employer.” This is simply an egregious act of bureaucratic overreach.

Let me be clear. In this case, acting on its own, the NLRB expanded its jurisdiction. Neither the existing administration at the time nor Congress asked or ordered the NLRB to take this action.

The impacts of labor strife on Tribal governments and economies are more harmful than on other governments because there is no effective tax base in Tribal communities. Indian lands are held in trust by the United States and are not subject to taxation. The high unemployment rates and legal restrictions make income taxation an unfeasible option.

As a result, the businesses operated by Tribal governments, gaming operations, Tribal agriculture, energy and timber operations, and other Tribal government enterprise constitute the sole source of revenue that is used to fund essential government services for Tribes.

This bill has drawn bipartisan support in our effort to reverse the decision of the NLRB. In the 114th Congress, the same language passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 249–177.

□ 1400

This bill will strengthen Tribal sovereignty and correct this overreach, directing the NLRB to enforce the NLRA, National Labor Relations Act, as it was originally intended. In the end, Mr. Speaker, all we are doing here today with this bill is affirming what was Congress’ original intent. The NLRA does not have jurisdiction over Tribal governments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, over 3 months ago, the funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, expired. Today, families throughout the country, including 90,000 children in my home State of Colorado, face great uncertainty about the future of their healthcare.

When CHIP was first passed, over 20 years ago, it was done in a bipartisan manner, and, until recently, CHIP has always been a bipartisan, nondivisive issue. It is unfortunate to see that, today, here, we are in this body under Republican leadership and, somehow, even children’s health insurance has become a political football while we while away our time, our precious legislative time, on bills that have passed this body before and don’t go anywhere.

In our most recent Band-Aid for government funding, House Republicans made a claim that CHIP was extended until March 31, but that wasn’t the

case. By some reports, States could run out of funding in the next few weeks. In fact, in Colorado, our own budget experts predict the State will run out of children’s health insurance money by the end of February. Cancellation letters are literally scheduled to go out at the end of this month.

Mr. Speaker, this simply isn’t a way to govern, crisis to crisis, ignoring the real issues people care about in order to consider special interest legislation. Republican leadership and the Trump administration continue to refuse to work on finding a bipartisan solution for the hundreds of thousands who have Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival—or DACA recipients—who are in limbo. We can simply put that bill on the floor today, the Dream Act, and I feel it would pass.

We have the votes to do so, Mr. Speaker. Let’s simply have a vote. It is a purely manufactured crisis.

I am happy to say we will be giving the opportunity for Members of this body to defeat the previous question and move to a vote on the Dream Act, shortly. My colleague, Mr. CORREA, has joined us to offer that motion in a few minutes.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle often say that the real deadline for a DACA solution isn’t until March, but, in reality, every day, already over 100 Deferred Action recipients lose their protected status, are unable to work with their situation unresolved.

For those DACA recipients, the deadline isn’t March. The deadline has already passed, hence, the urgency. Now is the time to pass the Dream Act, to allow these DACA recipients to continue to live and work and serve in the only Nation that many of them have ever known their whole lives.

All the while, congressional Republicans still refuse to work with Democrats on a long-term government funding solution. Here we are less than 10 days from another government shutdown. The Federal Government continues to move from quick spending patch to quick spending patch, costing taxpayers more in the long run by preventing our agencies from doing the planning necessary to improve efficiency.

Today we are only 5 legislative days away—9 actual days—from a government shutdown and the huge negative repercussions that would follow. As a former businessowner, I know, firsthand, the value of long-term budgeting and stability. Millions of Americans know how to plan their family budget and their home budget. Why can’t Congress do it for the country?

Instead of working on a long-term budget solution, the House is spending its time on other legislation. Here we have a bill that undermines workers’ rights and their protections under the National Labor Relations Act.

In addition to this controversial bill, there are two attached pieces of legislation that were originally separate

bills that easily could have gone on the suspension calendar and would have largely been noncontroversial. They passed on unanimous consent in the Senate and in the House Natural Resources Committee, but their fate is put in jeopardy by putting them onto a controversial bill.

The first bill amends the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010. To clarify, that is a separate economic development fund known as the WMAT settlement fund that can be accessed to cover potential cost overruns for this rural water project.

The Interior Department has said it is unsure if the settlement fund could be used for additional costs, and so this clarifies that water-related economic development projects would specifically include the planning, design, and construction of the rural water system. This legislation could have passed and, likely, could have become law but, instead, has been put into jeopardy by affixing it to a bill that is unlikely to go anywhere.

The second uncontroversial bill that is wrapped up is regarding the authority of pueblos. It concerns two New Mexican pueblos and simply clarifies that they could lease their lands that are held in trust by the Federal Government for 99 years. This legislation ensures Native Americans have the right to their lands that they deserve. It respects their sovereignty and nations in a noncontroversial way.

I am fully supportive of these two technical and simple pieces of legislation, but, unfortunately, because they are attached to a bill that isn't going anywhere, are very unlikely to become law.

These are the types of bills that could go straight to the suspension calendar and straight through the Senate and should be signed by the President, but, instead, they are being put in jeopardy by lumping them in with a bill that is unlikely to become law.

There are so many of these types of Natural Resources Committee bills from both Democrats and Republicans that should be making their way forward as stand-alone items.

I am glad, for instance, that one that I authored, my Bolt's Ditch and the WEDGE Act—actually, two that I authored—were put forward and passed by this House and not attached to other controversial legislation.

I am also reintroducing, soon, a bicameral bill that I also consider noncontroversial, the Continental Divide Wilderness, Recreation and Camp Hale Legacy Act bill. It would preserve over 90,000 acres of wilderness and recreation lands in Summit and eastern Eagle Counties, and is endorsed by local businesses, commissioners, and towns across the area.

It was crafted with input from dozens of stakeholder groups, including the Wilderness Society, Vail Resorts, the Outdoor Industry Association, the International Mountain Bicycling As-

sociation, Conservation Colorado, and many municipalities and local businesses. It will help sustain our recreational economy in Eagle and Summit Counties, protect watersheds, and preserve important wildlife corridors and tourism opportunities.

These are the kinds of bills that we should be moving forward from the Natural Resources Committee, not controversial bills that actually take away the rights of American citizens, including Native American citizens.

And, while we are not today, we should never be moving forward on Natural Resources Committee bills that actually whittle away at the public lands we all own and the Antiquities Act by shrinking monuments like Bears Ears or making it easier to destroy lands we cherish and value.

All I ask is that we separate out these two Natural Resources bills, send them to the suspension calendar, and not let them be put in jeopardy by affixing them to the fundamental underlying legislation which is controversial, namely, the Tribal labor bill. That is the bill that is the main controversial bill in this package.

And, of course, I stand here as a supporter of the rights of every American to organize. I am a supporter of workers' rights, and I am also a strong supporter of Tribal sovereignty, not only principles under American law, but the right thing to do.

I, like many of my colleagues, place a great deal of importance in Tribal self-determination, autonomy, local control, and independent governance for our nations. In fact, I have been the champion of sovereignty, and I have long voted in favor of legislation that allows Tribal discretion in the judicial processes and in education.

But, of course, the right to organize is an inalienable right of every American, protecting our workers, including Native American workers, to fight for a safe working environment regardless of what entity owns the company they work for. Legislation balancing these two competing principles is possible.

Reconciling these two priorities can be difficult, but I think that there is a way to do it. Instead, this bill drives a wedge between issues or groups that have a history of working strongly together, such as Native Americans and labor unions.

We can balance critical rights to sovereignty with the protections that are due to every American citizen regardless of their race, ethnicity, cultural practices, membership in an Indian nation, or governing structures. This legislation does not find the right balance. It hurts workers of all stripes and colors, including many Native American workers.

Workers have the right to collectively bargain; otherwise, workplaces become unsafe, sexual harassment can go unchecked, and the income gap continues to widen. This legislation would strip Native Americans and non-Native Americans, many of whom work for

Native American enterprises, of the right to collectively bargain.

Without the right to self-governance, we would not have the strong communities present across the country today. Without the right to collective bargaining, we would not have the strong and growing economy that supports our middle class. This legislation simply does not succeed in balancing both of these values.

I also want to point out that President Trump agrees with me, or at least he did last time he commented on this 25 years ago. In 1993, at a hearing before the House Committee on Natural Resources regarding the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, then private citizen Trump testified regarding the legal barriers facing labor unions at that time to organize workers employed at Tribal casinos. His testimony said, in part: "At present, even union workers in States like New Jersey would have no federally or State protected rights or the ability to organize in casinos on Tribal lands. The unions hope to do something about this. They hope to gain the right to recognition, the right to organize if they so choose. Quite frankly, I hope they have better luck than we have had so far."

Mr. Speaker, the last time the President commented on this, it is clear that he also believed that workers on Tribal land should have the right to collectively bargain. I hope that his administration would not be supportive of this legislation if it were to move through Congress, which it is unlikely to do.

Instead of policies that benefit those at the top, I have a number of ideas that I will be talking about later that we can move forward to empower workers and help make sure that the 21st century economy works for everyone.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Colorado covered a lot of ground, so let me try to respond to some of that area because a lot of it doesn't have a whole lot to do with the legislation until the final phase of his remarks.

In terms of CHIP, we actually agree. I think that's something—and, frankly, this House should be proud it passed a CHIP bill on a bipartisan basis months ago. Our real problem is the United States Senate simply hasn't produced legislation. It doesn't have to accept our legislation. It just needs to pass a CHIP bill so we can go to conference and bargain.

I am pleased that both sides, frankly, have worked to make sure that, when we have done extensions of government spending as we work through some of these knotty issues, we continue to fund CHIP. I think the leadership on both sides of the aisle have been clear about that, and I think we will. But, again, it will be great when the Senate finally passes a bill or we make this part of a larger spending bill.

In terms of my friend's points about the Dream Act, I am honestly heartened at the discussion that took place at the White House yesterday. I think there is a genuine desire to come to an agreement on DACA. But the real issue there is border security in addition to legal status.

These folks, obviously, I think, deserve legal status; but you also have to fix the problem, and the problem is on the border. So the outline of the deal is there if people approach it in good faith on both sides of the aisle. I take the fact that we had leadership in both parties meeting with the President yesterday as a good sign in that regard.

In terms of the budget, we probably have at least some areas of agreement. My friend didn't vote for it, but it is worth noting, the House passed every single appropriations bill before the September 30 deadline. We have been waiting now for over 120 days for the United States Senate to just pass a single appropriations bill.

We are in discussions with them now, and I think at some point, when there is an agreement as to what the top line number is—and I think we might not be too far away from that—then we will be able to proceed. But again, this House has done its work. Just as it did on CHIP, it produced legislation on time, and it is prepared to sit down and negotiate with the Senate whenever the Senate decides it can get around to getting its job done.

In terms of the National Labor Relations Act, the Tribal sovereignty portion of this bill, let me point out a couple of things.

My friend does have an excellent record, honestly, in terms of support on Native American issues. This is just an issue where we disagree. There will be Republicans and Democrats who oppose this legislation. There will be Republicans and Democrats who support this legislation.

It is not really purely a partisan question at all, but it is worth noting, the Indian community is united on this issue. The National Congress of American Indians, over 150 Tribal organizations and individual Tribes have come and asked the Congress to correct this oversight.

The fact that this happened in the way it did, that is, the National Labor Relations Board acted on its own to extend its jurisdiction, had no instructions from Congress to do that, had no request from the administration to do that, they just decided they would do it all, that is my definition of a regulatory body run amuck.

For almost 70 years, the NLRB recognized that it did not have jurisdiction in this area and did not try and do it. This is a very new thing. It aroused opposition in Indian Country immediately.

Again, we don't apply these standards to any State government or any local government. We have lots of State governments and lots of local governments involved in activities that

are not strictly governmental. They run municipal golf courses. They do water parks. None of these things are necessarily inherently government. They are not forced to comply with this. So we should extend to Tribal government, which we historically have done, the exact same status and rights in this regard as we do to State and local governments.

We would all be pretty upset if the Federal Government decided it would interject itself in this way into the affairs of any individual State or any of the individual localities that we represent.

□ 1415

Working for a public entity is different. You certainly have rights, but there are restrictions. You have certain rights, like the right to strike, that in most States and most localities do not exist. Tribes should have the same right to make those sorts of decisions for themselves. Again, they resent and have resented historically the violation of their sovereignty. In this case, a regulatory agency without the authority of this body and without the authority of the administration that existed at that time acted on its own.

What the Indian nations and Indian Country have come and asked is: Restore us the sovereignty that you historically accorded us.

That is all this legislation does.

The last point, my friend says this is unlikely to become law. I beg to disagree. Not only did this pass the House on a bipartisan vote in the last Congress, but this Congress it has been reported out of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs on a bipartisan vote. There is every reason to believe this. We will see what the administration does. But I suspect views change over 25 years, and I would hope the administration is supportive of this. As a matter of fact, as I recall, I think they issued a statement to that effect.

So, regardless, let's do our job. Let's continue to do the job we did in the last Congress when, on a bipartisan basis, Republicans and Democrats alike decided Tribal sovereignty was an important issue. We should work together to defend it and to expand it. In this case, we are working to reclaim something that a Federal agency took away, acting on its own, over a decade ago. So the solution to this is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge my friends to support the rule and, more importantly, the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, when we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule—not just any amendment, but an amendment to bring up the bipartisan, bicameral bill, H.R. 3440, the Dream Act.

It is far past time that we consider this urgent piece of legislation, the lack of which is tearing apart the lives

of over 100 aspiring Americans every day who are unable to do what you and I take for granted, Mr. Speaker, which is simply go to work the next day. Every day that we fail to act, approximately 122 DREAMers lose their legal ability to work.

Mr. Speaker, even Republicans have called for a vote on this critical issue. At the end of last year, 34 Republican colleagues sent a letter to Speaker RYAN urging a vote before the year's end, a vote that never happened, a vote my colleague, Mr. CORREA, is giving us a chance to take now.

How much longer will this body be complicit in the Trump administration's assault on DREAMers?

It is time we listen to the vast majority of Americans and the majority of this body and act to protect courageous, aspiring Americans like the group from Colorado I met with yesterday.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, recently, my daughter came home from high school accompanied by two of her good friends. These young ladies are about 16 years of age. They wanted to sit down and talk to me a little bit, so we sat down and we spoke. After a while, I learned these young ladies were very nervous and very scared. They were DREAMers.

They had a basic question for me, which was: What can we do? What can you do for us?

Very, very tough questions. After a moment I answered them: Continue to study hard. Continue to follow the law. Be good students and don't give up hope.

At the same time I told them: Don't worry about Washington, D.C. I am going to Washington to fight for you.

That is what we are doing here today, myself and my colleagues, fighting for DREAMers, fighting to make sure that they have a shot at the American Dream.

Now, I am happy to say today that DREAMers enjoy support of not only Democrats, but Republicans as well on this floor.

Why?

Because all of us know who DREAMers are. DREAMers are hardworking individuals. They serve in our military. They are soldiers, police officers, firefighters, nurses, teachers, and, of course, they are also our neighbors. DREAMers also are very good immigrants. They pay their taxes and follow the law.

Do you know what?

They provide value to our country.

Recently, I also had the opportunity to visit my son's high school, the Air Force Naval ROTC program. I went to be part of what is called a pass in review. Some very nice, honorable young cadets passing in review, all saluting the flag of the United States, all taking the Pledge of Allegiance to our country and to our flag.

Do you know something?

A lot of those cadets were DREAM-ers.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the chance to do what is right. We have a chance to do our job. Let the Dreamer legislation come before us for a vote and let's give the DREAMers the opportunity to earn the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, let's not live with regrets. Let's not look back 5, 10, 15 years from now and say what we could have, should have, would have. Now is the time to act. Now is the time to vote for our DREAMers.

I ask my colleagues to please vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring up the Dream Act to vote for justice and equity.

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

Again, Mr. Speaker, I certainly respect my friend's right to bring up a subject that they think is important and is important, and it is appropriate that they use their time to do that.

I would remind them that there is a negotiation underway. I think the issue here is less about DACA probably and more about border security. The issues are naturally paired together. These young people came here through no fault of their own. They are not responsible for any sort of criminal act. But they were transported across a very porous border.

So to ensure that we are not here again doing the same thing again, strengthening that border at the same time that we provide legal status seems the appropriate thing to do. I suspect neither is achievable without the other linked together.

So I take it that the two sides are negotiating. I am not involved in those negotiations. I am not a member of the relevant committees, but I think the two sides are involved in that negotiation. My hope is that they come to an agreement and that we can have a large, bipartisan victory and a piece of legislation that we are all proud of. But I suspect it is going to take some give-and-take on each side to achieve that.

I do want to go back, though, to the principal underlying legislation here and ask my friends—many of whom, by the way, will support this legislation. There will be considerable Democratic support for this. But I would hope—and, again, I understand this is an issue of competing goods, but sovereignty is not something we should grant to States and localities and deny Indian Tribes.

We should not have a double standard here. If we need to make changes

across the entire Labor Relations Act, fair enough. I guess we should consider that. But we should not single out Tribes and make them subject to capricious, arbitrary, bureaucratic activity deciding on what their legal status is, what their rights are, and interfere with their ability to operate their own businesses, which are absolutely indispensable to supporting their governmental activities.

We do not give Tribes the power to tax. They can't tax their own land. They can't tax their own citizens. If they are not successful economically, they have to rely on the limited resources given by the Federal Government to do everything from protecting their citizens to providing healthcare for their citizens and to making sure that there is appropriate education for their citizens. They ought to be able to do what other governments do and earn money and run their own affairs.

We allow States to do that. We allow localities to do that. For almost 70 years, we allowed Indian Tribes to do that. Then we took it away from them. They are not even asking for something new. They are just asking for something that was taken from them, in terms of their authority and sovereignty, to be restored to them.

Mr. Speaker, again, I go back to urging the passage of the underlying legislation. I hope that we continue to work on these other issues that my friends have brought up. We are working on them in areas like CHIP, like the DACA question, and like the border security question.

But let's also take our time and pass this very important piece of legislation and restore to Indian Tribes what the National Labor Relations Board took away from them over a decade ago.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to address some of the things that my colleague, Mr. COLE, said. The big difference here between Tribal-owned and -run businesses and State and local governments is that State and local governments are not generally in the business of owning/operating companies. With very few exceptions, we don't have a socialist form of government in this country where cities or States are actually operating businesses in competition with the private sector.

Tribes, in addition to their Tribal workers, which are more analogous to State or local workers—and it is an appropriate discussion—also happen to own businesses, which is fine, and they produce revenue for the Tribes, which is great. However, they should play by the same economic rules as other businesses, which in no way impede businesses from succeeding in our country.

Of course, many of these Tribal-owned businesses are the main source of support and income for Tribes. If our labor laws work for any other business, they should also work for them.

American citizens, including Native American citizens of our country, don't lose their rights as workers because of the ownership of the organization and company that they happen to be employed by. That is a key tenet that needs to be balanced with, of course, Tribal sovereignty, which I am a strong supporter of.

If the discussion were simply about Tribal employees, it would be a different discussion. To be clear, it is about businesses that are owned by Tribes, and we simply don't have an analogy on the State and local side with very few exceptions. I am sure there is one somewhere. But, in general, municipalities and counties are not the owners of operating businesses that compete in the private sector.

Now, I want to talk about what is possible with regard to enhancing the rights of workers and labor. Instead of these kinds of policies that take away the rights of workers, including Native American workers, we should be moving forward on policies that put workers first.

My bill, the Giving Workers a Fair Shot Act, would do that. The bill would provide reasonable solutions to address the growing inequality in the United States by helping workers and ensuring that companies follow the law, emphasizing the need for corporate accountability.

It would remove unfair obstacles to forming a union, enhance transparency from employers, and increase penalties for violating our labor laws, which are strong but often not enforced.

First, all too often, employers frequently drag their feet on a newly formed union's first contract for months, sometimes for years, often with the goal of avoiding an agreement. Sometimes that means a newly certified union that the voters have voted in fails to receive a first contract.

My bill would set up a first-contract arbitration system where the union or the employer has the option of seeking mediation if they feel one party is not responding adequately to a negotiation request.

It would also ensure that no taxpayer funds are used for union busting or persuaders, activities like planning and implementing activities that deter employees from joining or forming a union. Again, it simply makes sure that no taxpayer funds are used for that explicit purpose.

Third, the bill updates the National Labor Relations Act's definition of "supervisor." Too often, workers are reclassified as supervisors for effectively gerrymandering bargaining units. This updated definition helps prevent that sort of manipulation and would make it easier for employees to be able to form a union if they so choose.

Fourth, the bill reaffirms the importance for the government to protect workers from having their rights violated by increasing criminal and civil

penalties for individuals and executives who violate critical labor laws.

Injured workers and worker deaths should never be simply a cost of doing business. These robust protections help make sure that this is truly a criminal issue for the few bad actors that exist on the employer side.

Finally, the legislation empowers shareholders and creates new accountability for CEOs and executives by preventing the CEO and chairman at a publicly traded company from being the same person. We would all love to work for ourselves, but that is not in the long-term economic interest of the shareholders, the customers, or the workers.

The bill also expands insider trading restrictions for executives to 1 year after they leave a company.

In my district and across Colorado, people are clamoring for proactive policies that actually help address the income gap and put the needs of middle class families and workers first. Policies like the Giving Workers a Fair Shot Act would do that.

Now, this legislation that we are seeing here today is not the only controversial legislation we are seeing this week. Unfortunately, the next rule up will be one that takes away our constitutional rights as Americans.

The FISA reauthorization legislation has been described as a compromise, but that is not the case.

□ 1430

This legislation is not the necessary FISA reform bill that many in Congress, including myself, have called for, which is why I and so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are opposed to it in its form and support the Amash-Polis amendment, cosponsored by many others.

It is also why the current FISA reauthorization bill is opposed not only by privacy and civil liberties groups and consumers but also technology companies and job creators across the political spectrum. Businesses are, rightfully, afraid that, if this bill passes, it will make it even harder for American companies to engage in international commerce.

Many countries in Europe, for example, will simply refuse to do business with a technology company that is housed in the U.S. because they are afraid of what will happen to their citizens' data, perhaps even in contravention of their own stronger privacy laws.

This bill does not make any steps in the direction of reform that are necessary. It falls short on several grounds. In fact, in some ways, it makes the FISA program worse by codifying the "abouts" collections term that refers to the NSA searching through the internet traffic to collect not only communications to or from an intelligence target but also those that simply mention an identifier used by a target, even though that has been declared unconstitutional twice. It could

be the name of a city or State or even a country that can be used as an identifier; in theory, subjecting close to 100 percent of tax and emails and internet traffic to warrantless searches.

This bill fails to consider the core concern that I have and that many Members on both sides of the aisle share; namely, the government's use of section 702 information against American citizens in investigations that have nothing to do with national security and does not require a warrant or the due process of our Constitution.

Instead, the bill codifies the ability of the government to access the content of our emails and telephone calls without a warrant. It creates an unprecedented and unworkable "optional" warrant, which is merely window dressing but does nothing to address the legitimate concerns.

These massive flaws could have been addressed, had we proceeded under regular order, but this version was reported only from the Intelligence Committee and bypassed the Judiciary Committee, which was cut out of negotiations when they agreed to go along with the Intelligence Committee railroading their committee. That is why I signed a bipartisan letter with dozens of our Members demanding FISA be handled under regular order.

I am proud to have offered the amendment that will be considered later with Representatives LOFGREN and AMASH and others that would provide a better path to keep American citizens safe and protect our privacy and ensure that American companies can remain competitive abroad. It will protect our constitutional rights and keep us safe.

My amendment, which is based off the USA RIGHTS Act, ends backdoor searches, ends reverse targeting, bans "abouts" collections, and strengthens FISA court oversight and transparency. I think these are all common-sense and necessary changes that Americans have been demanding for years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to oppose the FISA reauthorization and support the Amash-Loftgren amendment when they are brought forth shortly.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to a couple of my friend's points.

Let me begin by disagreeing respectfully with my friend's assertion that people are having their rights stripped away.

The only people losing their rights here are Indian Tribes. That is what happened when the NLRB did what it did. Without the direction of Congress or the administration, it decided on its own it would treat Indian Tribal governments different than it treated other governments. So it is those rights to the Tribal governments that we are busy trying to restore.

My friend, who, again, is very good on Indian issues, as a rule, and I under-

stand the competing claims here. So I recognize the tension that is involved in that. But it is not as if Tribal governments don't have their own labor codes and their own standards. Frankly, those have to comply with American law.

Under the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1965, there is absolutely nothing that a Tribal government can do that would contravene the guaranteed rights in the United States Constitution for all Americans.

So to suggest that they are somehow violating the rights of American workers, I think, is to mischaracterize who they are and how they have acted. What they have said is, if we are sovereign, if the Federal Government says that State governments and local governments are allowed to regulate their own workforces, then Tribal governments are allowed to do the same.

I want to disagree also with my friend. There are lots of municipal golf courses in the United States. There are lots of municipal water slides. There are park systems. You can go to the State of Virginia and it happens to own the liquor business in the State. It has decided it is going to make that a State function. We don't regulate those employees.

So the idea that just because it is a money-making activity, that we then somehow treat it differently, we don't do that to any locality or any State in the country.

We just had an unelected Federal agency decide on its own it was going to do that to Indian Tribes. It is not doing it to anybody else, just to Tribes. I would submit that that is fundamentally unfair. Again, nobody's rights are taken away. Every American citizen has exactly the same right.

But if you were to go to work for the Federal Government, you don't have precisely the same rights you do in the private sector. The same thing is true here. If you choose to go to work for a Tribal government, you live within that regime. That regime has to comport with the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and you have not lost your action rights in Federal court if you think there is a violation.

So I think, frankly, this is a case that is crystal clear. You treat everybody the same way, every governmental unit the same way. That is all the Tribes are asking for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a distinguished member of both the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his work as the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that deals with funding public health as well as medical research.

I heard some comments about extension of the funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program at the beginning of the debate, and I wanted to

come to the floor and remind people that the Energy and Commerce Committee did do its work as far as continuing the funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program. It completed its work. We delayed a little bit at the request of committee Democrats, we delayed a little bit at the request of the ranking member of the full committee, but we did deliver a product the first part of October.

That product passed the floor of this House late October, early November. It passed with, of course, almost every Republican vote and over two dozen Democratic votes. It was, indeed, a bipartisan effort.

It funded the Children's Health Insurance Program for 5 years, which was the Democratic request; the funding levels were requested by the Democrats; and it was offset in a responsible way.

That bill is pending over in the United States Senate, and I, frankly, do not understand why the Senate minority leader will not release that bill for a vote by his Senators because it is, after all, Democratic Senators who represent States around this country that are going to suffer as a consequence of not passing this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to address something my friend, Mr. COLE, said.

Again, I am sure you can find a few instances in municipal and State government, but I am sure the gentleman would agree that, relative to size, they are very few and far between. Even most municipal golf courses are run by private operators under contract to municipalities. I am sure the gentleman can find a couple that aren't.

I have interacted with businesses in my district that are owned by Tribal nations, and I worked with them. There are a number of provisions in law that help them. I support those.

But I do believe that workers don't give up their rights simply because they work for a company that happens to be owned by a Tribal nation, as opposed to an American or even a Native American citizen of our country who, in their personal capacity, is the owner of a company and would not have the same ability to deprive workers of their rights as a company that was owned by his or her Tribe.

So, again, we want to make sure we support Tribal autonomy. And I do. Perhaps there is a bill to be had here, but it is simply not this bill.

I want to share a story of one of my constituents from Fort Collins, Colorado, that I think will bring this back to what our body should be doing.

I understand there are arguments on both sides of this. I understand there are people on both sides of the aisle who have concerns and also who support this bill. But it is not the urgency that we face with regard to deferred action or child health insurance.

In July of 2017, Carla and her husband from Fort Collins found out they were

expecting another child. Both Carla and her husband work full time. Carla works at a local childcare center. Her husband works at a local retail store.

Even with their two full-time incomes, like many Americans, they felt the Children's Health Insurance Program was the only medical coverage for them, and Carla enrolled in CHIP.

Carla is due to deliver her baby in March of this year, but she worries that, when the baby comes, she won't have medical coverage anymore. Unfortunately, Carla is right to worry. Right now, Colorado is expected to run out of CHIP funding at the end of February, just a few weeks before Carla is due.

That is why this issue is so urgent, Mr. Speaker. For the tens of thousands of children and pregnant women, like Carla, we can't wait another minute to provide a permanent extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

But instead of finding a bipartisan fix for the Children's Health Insurance Program or for deferred action or to keep the government open, instead, here we have yet another bill that people will have different opinions on, and I feel that it undermines workers' rights and is not supportive in the way that I would be of the rights of our nations. It is, unfortunately, another example of misguided priorities.

We have precious little time—I believe 4 days—until the funding of the government expires. We should have acted on the Children's Health Insurance Program last year. We should have acted on deferred action last year. We need to act now.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I oppose the underlying bill, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, and I want to stress that, while we disagree on this, I appreciate his efforts in Native American issues. He has a record that, I think, is an excellent record overall. We just disagree very profoundly in this case.

I will say this: if you happened to just casually turn on the coverage of the debate at any point, you might wonder what we were debating about. In the course of the debate, we have talked about CHIP, we have talked about the DREAMers, we have talked about the budget, we have talked about FISA. We have spent a lot of time talking about a lot of different things other than the information at hand. I don't begrudge my friend. He feels very passionately about those areas.

It is interesting to me that, on the FISA issue, for instance, we will actually have a debate tomorrow. The amendment my friend supports will be in order tomorrow. We will have an opportunity to do that.

I think there are good faith efforts underway on both sides on the DACA issue and on the issue of FISA, particularly on the issue of the budget as well. Again, I wish this place worked a little

differently. Sometimes deadlines are like alarm clocks here, but those things are underway.

What we are talking about today is also an effort that has been waged by Indian nations for over a dozen years to try and reclaim part of their sovereignty that was unjustly taken away from them.

I am going to disagree with my friend very profoundly. Nobody's rights have been taken away. Every American's rights are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The Indian Civil Rights Act of 1965 makes it abundantly clear no Tribe can do anything in contravention and restrict the rights of Americans.

The only people who have lost rights in this whole discussion and episode have been Tribal governments who had their right to regulate their labor affairs, the same way we allow States and localities to do it, taken away from them.

It wasn't taken away from them by an act of this Congress. We never passed legislation. It wasn't taken away from this because the administration ordered some agency of the executive branch to do something. It was taken away because, acting in a rogue manner, the National Labor Relations Board, on its own, decided it would expand its legal authority.

Well, that is great. They may have a case to make. But that is not what they are supposed to do. They are supposed to operate within the authority Congress gives them. If they think they need a grant of additional authority, they come to Congress and ask for that grant of additional authority. They don't simply, on their own, decide they will willy-nilly violate the rights of a sovereign Native American nation. That is exactly what happened in this case. Frankly, the Tribes have been extraordinarily patient in pursuing the remedy to this.

I think we ought to, today, take the opportunity to rectify a wrong that an agency of the executive branch did without the consent of Congress or even without the consent of the President of the United States at the time and allow Tribes to reclaim the authority that they exercised for over 70 years.

If we think we need to do something different in that regard, that is a fair point to make. If we do, it needs to be the same for State governments and local governments. You don't single Tribes out of sovereign entities and impose something on them that doesn't apply to everybody else that is a sovereign of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I encourage all Members to support the rule, but I recognize my friends probably will not, and that is fair enough. That is normal partisan debate.

But with S. 140, the House is taking steps to strengthen Tribal sovereignty. This body actually has a pretty good record. I worked with my friends across the aisle when we passed the Violence

Against Women Act, which had a very important component giving Tribes back some of the jurisdiction that they needed to regulate domestic abuse and sexual assault on their own territory.

□ 1445

My friends were overwhelmingly supportive and helpful in that measure. It would not have happened without them, so I know in many cases we do agree. But in this case, under this bill, Tribal governments will be able to be excluded from the requirements for employers under the NLRA, just like State and local governments.

This legislation will reverse the bureaucratic overreach of the NLRB and clarify the law once and for all. This bill is a commonsense solution that will clarify the original intent of Congress that the NLRA does not have jurisdiction over Tribal governments.

I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this work. We will actually have a split decision over this. There will certainly be some Republicans supporting my friend's position, but by and large, I think this House will do what it did the last time it considered this legislation, and that is, on a bipartisan basis, pass the law.

This time, given the action of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, we have every reason to believe the legislation will be picked up and sent to the President's desk, where I am confident it will be signed.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 681 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 139, RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 682 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 682

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 139) to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-53 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 682, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of S. 139, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

The rule also provides for a motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule makes in order an amendment offered by Mr. AMASH, representing ideas from Members of both sides of the aisle.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee received testimony from numerous members, including Intelligence Committee Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF. We also heard from Judiciary Committee Ranking Member NADLER, Congressman FARENTHOLD, Congressman AMASH, Congresswoman LOFGREN, and also Congressman POE.

In addition to the vigorous debate on this legislation before the Rules Committee, both the Judiciary Committee and Intelligence Committee held mark-ups on legislation to reauthorize section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Today we have the opportunity to pass an important piece of legislation that will enhance our national security and strengthen protections of Americans' privacy.

Mr. Speaker, I publicly thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman NUNES for their important work on this legislation. As a result of their efforts, the legislation we will consider today will protect the privacy rights of individual Americans without hindering the intelligence community's ability to gain valuable intelligence about the schemes and identities of our enemies.

Our government's most fundamental responsibilities are to defend the American people from harm and to protect their liberties. The value that we place on these duties is reflected by the fact that they are enshrined in the preamble to the Constitution.

To provide for our common defense, the dedicated men and women of the intelligence community work tirelessly to defeat the efforts of our foreign adversaries, whether they are terrorists, hostile foreign states, or nuclear proliferators.

Our Constitution tasks each branch of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—with constantly working to protect the liberty of every American.

With the bill provided for by this rule, the Chamber will be considering legislation that will help us better achieve both. The FISA Amendments

Reauthorization Act will extend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, Title VII for 6 years while increasing oversight of its implementation at every level and providing more robust privacy protections for Americans.

Section 702 of FISA has proven to be an invaluable tool for collecting foreign intelligence and providing insight into the plans and intentions of our enemies. It is one of the National Security Administration's most important operational authorities.

It permits the government to conduct targeted surveillance of foreign persons located outside the United States, with the compelled assistance of electronic communication service providers, to acquire foreign intelligence information.

Mr. Speaker, this program's importance to national security cannot be overstated. While many of the examples of its successes are classified in nature, I can tell you here today that it has helped protect the homeland and the American people.

One declassified example that I can share with Members concerns the story of Hajji Iman, who rose through the ranks of ISIS, eventually becoming the terrorist organization's second in command.

For more than 2 years, the intelligence community searched for Iman. During that period, the NSA used their section 702 programs to target his communications and his close associates. Their resourcefulness, together with these 702 resources, eventually led them to him.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was a terrorist. He was a murderer. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Iman was killed by U.S. special forces on March 24, 2016, during an attempt to apprehend him.

We may not see every victory that the 702 program delivers on behalf of innocent Americans, but these initiatives help protect Americans every day.

Let us pause to note, however, that with the broad authority granted by a program like 702 to collect foreign intelligence information to fight our foreign enemies, it must come with expansive safeguards against abuse of that authority and expansive oversight of its use.

To ensure that the authorities under section 702 do not come into conflict with the liberty and privacy interests of the American people, the FISA Amendments Act expands substantially on the already extensive safeguard.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, each branch of government is responsible for protecting the liberties of the American people. In the executive branch, there are extensive internal controls that require agency heads and the Attorney General to review and approve of actions under 702. Additionally, the inspector general for the intelligence community and the Department of Justice are tasked with comprehensive review of this program's implementation.

Mandatory internal procedures known as targeting and minimization procedures also govern the collection, use, and dissemination of information, and they are in place at each agency that uses FISA section 702.

The FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act expands upon the internal protections by requiring each agency to also adopt querying procedures to control how each agency searches its database for 702-acquired communications.

This brings me to the judicial branch. Under current law, the targeting and minimization procedures must be approved annually by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, of FISC, which is made up of a rotating group of Article III judges.

The FISC, with the aid of amicus curiae briefs and technical experts, engages in exhaustive review and consideration of section 702's implementation for compliance with the Constitution and the law.

This legislation will enhance the FISC's considerations of privacy issues by providing the FISC with the authority to compensate amicus briefs and technical experts.

Finally, there is Congress, where we come to. The Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Intelligence have conducted multiple oversight hearings and meetings in both classified and unclassified settings. Numerous insights came from those hearings, and the legislation that will be considered under today's rule reflects them well. The bill makes a number of improvements that will enhance the congressional oversight in coming years.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is time to remember one more group that remains critical to protecting Americans' liberties: American men and women themselves.

This legislation will improve transparency and public oversight of FISA section 702 by requiring the Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General to conduct a declassification review and publicly release the FISA section 702 minimization procedures every year.

Mr. Speaker, the most important reform contained in this legislation constitutes the most substantial reform to the program since its inception.

Under this legislation, the FBI will be required, when conducting a criminal investigation of a U.S. person, to obtain a warrant from the FISC prior to accessing the content of the communications that were acquired using 702.

Section 702 information is collected for the purpose of foreign intelligence operations, and this critical new requirement forecloses the possibility that FBI agents investigating Americans for traditional crimes would be able to use 702 information in such domestic investigations.

In addition to the numerous safeguards currently in place and added by this legislation, Americans are guaranteed their right of privacy by the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

I took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, and the oath guides every action I take in this Chamber. The FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act ensures that the Fourth Amendment rights of Americans are upheld and includes additional safeguards on top of constitutionally guaranteed rights.

Mr. Speaker, we have reviewed the importance of the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act in stopping terrorist attacks and protecting the American people, but this point bears repeating: this program allows the government to obtain the communication of foreigners outside the United States, including foreign terrorist threats, in support of the counterterrorism efforts worldwide. It has allowed us to respond to threats to our country.

Now let me tell you a little bit about what the 702 program is not. It is not a bulk collection of data. It cannot be used to target Americans and it cannot be used to target individuals located inside the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act is an example of what Congress can accomplish when we work together to find solutions to our Nation's weightiest challenges.

Mr. Speaker, before I close my opening, I also will acknowledge that there is a lot of difference of opinion, as there should be, on this bill. But at the end of the day, progress has been made, protections have been implemented, and the security of our country must be taken into account. That is why this bill needs to pass and any amendments that were brought forward need to fail.

We need to push this forward and begin the process in continuing to protect our private citizens' personal responsibilities and liberties, but also, at the same time, making sure that our intelligence communities and those entrusted with the sacred duty of protecting this country have the tools they need to do that. Anything else would be less than what we should be here.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today with the rest of my Democratic colleagues in utter amazement at the dizzying dysfunction exhibited by our friends across the aisle. For reasons beyond understanding, we have to vote on the reauthorization of section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act because late last year the Republican leadership chose to prioritize massive tax cuts for their wealthy donors over the safety of American citizens.

□ 1500

Like so many other important issues, House Republicans decided to punt on the reauthorization of 702 by simply ex-

tending it to January 19 of this year, coincidentally, the same date the government will possibly shut down.

Mr. Speaker, as a former judge and the former vice chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I do occupy a unique vantage point in the ongoing debate between the need to steadfastly protect the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution while also ensuring that those in the intelligence community have the tools they need to keep our country safe from those who wish to do us grave harm.

Putting the finer points on this debate aside for a moment, I can tell you with complete certainty that such a debate deserves to be lengthy and thorough, neither of which have happened here.

I was concerned to learn, if not a bit dismayed, that the House Intelligence subcommittee which has oversight jurisdiction of the National Security Agency did not hold a single hearing on today's bill. In fact, the full committee did not even hold a single hearing on this important piece of legislation.

Think about that. As the Republicans approached the need to discuss the reauthorization of one of the more important tools to fight terrorism that, simultaneously, brings along legitimate and important Fourth Amendment concerns, the majority, in all their wisdom, thought it prudent to hold exactly zero hearings on such an important matter. That is a brazenly inept way to govern.

To add insult to injury, I am told that members of the committee were given about 36 hours to read the bill before having to vote it out of committee.

A side note here: the bill they were given 36 hours to review is not actually the bill we have before us today because the majority had to use a Rules Committee print to fix some of the most troublesome parts of the original bill in order to obtain my friend Ranking Member ADAM SCHIFF's support. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, that support did not come easily, and important changes were made to the bill as it was presented to the committee in its original form.

For example, Mr. SCHIFF was able to ensure the Republicans' unmasking language was removed from today's bill. The removal of such language ensures that one of the Republicans' most heinous political stunts is not codified into law. This was and is a significant improvement.

Moreover, the Republicans removed the controversial expansion of the definition of "agent of foreign power," which concerned privacy and technology groups.

Today's bill also addresses what is known as "abouts" collection. This is the collection of communications that are not to or from a target but, rather, communications that merely reference the target. The NSA, itself, shut down this collection method earlier this year.

The legislation before us today will allow such collection to resume, but only if the NSA first devises a way of doing so that addresses privacy concerns, obtains permission from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, and Congress does not object after a 30-day review period.

Now, this may seem to be a better option than what I am sure many, if not most, Republicans wanted, which is the full-scale reimplementation of "abouts" collection, but considering how much difficulty the majority has in simply keeping the lights on around this place, I think it is fair to question their ability to provide meaningful oversight in just 30 days. Again, this is simply evidence for the need to return back to regular order under which bills are fully and fairly considered.

Regardless of where one comes down on this issue, I can assure you that there are Members on both sides of the aisle that are sick and tired of being shut out of important policy discussions concerning subjects like those before us today.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), a fellow member of the Judiciary Committee and former chair of that committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 139, which is the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act.

I have stood on this floor debating the PATRIOT Act after 9/11. I fought for reforms in 2015 with the USA Freedom Act. And now here we are debating the latest need to balance privacy and security.

Since Congress last reauthorized section 702, we have learned a great deal about the operation of this program. These revelations have highlighted the risks that it poses to privacy and civil liberties. This program needs to be reformed, but, Mr. Speaker, this is not the bill to do it.

Rather than provide meaningful reforms, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act would reauthorize section 702. However, as we are all well aware, the program routinely sweeps up millions of innocent Americans' emails.

The warrant requirement in this bill applies to only fully predicated, official investigations and not to the hundreds of thousands of searches the FBI runs every day just to run down a lead or check out a tip. The loopholes are too great to ensure proper protections.

In this morning's Washington Post, on page A4, an article says, in part, FBI officials told aides of the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), last week "that under the proposed bill, they anticipate rarely, if ever, needing permission from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to review query results, according to one of the aides." And this was not denied by

the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

We are going to hear an awful lot about warrants on the floor and how this fixes the problem, but here the FBI has said in no uncertain terms to one of our congressional aides that they are never going to have to use this warrant requirement, which was drafted by the Justice Department that has opposed warrants all along. If ever we have seen the fox not only watching the henhouse but inside the henhouse, this is it. It isn't even a fig leaf being small or otherwise. It is simply a way to divert the attention of this Congress away from what is really going on.

Furthermore, the bill would provide a path for the NSA to restart the practice of "abouts" collection, which has been described by the ranking member. The proposal grants some committees 30 days to review any effort to turn "abouts" collection back on, giving Congress little or no say on this matter. We all know that we can't do anything in 30 days around here, and yet the bill restricts us from doing that.

Finding a bipartisan and balanced solution is very possible. I know because I have done it twice with the PATRIOT Act and the Freedom Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. The House Judiciary Committee passed the USA Liberty Act with bipartisan votes. This bill fails to do these necessary reforms. The program should be reauthorized if done in the right way. This bill is the wrong way. It is time for Congress to put the F for "foreign" back into FISA. There is no F for "foreign" in this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my friend from the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. SENSENBRENNER for the reasons he has outlined that this bill should not become law. However, I am also speaking in favor of the Amash amendment that has been put in order that would fix the problems that he has so eloquently outlined.

Before 702 was enacted into law, the NSA and the FBI would need to get a probable cause warrant to collect this information. We made a major change that allows this information to be collected when a foreigner is communicating with an American, and when you go to the "abouts" collection, which the underlying bill would codify, even when that doesn't occur, when there is merely discussion of a foreigner. That is not what I think our Constitution requires. And we did not outsource to the judicial branch or the executive branch the decision on what the Constitution requires us to do.

Now, we have learned that there is a vast amount of information being collected—we can't go into the details of that in an open session, just that we have been told by Admiral Rogers the scope of this—and that the database that is so-called incidentally collected because of the architecture of the internet could be searched for Americans without a warrant is not consistent with the protections outlined in the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution.

The Amash amendment, which is basically the USA RIGHTS Act, ends these backdoor searches by requiring a warrant. It ends reverse targeting. It bans the "abouts" collection and prohibits the collection of domestic communications, prevents the misuse of information on Americans, and is something that we should support.

Now, in a letter to the Senate in October, a coalition of groups said this:

The USA RIGHTS Act, which is essentially the Amash amendment, is markedly superior to all current legislative proposals to reauthorize section 702.

Who said that?

The American Civil Liberties Union and FreedomWorks, the NAACP, but also the Project On Government Oversight, and Color of Change. This is a broad, left-right coalition that has come together, even though there are many things we disagree on, because we agree on one thing: When we took an oath to defend the Constitution on our first day of this session, we didn't take that oath to defend the Constitution when it is convenient or when we feel like it. No. We took that oath to defend the Constitution every day, in every way, and with every bill. And without the Amash amendment, this bill falls short.

Just a note on where we are in the timing. It is true that this has been delayed, I would say unconscionably delayed, for this proceeding. But we have more time than has been suggested.

Under the existing act, it provides that, if there is an existing order from the FISA court, that order remains in effect even if the underlying bill lapses. We have an order that extends into late April. So we have a deadline, but it is not this week and it is not next week. We owe it to our constituents and we owe it to our obligation to the Constitution to get this right.

When JIM SENSENBRENNER, who is someone whom nobody is going to question his conservative credentials, and when Judge POE, ZOE LOFGREN, and JERRY NADLER come to the same agreement on the Constitution, I would hope that our colleagues would listen. Vote for the Amash amendment, and, if it does not pass, vote against the bill.

□ 1515

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

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my next speaker, there are a couple of things to clarify here.

This is an urgent matter. Although the gentlewoman spoke of this in the sense that the existing orders would stay in place, she fails to mention, and others have failed to talk about, that any new orders or even currently existing orders are being enforced by the intelligence community, which is set under that sort of pale of direction that they want.

So I guess if you are satisfied protecting the country with existing orders and existing threats that lasted yesterday, but I will guarantee you somebody else woke up this morning wanting to do us harm. I want the intelligence community to be able to address that in a way that is prudent and proper, which is what I feel like is happening here.

The other issue here is, and I want to make this very clear, there are strong opinions, and I respect the gentlewoman from California immensely, I have relayed and have had similar concerns that she has had over the process and I have voted with her several times to move forward, but we have moved forward, and there are, I believe, protections in this bill.

So when we also talk about, as we go forward, and there is going to be a lot of passionate rhetoric, who is looking out for whom and reminding us of our oaths, I took the oath here, just as the gentlewoman did, when we started this new session, but I also took another oath in the United States Air Force and also served in Iraq and also serve in that time since currently in the military, and we have that oath as well.

I will not take a backseat to anyone who can consciously disagree about where we are. This is a good bill. This is something that I would love to see in different ways changed, but this is the arc of where we are now in protecting our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of reauthorizing FISA 702.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about unconscionable delaying tactics or talking about the need for regular order. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that just today on this floor, we have watched, once again, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle playing games. We have had this particular debate now delayed by the games that their Members have been playing over the course of the last several hours with motion after motion to adjourn. That is, Mr. Speaker, what I believe is unconscionable.

This is a bill that is a bipartisan bill. The ranking member of the Intelligence Committee as well as the chairman of the Intelligence Committee worked very hard to come to agreement on this bill.

I would argue, if anything, Mr. Speaker, the bill goes too far in terms of beginning the process that we cannot begin of putting walls up.

All of us lived through 9/11, and we know, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that we saw that day was what can happen when we make it much more difficult for our law enforcement and our intelligence agencies to connect the dots, much more difficult for them to stop terrorist attacks against this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that goes directly towards those issues. This is one of the most important pieces of policy and of authority that the National Security Agency has. I think it is very important for people who are listening to this debate to recognize that this authority is an authority that allows surveillance of foreign nationals on foreign territory, not in the United States.

I would urge my colleagues, particularly when we have got a bill that is a bipartisan product, that is a product that has been worked on and agreed to in a bipartisan manner, that it is unconscionable for them to delay, unconscionable for them to hold the Nation's security hostage.

We are seeing it, Mr. Speaker, not just with respect to this particular piece of legislation, but we are seeing it, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the entire negotiations underway today over the budget for the Nation.

We have seen a situation where, as they did today, they are trying to accuse us of holding DACA hostage, of holding DACA individuals hostage. That is not what is happening, Mr. Speaker.

The Democrats in this House, Mr. Speaker, are, in fact, holding our national security hostage, and they are doing it with respect to the funds that our military needs as well.

We are a nation today that is facing grave and growing threats. We are a nation that is putting tremendous demands on our intelligence service, on our intelligence professionals, and on our men and women in uniform. I think that every Member of this body who decides to play games, rather than do what is right and what is necessary and what our constitutional obligation and our oath requires, ought to think as they are doing that: What does it mean to the mothers and fathers across this Nation who have children who are deployed for the defense of the Nation, the mothers and fathers across this Nation who know that we are sending their children into harm's way?

The Democrats in this body, Mr. Speaker, consistently continue to hold up the funding that our military needs and, in this case in particular, to hold up the reauthorization of this crucial piece of policy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the reauthorization of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am amused by my friend from the Rules Committee's assertion that today, because of protests with reference to DACA, members of my party were protesting that concern.

I am also amused that they are in the majority, and she accuses us of delaying, when, in fact, this measure was scheduled 2 or 3 months ago and could have been brought to the floor, but, no, they were busy about tax cuts, and so they didn't get around to allowing for this important matter to be brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) to respond to the gentleman from Georgia.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to respond.

The NSA will not go dark, and I think it is important that we understand that.

We are collecting the content of phone calls, emails, text messages, videos, pictures of Americans, putting it in a database and querying it, searching it without a probable cause warrant. That is the state today, and that will continue until reform is done. It will not go dark. I thought it was important to make that clear.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I know he wanted to yield to my colleague from the Judiciary Committee, to have the chance to clarify that.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from California attempting to clarify.

Again, I stand by my statement. The simple fact is, it is the statement it will not go dark, but the issue is we go further here in the collection happening, but how we use that and how we deal with that in a national security context, there is an interesting issue here, and there is an issue that could keep us from doing what we need to do.

Again, this is the debate that we can have, this is the debate that we need to have on this floor, but there is a difference of opinion here. In this instance, I think with the pervasive efforts put in place, I believe that this program is one worth keeping.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), a former FBI special agent.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of reauthorizing section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which is due to expire.

As a 14-year FBI special agent, including significant time as a counterterrorism agent, I am an eyewitness to the importance of this program and the deliberate and lawful manner in which it is used.

The fact is, section 702 is a critical tool that the intelligence community uses properly to target non-U.S. persons located outside of the United States to acquire information that is vital to our Nation's security.

Equally as important, this crucial program has operated under strict rules and has been carefully overseen

by all three branches of our government to protect the privacy and civil liberties of all Americans.

As we have seen, both in our country and abroad, proper surveillance and law enforcement is vital to protect us against terror attacks, especially lone attacker scenarios. As terror groups like ISIS continue to lose territory in Iraq and Syria, our intelligence community has warned that we will see more of these one-off attacks as opposed to more traditional conspiracies.

At a hearing of the Homeland Security Committee, I asked FBI Director Chris Wray about this program as part of our national security posture. He said, despite the high volume of threats, there are few dots that can actually be connected in regard to these "more loosely organized situations." Information already lawfully obtained by the FBI is crucial in, as he said, understanding "which threats are real and which ones are more aspirational."

Section 702 allows the national security professionals to query information to determine whether a tip from State or local law enforcement or others is credible, and it begins the process of marshalling resources to head off potential threats.

Allowing section 702 to expire would leave America vulnerable at a time when we need this protection the most. As Director Wray clearly stated: "If 702 is walked back, we will be . . . starting to rebuild the wall that existed before 9/11."

Mr. Speaker, with today's terror landscape, we cannot go backwards when proven, legal means exist to keep Americans safe.

I urge my colleagues, Democrat and Republican alike, to support this vital national security measure. The safety and security of the families we represent depend on the passage of this measure. Let us get this done for them.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations and a good friend of mine.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Florida for his astute assessment and analysis in his earlier remarks today, particularly sharing with us his experience on the Intelligence Committee, and I thank him for mentioning the fact that I serve as the ranking member on the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee.

In that capacity, that committee certainly encounters not only our Nation's law enforcement but many of the issues dealing with terrorism, including the work on homeland security.

With that in mind, I want to simply say to my colleagues and, certainly, to my good friend, who served and dedicated his life to the FBI for 14 years, none of us over the past couple of

months will take a backseat to championing the FBI, thanking the FBI, recognizing the FBI for the very valiant work that it does.

Being on the Judiciary Committee for the number of years that I have served, I have worked with almost every FBI Director, and agents, particularly the SACs in my particular jurisdiction, and have been engaged in discussions on the resources and needs of that organization. Mr. Speaker, again, we thank them for their service.

I would offer to say that the position I take today is to protect the FBI and to protect the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD, interestingly enough, an article written by SHEILA JACKSON LEE, "Protecting America, protecting Americans," dated October 16, 2007.

[From the POLITICO, Oct. 16, 2007]

PROTECTING AMERICA, PROTECTING AMERICANS

(By Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee)

Nearly two centuries ago, Alexis de Tocqueville observed that the reason democracies invariably prevail in any martial conflict is because democracy is the governmental form that best rewards and encourages those traits that are indispensable to martial success: initiative, innovation, resourcefulness and courage.

The United States would do well to heed de Tocqueville and recognize that the best way to win the war on terror is to remain true to our democratic traditions. If it retains its democratic character, no nation and no loose confederation of international villains will defeat the United States in the pursuit of its vital interests.

A major challenge facing the Congress today is to ensure that in waging its war on terror, the administration does not succeed in winning passage of legislation that will weaken the nation's commitment to its democratic traditions.

This is why the upcoming debate over congressional approval authorizing the administration to conduct terrorist surveillance on U.S. soil is a matter of utmost importance. I offer some thoughts on the principles that should inform that debate.

In the waning hours before the August recess, the House acceded to the Bush administration's request and approved the woefully misnamed "Protect America Act," which gives the federal government enlarged powers to conduct electronic surveillance of American citizens under the guise of conducting surveillance of foreign terrorists.

Fortunately, the authority conferred by the PAA expires next February.

It is therefore incumbent on the Congress to act expeditiously to amend the PAA so that it achieves the only legitimate goals of a terrorist surveillance program, which is to ensure that Americans are secure in their persons, papers and effects, but terrorists throughout the world are made insecure.

The best way to achieve these twin goals is to follow the rule of law. And the exclusive law to follow with respect to authorizing foreign surveillance gathering on U.S. soil is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Enacted by Congress in 1978, the exclusivity of FISA was undisputed. Any legislation authorizing terrorist surveillance programs which the administration seeks to conduct must explicitly affirm that FISA is the sole basis of lawful authority for conducting foreign surveillance gathering on U.S. soil.

That FISA remains the exclusive source of authority does not mean that the law cannot

be adapted to modern circumstances or revised to accommodate new technologies. One widely acknowledged reform is to amend FISA to make clear that foreign-to-foreign communications are not subject to FISA, even though modern technology enables that communication to be routed through the United States.

Additionally, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court is indispensable and must play a meaningful role in ensuring compliance with the law.

Legislation must ensure that the FISC is empowered to act as an Article III court should act, which means the court should operate neither as a rubber stamp nor a bottleneck. The function of the court is to validate the lawful exercise of executive power on the one hand, and to act as the guardian of individual rights and liberties on the other.

Congress should reject any proposal that grants amnesty to any telecommunications company or other entity or individual that helps federal intelligence agencies spy illegally on innocent Americans.

Amnesty will have the unintended consequence of encouraging telecommunications companies to comply with, rather than contest, illegal requests to spy on Americans.

The only permissible path to legalization of conduct in this area is full compliance with the requirements of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Finally, authorization to conduct foreign surveillance gathering on U.S. soil must never be made permanent. The threats to America's security and the liberties of its people will change over time and require constant vigilance by the people's representatives in Congress.

In short, it makes much more sense to enact legislation that protects Americans, rather than one that protects America, as the administration's proposal claims to do. At bottom, America is its people connected to each other, and to past and future generations, as in Abraham Lincoln's unforgettable phrase, by "the mystic chords of memory stretching from every heart and hearthstone."

America, in other words, is Americans coming together in a community of shared values, ideals and principles. It is those shared values that hold us together. It is our commitment to those values that the terrorists wish to break because that is the only way they can win.

Thus, the way forward to victory in the war on terror is for this country to redouble its commitment to the values that every American will risk his or her life to defend. It is only by preserving our attachment to these cherished values that America will remain forever the home of the free, the land of the brave and the country we love.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, that article suggests that we have the responsibility to protect America and Americans. I would make the point to my good friend, who mentioned that men and women or families sending their young people over to battlegrounds, they are absolutely right, and those young people who are going over to battlegrounds are going over on the basis of freedom. Their parents sacrificed, these loved ones sacrificed their young people because they believe so much in the freedom of this Nation.

Well, I will tell you that section 702 and the underlying bill, there is no freedom in this particular bill, and that is why we need to address the question in a thoughtful manner. I

don't mind if we extend this to have a longer debate so that we can work through some of our concerns.

Let me be clear that S. 139 fails to address the core concern of Members of Congress and the American public. The government's use of section 702 information against United States citizens in investigations that have nothing to do with national security, that is the crux of our advocacy for both the Amash amendment, joined by myself and ZOE LOFGREN and TED POE and many others—it is not to undermine the security of this Nation. It is to give substance to those families who sacrifice and send their young men and women to faraway places.

The warrant requirement contained in the bill is riddled with loopholes and applies only to fully predicated official FBI investigations, not to the hundreds of thousands of searches that the FBI runs every day to run down a lead or check out a tip.

S. 139 exacerbates existing problems with section 702 by codifying the so-called bulk collection, a type of surveillance that was shut down after it twice failed to meet the Fourth Amendment scrutiny.

S. 139 is universally opposed by technology companies, privacy and civil liberties groups across the political spectrum.

Let me read briefly what the Amash amendment really says. It is not something that would stop security, surveillance, and work in its tracks. What it does is, "Except as provided in subparagraph C or D, no officer, agent, or employee of the United States may conduct a query of information acquired under subsection A in an effort to find communications of or about a particular person if there is reason to believe such person is a United States person," protecting the First Amendment freedom of speech and all of that, but matched with the important amendment of the Fourth Amendment, which, of course, is unreasonable search and seizures.

□ 1530

An application by the Attorney General to a judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that describes the determination of the Attorney General is probable cause to believe that such communications provide evidence of a crime, such person is a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power. This is a minimal standard.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a minimal standard of which every American should expect and is owed. It is a minimal standard upon which we stand the Constitution.

We are missing what our role is here. It is not to rush through a FISA bill that has been delayed by my Republican friends. More importantly, it is to

do right by the American people. We are not doing right by the American people.

I remember fighting against reverse targeting, a major issue in our work on the Freedom Act and the PATRIOT Act. Now, today—in 2017, going into 2018—in 2018, it is important to remember that 9/11 was to not turn terror on Americans; it was to protect us from terrorism and to withstand that with the upholding of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I rise in opposition to the rule for S. 139, the “FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017,” and the underlying bill.

S. 139 reauthorizes Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which is scheduled to expire on January 19, 2018.

Although Section 702 is a critical national security tool set to expire on January 19, 2018, events of the recent past strongly suggest that Section 702 should not be reauthorized without necessary and significant reforms that are not included in the legislation before us.

So as the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I oppose the rule and underlying bill for several compelling reasons:

1. S. 139 fails to address the core concern of Members of Congress and the American public—the government’s use of Section 702 information against United States citizens in investigations that have nothing to do with national security.

2. The warrant “requirement” contained in the bill is riddled with loopholes and applies only to fully predicated, official FBI investigations, not to the hundreds of thousands searches the FBI runs every day to run down a lead or check out a tip.

3. S. 139 exacerbates existing problems with Section 702 by codifying so-called “about collection,” a type of surveillance that was shut down after it twice failed to meet Fourth Amendment scrutiny.

4. S. 139 is universally opposed by technology companies, privacy, and civil liberties groups across the political spectrum, from the ACLU to FreedomWorks.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us comes from the Intelligence Committee, where it was passed on a strict party-line vote.

This stands in stark contrast to H.R. 3989, the USA Liberty Act, I the bipartisan bill reported by the Judiciary Committee after multiple hearings, an open markup process, and a bipartisan vote of approval.

The USA Liberty Act enjoys much broader support, contains meaningful reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and is far superior to the bill before us.

FISA was enacted in 1978 to provide the Executive Branch with a statutory framework for gathering “foreign intelligence information” from U.S. persons.

FISA authorizes special court orders for four purposes:

1. electronic surveillance;
2. physical searches;
3. the installation and use of pen registers and trap and trace devices; and
4. demands for the production of physical items.

Although FISA is designed for intelligence gathering, and not for the collection of criminal evidence, the law applies to activities to which a Fourth Amendment warrant requirement would apply if they were conducted as part of a criminal investigation.

Most commonly, authorization for a wiretap or physical search under FISA is obtained by application to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (“FISC” or the “FISA court”).

Section 702 is part of the FISA Amendments Act (FAA), a successor to the Bush Administration’s unlawful warrantless wiretapping program that ended in January 2007.

The FAA adds a new Title VII to FISA that grants the government the authority to monitor electronic communications of non-U.S. persons abroad.

Section 702 authorizes the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence “to acquire foreign intelligence information” from “persons reasonably believed to be located outside the United States.”

Although the FAA prohibits the intentional targeting of persons in the United States, the FAA had been in place for only a few months when the New York Times reported that the NSA had “overcollected” domestic communications, a practice described as significant and systematic, even if unintentional.

Subsequently, the Director of the Office of National Intelligence stated that “it is not reasonably possible to identify the number of people located in the United States whose communications may have been reviewed under the authority of the FAA.”

Section 702 provides that the government “may not intentionally target a person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States if the purpose of such acquisition is to target a particular, known person reasonably believed to be in the United States.”

Mr. Speaker, Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act was enacted to protect the liberty and security of Americans, not to diminish their constitutional rights.

That is why Section 702 should not be reauthorized with reforms to prevent the government from using information against its political opponents or members of religious, ethnic, or other groups.

One way to do that is without interfering with the national security objectives of 702 surveillance is simply to require the FBI to obtain a warrant before reading communications by Americans, when it finds those communications by targeting that American and searching its 702 databases.

Enforcing the warrant requirement would prevent the misuse of Section 702 to conduct “backdoor searches” where government agencies, including individual FBI agents, may search the communications collected under section 702 for communications by an individual American, read those communications and disseminate them within the government, all without any external oversight, much less a judicial warrant, simply by claiming a “foreign intelligence” purpose.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans want to find a common-ground where common-sense rules and regulations relating to fighting terrorism at home and abroad can exist while still protecting the cherished privacy and civil liberties which Americans hold close to our collective hearts.

Mr. Speaker, I noted in an op-ed published way back in October 2007, that as Alexis

DeTocqueville, the most astute student of American democracy, observed nearly two centuries ago, the reason democracies invariably prevail in any military conflict is because democracy is the governmental form that best rewards and encourages those traits that are indispensable to success: initiative, innovation, courage, and a love of justice.

The best way to keep America safe and strong is to remain true to the valued embedded in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The bill before us does not strike the proper balance between our cherished liberties and smart security.

We can do better; we should reject this rule and the underlying bill and bring to the floor for debate and vote H.R. 3989, the USA Liberty Act.

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

Just real briefly, I think one of the issues here is this discussion of riddled with loopholes and riddled with anybody. It is just a reminder that agencies not already defined in this cannot just do random searches of this database. This is something that we have just—again, let’s just push back on the facts of the case.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to say “pause,” take a step back, reject the rule, and give ourselves a chance to, frankly, do it better.

FISA reauthorization is inarguably one of the most consequential votes we will take in this Congress because the constitutional stakes are so high. Civil liberties are the core of our Bill of Rights, and we are asked to take action that affects them in the name of keeping us safe. I get that.

But it is critical that we get it right. I think we can do better. To make decisions of this magnitude, we should have the most robust process possible, full and open debate, and input from the stakeholders, thoughtful deliberations by the Members. The process for this bill thus far has decidedly not been that, has not been great. It was written and rewritten in secret and with minimal debate or stakeholders’ input.

But—this is a big but—I am actually optimistic because I have seen a change in the last few days and I think we have an opportunity here. The administration is suddenly engaged, and we are seeing vibrant debate from stakeholders in the technology sector, civil liberties advocates. Members have had very serious discussions, including here on the floor today, but in the Halls, offering amendments to rules, unfortunately, which are not being allowed—save one.

We are being asked to shut all that down, that opportunity, and push through an extension that will run for 6 years. Frankly, stop and think: 6 years in the world of technology is an eternity.

So, for all these reasons, I ask my fellow Members to join me in opposing this rule and, instead, allow the House an opportunity to work its will, to take a little more time, and to do it better because we really do need to wrestle with privacy, with what privacy means in a world where our entire personal lives are stored somewhere online as ones and zeros. Frankly, that is happening at an even faster pace than it is now.

We need to debate how the Fourth Amendment protects us against search and seizures applying to our digital records. We are all being rendered into nothing but a massive storehouse of ones and zeros.

The tensions or balance between civil liberties and national security is a debate as old as this country, but they are not mutually exclusive. They are hard—they are darn hard—but they are not mutually exclusive and they are not impossible.

I know well how many threats we face around the world and I don't take them lightly. The fact that we have not faced another major terrorist attack since 9/11 is a testament to the skill and the hard work of the intelligence community, and I tip my hat to them. I am absolutely committed to giving them the tools they need to keep us safe, consistent with our constitutional rights.

But we live in an era of the most powerful spying tools the world has ever known. Twenty-five years ago conversations were ephemeral. They were conducted in person or over the phone. But now they occur over email or chat and they are archived forever. Our medical, financial, and legal records are all online; so are our photos. Our cell phones track us everywhere we go.

The data available on us is unprecedented, and the fundamental principle of the Bill of Rights is that we have the right to keep our data private. We need new safeguards to ensure that.

So, by rejecting this rule, we have a chance to do it better. In so doing, both keep us safe and protect our constitutional rights.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the rule.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how much time is remaining on both sides, and then also inquire of my good friend from Florida if he has any more speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Does the gentleman from Florida have any more speakers?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would advise that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the United States House of Representatives is known as

the people's House, yet the people's representatives continuously are shut out of policy discussion after discussion. They are shut out of writing bill after bill, and they are shut out of offering any meaningful amendments.

Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, if the people's representatives are shut out, then the people are shut out. If you look around at how the majority is running this place, through a historically closed process, the result is not at all pretty.

I have some advice for my Republican friends. If, like this side of the aisle, you spent more time working on policies that help the American people instead of the wealthy and rich corporations who are, I might add, doing just fine, you would likely not only see more legislative successes, but you would be able to spend more time on important issues like this critically important issue, the extension of section 702.

Mr. Speaker, as is clearly evident, Democrats remain ready to work in a bipartisan manner to accomplish all that remains left to do for the American people. We are ready to fund the government and provide for smart investments for the future of our country.

We are ready to pull the hundreds of thousands of DREAMers out of unnecessary limbo and provide them with the status they deserve. We are ready to go forward with comprehensive immigration. We are ready to provide the funding and authorization needed to give millions of low-income children the health insurance they need. We are ready to fix our roads and our bridges and our railways and air trafficking. We are here and waiting, but time is running out.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Florida, my cohort on the Rules Committee, but I will just also say I appreciate his advice. But also, as a reminder back to my friend from Florida, we have spent time talking about things that matter and things that were messed up.

In fact, we spent a lot of time in this House and passed a healthcare bill because people in my district called me regularly over the holiday, as the new year approached, saying: We can't get insurance, or the insurance that I am provided, no doctor will accept.

We have spent time on that. I believe that is real.

We spent time in this body over the past few years working on a bill called Dodd-Frank that, in my district, decimated community banks and made lending harder and made businesses have more trouble trying to hire people to put them to meaningful work. Yes, we are spending time on things that were not well thought out.

Tax reform was well thought out and is helping Americans in all districts, including my friend's, and I believe we will continue to hear more about that as the day progresses.

But today, again, as many times, we are focused on a bill that has serious debate. It has the reality of some that can take and look at one thing and see a difference, and I agree with my friends on that. But that is why we are having this debate. That is why there will be an amendment on this bill that I oppose and that others will. Some will support it.

But I tell you one that does not support it: the current administration does not support the amendment. The current administration supports the bill, and the relevant committees that have worked on this bill support the underlying bill.

Number two, one of the issues that we have talked about today and one of the things we have to be very careful of is going back to something that was supported by both parties, and that is the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission report that said that we have to take seriously the foreign—I respect greatly my friend, former speaker on our side, who disagrees with this bill, but this is about foreign surveillance. This is the foreign part of this, and we have got to make sure that we have that capability.

Really, this bill—if you continue, and especially looking at the amendment and where others want to go—would build walls that led to the very problems that we expressed before 9/11.

Then there is this last case that continually comes up, and it was about the "about collection," which is no longer being done and practiced. It has been said: Well, we are just codifying it, and they can bring it back willy-nilly.

Let's remind ourselves of what actually has to happen. They have to actually decide that, one, they can, and they have to bring it to the FISC, the court. Oh, wait. Hold on here a second. Let's think about what just happened here. They have to bring it back to the very court that said: Oh, we have got a concern about this and why they have suspended it.

But, Mr. Speaker, let's also talk about why this even occurred, to start with, with the court. It was because the agencies, the intelligence communities, self-reported an issue that they needed to look at. It was not hidden. It was self-reported to the court. This is the protections built into this legislation.

Now, we can debate whether they go far enough or they are not enough or they are properly billed. This is sort of like a debate that needs to happen.

But be careful where we go here, to let the American people be led to believe that things that are happening are not really happening. Do not let it be led to believe that there are not things in place set up by even friends who have spoken today, maybe even against this, that were put in place to

protect the personal rights of our citizens.

Let's never forget that the end result of this is keeping our Nation safe while balancing the privacy concerns of our own citizens, which is never outside of my thoughts and discussions.

For years, the five years that I have been in this body and worked on the Judiciary Committee, we have pushed this envelope, pushing it for protection while, at the same time, balancing our national security needs. I will never say, for the most part, that there is a perfect bill ever to hit this floor. I would think that my friend would probably agree with me on that.

So you have to find the balance and ask: What is the aim of the bill? What is it doing? And how did it go about.

I believe this strikes that balance.

You can have disagreement, but at the end of the day, my question to you is: Is your push to make something better willing to turn out the lights or go dark on watching those who wish to do us harm?

Don't bank on the fact that the intelligence community will just continue on under what has been happening and not look at what could happen, even as we are in this Chamber debating this bill. I want them to be able to see clearly the threats to this country. I want them to use the processes in place to protect American citizens in this process, which they are doing, which, by the way, was highlighted by the fact of the self-report that led to the unbalanced collection being stopped.

□ 1545

But I never would want to put the security of this country in doubt when they cannot look or they are on shaky legal ground of what they can and cannot do to protect us. This goes back to a time in our country's history where we have technology—it was just said recently—that is changing. I want them to have the ability to continue this process under the supervision of a plan that is put in place. Where those need to be adjusted, they can be adjusted.

Are there other needs that need to be addressed? Yes, there are. The Intelligence Committee chairman and I have spoken on those already. The Judiciary Committee, also, is looking into these. But at this point in time, this bill is one that I believe strikes the balance that is critical for our intelligence and law enforcement communities to have the tools they need to do their jobs, for our civil liberties and right to privacy, fundamental to our identity as Americans. I believe the underlying bill strikes that proper balance.

As we go forward, these are the debates, Mr. Speaker, we need to have in this Chamber. At the end of the day, it is about getting the bill and the process right so that we can achieve the aims that need to be achieved.

As we move forward, I would say this is what happened, this is how we work,

and, for now, I believe this is the proper way to go about it. I look forward to supporting this rule and the underlying bill to protect our Nation, the American people, and also to preserve our civil liberties.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 682 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 681; and

Adoption of House Resolution 681, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 181, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—233

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Abraham | Diaz-Balart | Kelly (MS) |
| Aderholt | Donovan | Kelly (PA) |
| Allen | Duffy | King (IA) |
| Amash | Duncan (SC) | King (NY) |
| Amodei | Duncan (TN) | Kinzinger |
| Arrington | Dunn | Knight |
| Babin | Emmer | Kustoff (TN) |
| Bacon | Estes (KS) | Labrador |
| Banks (IN) | Farenthold | LaHood |
| Barletta | Faso | LaMalfa |
| Barr | Ferguson | Lamborn |
| Barton | Fitzpatrick | Lance |
| Bergman | Fleischmann | Latta |
| Biggs | Flores | Lewis (MN) |
| Billrakis | Fortenberry | LoBiondo |
| Bishop (MI) | Foxo | Long |
| Bishop (UT) | Frelinghuysen | Loudermilk |
| Black | Gaetz | Love |
| Blackburn | Gallagher | Lucas |
| Blum | Garrett | Luetkemeyer |
| Bost | Gianforte | MacArthur |
| Brady (TX) | Gibbs | Marchant |
| Brat | Gohmert | Marino |
| Bridenstine | Goodlatte | Marshall |
| Brooks (AL) | Gosar | Mast |
| Brooks (IN) | Gowdy | McCarthy |
| Buchanan | Granger | McCaul |
| Buck | Graves (GA) | McClintock |
| Bucshon | Graves (LA) | McKinley |
| Budd | Graves (MO) | McMorris |
| Burgess | Griffith | Rodgers |
| Byrne | Grothman | McSally |
| Calvert | Guthrie | Meadows |
| Carter (GA) | Handel | Meehan |
| Carter (TX) | Harper | Messer |
| Chabot | Harris | Mitchell |
| Cheney | Hartzler | Moolenaar |
| Coffman | Hensarling | Mooney (WV) |
| Cole | Herrera Beutler | Mullin |
| Collins (GA) | Hice, Jody B. | Murphy (FL) |
| Collins (NY) | Higgins (LA) | Newhouse |
| Comer | Hill | Noem |
| Comstock | Holding | Norman |
| Conaway | Hollingsworth | Nunes |
| Cook | Hudson | Olson |
| Costello (PA) | Huizenga | Palazzo |
| Cramer | Hultgren | Palmer |
| Crawford | Hunter | Paulsen |
| Culberson | Hurd | Pearce |
| Curbelo (FL) | Issa | Perry |
| Curtis | Jenkins (KS) | Pittenger |
| Davidson | Johnson (LA) | Poliquin |
| Davis, Rodney | Johnson (OH) | Posey |
| Denham | Johnson, Sam | Ratcliffe |
| Dent | Jordan | Reed |
| DeSantis | Joyce (OH) | Reichert |
| DesJarlais | Katko | Renacci |

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

NAYS—181

| | | |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Aguilar | Gomez | O'Halleran |
| Barragán | Gonzalez (TX) | O'Rourke |
| Bass | Gottheimer | Pallone |
| Beatty | Green, Al | Panetta |
| Bera | Green, Gene | Pascrell |
| Beyer | Grijalva | Payne |
| Bishop (GA) | Gutiérrez | Pelosi |
| Blumenauer | Hastings | Perlmutter |
| Blunt Rochester | Heck | Peters |
| Bonamici | Higgins (NY) | Peterson |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Himes | Pingree |
| Brady (PA) | Hoyer | Pocan |
| Brown (MD) | Huffman | Polis |
| Brownley (CA) | Jackson Lee | Price (NC) |
| Bustos | Jayapal | Quigley |
| Butterfield | Jeffries | Raskin |
| Capuano | Johnson (GA) | Rice (NY) |
| Cárdenas | Johnson, E. B. | Richmond |
| Carson (IN) | Jones | Rosen |
| Cartwright | Kaptur | Roybal-Allard |
| Castor (FL) | Kelly (IL) | Ruiz |
| Castro (TX) | Kennedy | Ruppersberger |
| Chu, Judy | Khanna | Rush |
| Clark (MA) | Kihuen | Ryan (OH) |
| Clarke (NY) | Kildee | Sánchez |
| | Kilmer | Sarbanes |
| | Krishnamoorthi | Schakowsky |
| | Kuster (NH) | Schiff |
| | Langevin | Schrader |
| | Larsen (WA) | Scott (VA) |
| | Larson (CT) | Scott, David |
| | Lawrence | Serrano |
| | Lawson (FL) | Sewell (AL) |
| | Lee | Shea-Porter |
| | Levin | Sherman |
| | Lewis (GA) | Sinema |
| | Lieu, Ted | Sires |
| | Lipinski | Slaughter |
| | Loebach | Smith (WA) |
| | Lofgren | Soto |
| | Lowenthal | Speier |
| | Lowe | Suozi |
| | Lujan Grisham, | Swalwell (CA) |
| | M. | Takano |
| | Luján, Ben Ray | Thompson (CA) |
| | Lynch | Thompson (MS) |
| | Maloney, | Titus |
| | Carolyn B. | Tonko |
| | Maloney, Sean | Torres |
| | Massie | Tsongas |
| | Matsui | Vargas |
| | McCollum | Veasey |
| | McEachin | Vela |
| | McGovern | Velázquez |
| | Meeks | Velosky |
| | Meng | Walz |
| | Moore | Wasserman |
| | Moulton | Schultz |
| | Nadler | Waters, Maxine |
| | Napolitano | Watson Coleman |
| | Neal | Welch |
| | Norcross | Yarmuth |

NOT VOTING—17

| | | |
|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Adams | Hanabusa | Nolan |
| Carbajal | Jenkins (WV) | Poe (TX) |
| Cicilline | Keating | Scalise |
| Cummings | Kind | Turner |
| DeSaulnier | McHenry | Wilson (FL) |
| Gabbard | McNerney | |

□ 1613

Ms. SPEIER and Mr. GOTTHEIMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. BILIRAKIS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution 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. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 8 on H. Res. 682, the rule providing for consideration of S. 139, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017, I am not recorded due to my attendance at a briefing on airport security. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

□ 1615

HONORING DON YOUNG AS DEAN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a very happy purpose, and it is to recognize the Honorable DON YOUNG of Alaska as the new dean of the House of Representatives.

The tradition of having a dean dates back centuries to the House of Commons. It is an honor that goes to our longest continuously serving Member.

DON YOUNG is one of only 28 Americans in the history of this Nation to serve more than 40 years in this House. As you can see, he has a very bright future ahead of him.

DON, I want to be clear at the outset that there are limits to the dean's duties. For instance, you cannot hang a bearskin in the House Chamber. You still cannot reserve seats.

The dean has the responsibility of swearing in the Speaker. Remember, that is swearing in the Speaker, not swearing at the Speaker.

This milestone is not just a matter of longevity, but the word that comes to mind when you think of DON YOUNG is “loyalty.” This man is fiercely loyal. DON YOUNG is fiercely loyal to Alaska.

He fights hard for what he believes is right. Just look at ANWR. I know it is controversial. We have been talking about doing tax reform for 30-plus years here. DON YOUNG has been working on ANWR for 45 years. When we passed H.R. 1 in the House, that was the 13th time he passed an ANWR bill, and it finally made it into law.

Achievements like this just don't happen overnight. They require leaders willing to carry the torch, come what may. As we all know, DON YOUNG is not the kind of guy that is going to let anything—or anyone—get in his way.

He is loyal to his family and his friends, which includes many, many Members of this body. He can be direct, but you always know where he stands,

or, more importantly, you always know where you stand with him.

But most of all, as our dean, DON YOUNG is loyal to this institution. That, we all know. Decades on, DON YOUNG believes as much as anyone in the value of the work that we do here. As DON, himself, so characteristically put it: “those who think . . . I might retire, you can forget it. I like what I do.”

DON YOUNG is a man of this institution. He believes in this institution. He believes in the work that we do.

So, on this, his 16,374th day in the House, we extend our congratulations to DON, to Anne, and to their entire family.

I thank DON YOUNG for his service to Alaska and to this country.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN DON YOUNG

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join our distinguished Speaker in honoring Congressman DON YOUNG, who ascends to the position of dean of the U.S. House of Representatives following nearly 45 years of proud service on behalf of the people of Alaska. Congressman YOUNG also holds the distinction of serving as the first dean of the House from the Republican Party in 80 years.

Congratulations.

On behalf of the Democratic Caucus, I extend my congratulations to DON; his wife, Anne; and his entire family.

Despite our differences, it is clear that DON cares deeply about our Nation. DON serves because, in his words, he is “enthusiastic about meeting people and trying to solve their problems.”

As a former teacher, he is an advocate for quality education for all. As a former U.S. Army tank operator, he believes in ensuring that servicemembers, families, and veterans have the care they have earned. In honor of his late, beloved wife, Lu Young, he has been a champion for the Native children of Alaska.

The motto of the State of Alaska is “North to the future.” In his commitment to progress and better futures for the people of Alaska, DON honors those words.

The dean of the House has the honor of administering to the Speaker, as the Speaker indicated, the oath of office, which begins: “I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.” As dean, Congressman YOUNG will now have the special responsibility not only of defending the Constitution, but of defending the integrity and dignity of this institution, which he has done all along.

Following in the footsteps of great leaders before him—Sam Rayburn, John Quincy Adams, Carl Vinson—it is now DON's solemn duty to help foster a

climate of civility in the Congress and to hold our colleagues accountable for behavior beneath the standards of this body.

I told DON I would tell you this story when I just congratulated him. He has been very helpful to us in making the Presidio go from an Army post to a special kind of national park. I hope he considers establishing the Presidio in San Francisco part of his legacy. We would love to welcome him and honor him in San Francisco anytime he is ready for that.

But in the course of our conversations over those times, I noticed one day that DON had on this beautiful tie. It had a bald eagle and a baby seal on it. It had these beautiful animals on it. I said: DON, what a lovely, beautiful environmental tie you have on.

He said: I call it lunch.

Again, we know that DON YOUNG will always honor the important obligations, as he always has, and now his new obligation as dean of the House of Representatives. That is historic.

I congratulate him and thank him for his service.

SERVING THE PEOPLE OF ALASKA

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the Speaker and the minority leader for their introductions.

I have been in the House for 45 years, with nine Speakers and nine Presidents. I have been in this House with 2,000 Members who have left. I love this body.

I can suggest one thing: My greatest honor has been being able to achieve results for my State. I am the only Congressman from the whole State of Alaska, and I love it. It is my responsibility to represent the State and this House as the single person to do the job that I have been asked to do.

One of the things that I have enjoyed is the friendships. I don't think there is an enemy in the House. I worked across the aisle. Jimmy Oberstar and I never had an adversarial vote at any one time on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Now, when George Miller was the minority member, we had a lot of arguments and a lot of disagreements, but we hunted together and we ate together.

I believe in bipartisanship. I believe in this body to lead this Nation. Nine Presidents, the House has its job to do regardless of who the President is.

I thank my wife, who is in the audience up there in the gallery. A man gets lucky usually once in his life. I got lucky twice. My past wife was with me for 46½ years. My new wife has been with me about 8 years now. I want the State to pay her because she keeps me alive. And she likes what I do.

I want to thank my colleagues. Being the dean will not change me. I will still holler, “Vote.” I will sometimes get out of line. But in doing so, remember,

it comes from my heart, and my heart is in this House.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 140, AMENDING THE WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 681) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 140) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 181, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—234

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Abraham | DeSantis | Johnson, Sam |
| Aderholt | DesJarlais | Jones |
| Allen | Diaz-Balart | Jordan |
| Amash | Donovan | Joyce (OH) |
| Amodei | Duffy | Katko |
| Arrington | Duncan (SC) | Kelly (MS) |
| Babin | Duncan (TN) | Kelly (PA) |
| Bacon | Dunn | King (IA) |
| Banks (IN) | Emmer | King (NY) |
| Barletta | Estes (KS) | Kinzinger |
| Barr | Farenthold | Knight |
| Barton | Faso | Kustoff (TN) |
| Bergman | Ferguson | Labrador |
| Biggs | Fitzpatrick | LaHood |
| Bilirakis | Fleischmann | LaMalfa |
| Bishop (MI) | Flores | Lamborn |
| Bishop (UT) | Fortenberry | Lance |
| Black | Fox | Latta |
| Blackburn | Frelinghuysen | Lewis (MN) |
| Blum | Gaetz | LoBiondo |
| Bost | Gallagher | Long |
| Brady (TX) | Garrett | Loudermilk |
| Brat | Gianforte | Love |
| Bridenstine | Gibbs | Lucas |
| Brooks (AL) | Gohmert | Luetkemeyer |
| Brooks (IN) | Goodlatte | MacArthur |
| Buchanan | Gosar | Marchant |
| Buck | Gowdy | Marino |
| Bucshon | Granger | Marshall |
| Budd | Graves (GA) | Massie |
| Burgess | Graves (LA) | Mast |
| Byrne | Graves (MO) | McCarthy |
| Calvert | Griffith | McCaul |
| Carter (GA) | Grothman | McClintock |
| Carter (TX) | Guthrie | McKinley |
| Chabot | Handel | McMorris |
| Cheney | Harper | Rodgers |
| Coffman | Harris | McSally |
| Cole | Hartzler | Meadows |
| Collins (GA) | Hensarling | Meehan |
| Collins (NY) | Herrera Beutler | Messer |
| Comer | Hice, Jody B. | Mitchell |
| Comstock | Higgins (LA) | Moolenaar |
| Conaway | Hill | Mooney (WV) |
| Cook | Holding | Mullin |
| Costello (PA) | Hollingsworth | Newhouse |
| Cramer | Hudson | Noem |
| Crawford | Huizenga | Norman |
| Culberson | Hultgren | Nunes |
| Curbelo (FL) | Hunter | Olson |
| Curtis | Hurd | Palazzo |
| Davidson | Issa | Palmer |
| Davis, Rodney | Jenkins (KS) | Paulsen |
| Denham | Johnson (LA) | Pearce |
| Dent | Johnson (OH) | Perry |

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Pittenger | Russell |
| Poe (TX) | Rutherford |
| Poliquin | Sanford |
| Posey | Schweikert |
| Ratcliffe | Scott, Austin |
| Reed | Sensenbrenner |
| Reichert | Sessions |
| Renacci | Shimkus |
| Rice (SC) | Shuster |
| Roby | Simpson |
| Roe (TN) | Smith (MO) |
| Rogers (AL) | Smith (NE) |
| Rogers (KY) | Smith (NJ) |
| Rohrabacher | Smith (TX) |
| Rokita | Smucker |
| Rooney, Francis | Stefanik |
| Rooney, Thomas J. | Stewart |
| Ros-Lehtinen | Stivers |
| Roskam | Taylor |
| Ross | Tenney |
| Rothfus | Thompson (PA) |
| Rouzer | Thornberry |
| Royce (CA) | Tiberi |
| | Tipton |

NAYS—181

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

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Adams | Hanabusa | Scalise |
| Carbajal | Jenkins (WV) | Turner |
| Cummings | Kind | Wilson (FL) |
| DeSaulnier | McHenry | Yarmuth |
| Gabbard | McNerney | |
| Gutiérrez | Nolan | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1633

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 181, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

AYES—227

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Abraham | Fitzpatrick | Marshall |
| Aderholt | Fleischmann | Massie |
| Allen | Flores | Mast |
| Amash | Fortenberry | McCarthy |
| Amodei | Fox | McCaul |
| Arrington | Gaetz | McClintock |
| Babin | Gallagher | McKinley |
| Bacon | Gianforte | McMorris |
| Banks (IN) | Gibbs | Rodgers |
| Barletta | Gohmert | McSally |
| Barton | Goodlatte | Meadows |
| Bergman | Gosar | Meehan |
| Biggs | Gowdy | Messer |
| Bilirakis | Granger | Mitchell |
| Bishop (MI) | Graves (GA) | Moolenaar |
| Bishop (UT) | Graves (LA) | Mooney (WV) |
| Black | Graves (MO) | Mullin |
| Blackburn | Griffith | Newhouse |
| Blum | Grothman | Noem |
| Bost | Guthrie | Norman |
| Brady (TX) | Handel | Nunes |
| Brat | Harper | Olson |
| Bridenstine | Harris | Palazzo |
| Brooks (AL) | Hartzler | Palmer |
| Buchanan | Hensarling | Paulsen |
| Buck | Herrera Beutler | Pearce |
| Bucshon | Hice, Jody B. | Perry |
| Budd | Higgins (LA) | Pittenger |
| Burgess | Hill | Poe (TX) |
| Byrne | Holding | Poliquin |
| Calvert | Hollingsworth | Posey |
| Carter (GA) | Hudson | Ratcliffe |
| Carter (TX) | Huizenga | Reed |
| Chabot | Hultgren | Reichert |
| Cheney | Hunter | Renacci |
| Coffman | Hurd | Rice (SC) |
| Cole | Issa | Roby |
| Collins (GA) | Jenkins (KS) | Roe (TN) |
| Collins (NY) | Johnson (LA) | Rogers (AL) |
| Comer | Johnson (OH) | Rogers (KY) |
| Comstock | Jones | Rohrabacher |
| Conaway | Jordan | Rokita |
| Cook | Joyce (OH) | Rooney, Francis |
| Costello (PA) | Katko | Rooney, Thomas J. |
| Cramer | Kelly (MS) | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Crawford | Kelly (PA) | Roskam |
| Culberson | King (NY) | Ross |
| Curbelo (FL) | Kinzinger | Rothfus |
| Curtis | Knight | Rouzer |
| Davidson | Kustoff (TN) | Royce (CA) |
| Davis, Rodney | Labrador | Russell |
| Denham | LaHood | Rutherford |
| Dent | LaMalfa | Sanford |
| DeSantis | Lamborn | Schweikert |
| DesJarlais | Lance | Scott, Austin |
| Diaz-Balart | Latta | Sensenbrenner |
| Donovan | Lewis (MN) | Sessions |
| Duffy | LoBiondo | Shimkus |
| Duncan (SC) | Long | Shuster |
| Duncan (TN) | Loudermilk | Simpson |
| Dunn | Love | Smith (MO) |
| Emmer | Lucas | Smith (NE) |
| Estes (KS) | Luetkemeyer | Smith (NJ) |
| Farenthold | MacArthur | Smith (TX) |
| Faso | Marchant | Smucker |
| Ferguson | Marino | |

Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton

Valadeo
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—181

Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego

Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross

O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch

NOT VOTING—23

Adams
Barr
Brooks (IN)
Carbajal
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard

Garrett
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, Sam
Kind
King (IA)
McHenry

McNerney
Nolan
Scalise
Turner
Walters, Mimi
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1641

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1645

AMENDING THE WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 681, I call up the bill (S. 140) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 681, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-54 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

S. 140

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

SECTION 1. USE OF FUNDS IN WMAT SETTLEMENT FUND FOR WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.

(a) *AUTHORIZATION OF WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.*—Section 307(a) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-291; 124 Stat. 3080) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “, (b)(2),” after “subsections (a)”.

(b) *FUNDING.*—Section 312(b)(2)(C)(i)(III) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-291; 124 Stat. 3093) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, including the planning, design, and construction of the WMAT rural water system, in accordance with section 307(a).”.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA LAND ELIGIBLE FOR 99-YEAR LEASE.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (commonly known as the “Long-Term Leasing Act”) (25 U.S.C. 415(a)), is amended—

(1) by striking “Indians,,” and inserting “Indians,,”;

(2) by inserting “Ohkay Owingeh pueblo,” after “Cochiti,,”;

(3) by inserting “the pueblo of Santa Clara,” after “Pojoaque,,”;

(4) by striking “the the lands” and inserting “the land”;

(5) by striking “lands held in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Clara,,”; and

(6) by striking “lands held in trust for Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo”.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION OF EMPLOYER.

Section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 152) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “or any Indian tribe, or any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian tribe and located on its Indian lands,” after “subdivision thereof,,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) The term ‘Indian tribe’ means any Indian tribe, band, nation, pueblo, or other orga-

nized group or community which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

“(16) The term ‘Indian’ means any individual who is a member of an Indian tribe.

“(17) The term ‘Indian lands’ means—

“(A) all lands within the limits of any Indian reservation;

“(B) any lands title to which is either held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any Indian tribe or Indian or held by any Indian tribe or Indian subject to restriction by the United States against alienation; and

“(C) any lands in the State of Oklahoma that are within the boundaries of a former reservation (as defined by the Secretary of the Interior) of a federally recognized Indian tribe.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 140.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 140, as amended, which consists of three sections promoting Tribal self-governance and sovereignty over their lands, resources, and businesses belonging to Indian Tribes.

Section 1 of S. 140 amends current law to ensure the completion of a Tribal water system in Arizona. It makes a technical amendment to the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify that authority exists for any necessary cost overruns associated with the Tribe's rural water system, provided it falls within the existing authorization level.

This provision provides the White Mountain Apache Tribe and the Department of the Interior certainty that there will be sufficient funds to complete the rural water system.

Section 2 of S. 140 is identical to S. 249, a bill referred to the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs, which I chair. The Natural Resources Committee reported S. 249 favorably on July 24, 2017, by unanimous consent.

Section 2 amends what is commonly known as the Long-Term Leasing Act, to authorize two Indian pueblos in New Mexico to lease their restricted fee lands for up to 99 years, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Such leases may be for a variety of nonmineral development purposes. While current law generally authorizes Indian Tribes, subject to the approval of the Secretary, to lease their trust and restricted lands, the terms of the leases may not exceed 25 years.

This bill would authorize the pueblos of Santa Clara and Ohkay Owingeh to lease their restricted fee lands for terms of up to 99 years.

Congress has amended the Long-Term Leasing Act more than 40 times to adjust the terms and conditions of leases of Indian lands and to authorize leases of specific Indian lands by their Indian owners for a term of up to 99 years, subject to the approval of the Secretary.

While the Natural Resources Committee does not have jurisdiction over section 3 of S. 140, I wish to express my full support for promoting Tribal self-governance by giving Tribes parity with States and local governments for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act.

Tribal self-governance, or sovereignty, means that a Tribe may make its own laws and be governed by them. Since President Nixon launched the era of Indian self-determination, Tribes have shown that when they assume management and control over their affairs, they actually outperform the Federal Government.

Thus, section 3 of S. 140 will continue and enhance the policies of Tribal self-determination that have almost always enjoyed strong bipartisan, bicameral support for these measures.

S. 140, as amended, is fully consistent with promoting this important Tribal economic opportunity and freedom to do as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Today, we are debating a bill package that follows a very familiar playbook for House Republican leadership.

This bill package is just the latest attempt by my Republican colleagues to push a highly partisan agenda by combining that divisive proposal with noncontroversial items.

Today's bill includes two bills that passed Senate and House Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent.

One of these bills would make a technical correction to a previously passed Tribal water settlement, and the other would clarify that two pueblos in New Mexico should receive equal treatment when leasing their lands.

Unfortunately, instead of quickly passing these bills and suspensions and sending them to the President to be signed into law, House Republican leadership has decided to take those two bills hostage and combine them with a highly divisive bill that is likely not going anywhere—H.R. 986, section 3 of this legislation—which I do not support.

This political stunt seems doomed to fail. The only thing it will accomplish is wasting everyone's time.

Meanwhile, a list of bills that are critical to Tribes across the country sit in the Natural Resources Committee and are just ignored by the majority.

For example, we could be moving legislation that would protect and preserve Native American cultural artifacts, or legislation that would address issues at Indian Health Service, or legislation to codify meaningful and robust Tribal consultation process; or we could be here today passing the bipartisan bill known as the "clean" Carcieri fix.

These bills deserve attention. They are promoted by not only Indian Country, but many, many Members in a bipartisan fashion in this House.

I hope we can move past these petty political games soon, which people are, rightfully, sick of having to see.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to change course and stop blocking consensus bills from moving through this body by conjoining them with divisive, contentious proposals.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of S. 140.

I strongly support this bill, but I want to speak today about one particular piece of it—the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act—which I helped introduce, along with Mr. ROKITA.

Mr. Speaker, I often stand in this House to oppose interference from the heavy hand of the Federal Government, and this is no different.

In 2004, the National Labor Relations Board, unilaterally, decided that it needed to meddle in the affairs of Tribal-owned businesses on Tribal lands. This is a board that was set up to oversee union elections but has become the bureaucratic arm of big labor.

By further expanding its jurisdiction, the National Labor Relations Board threatened the foundation of Indian law, the principle of Tribal sovereignty, and the limits of a small Federal Government.

Since the Obama administration implemented this incredible government overreach, dozens of Tribes have supported legislation to clarify that the NLRB's jurisdiction does not extend to Tribes. The conservative, small government legislation we consider today would make that necessary correction.

Native American Tribes around the country, and especially in my home State of South Dakota, are plagued with grinding poverty, high unemployment, substance abuse, and poor healthcare. They continually seek economic development through self-determination, and the last thing that they need, when trying to improve economic

opportunities for their citizens, is a Federal bureaucracy further meddling with their efforts.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that subjecting Native American Tribes to National Labor Relations Board rules is yet another sign that some still want the Federal Government to interfere with Tribal decision-making.

I have sponsored the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, and this House has passed it multiple times.

I am proud that many South Dakota Tribes have long supported the bill, including the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, the Oglala Sioux Tribe, and the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association.

I urge my colleagues to withdraw the heavy hand of government and again support Tribal sovereignty.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 140.

As has been pointed out, buried in section 3 of this otherwise non-controversial water and lands bill is the text of H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. This nongermane provision would strip thousands of employees of their rights and protections under the National Labor Relations Act at Tribal enterprises located on Tribal lands.

At issue in the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act are two solemn and deeply rooted principles:

First, the right that Indian Tribes possess in matters of local self-governance;

Second, the rights of workers to organize unions, bargain collectively, and engage in concerted activities for mutual aid and protection.

Rather than attempting to balance these two important principles, the bill chooses sovereignty for some over the human rights of others. I would note that the approximately 75 percent of workers employed at Tribal casinos are not members of the Tribes running the casino, but this bill would strip labor rights of hundreds of thousands of these workers as well as those who are actually members of the Tribes.

In doing so, this legislation would abandon the carefully drawn balance between Tribal sovereignty and workers' rights that was adopted in the San

Manuel decision by a Republican-led National Labor Relations Board in 2004. Perhaps prompted by litigation, the board ruled that the National Labor Relations Act will only apply if it does not impact the exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters or abrogate rights guaranteed by treaties.

The San Manuel decision is based on legal principles governing Federal laws of general applicability with respect to Indian Tribes that have been upheld by appeals courts for over 30 years. That is why courts have ruled that Tribes must comply with labor and employment laws such as the Fair Labor Standards Act; the Occupational Safety and Health Act; the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA; and the employer mandate of the Affordable Care Act.

Yet this bill singles out the National Labor Relations Act on the grounds that Tribes must be given parity with State and local governments which statutorily are exempt from the NLRA. Maybe States and localities should have been considered, but the statutes are clear that they are exempt.

This is not a reason why Tribes should be exempt from an otherwise generally applicable law. Furthermore, State and local governments are covered under title VII of the Civil Rights Act; whereas, Tribes are expressly exempt.

For employees of Tribal enterprises, therefore, unions are the sole protection under Federal law against discrimination, including sexual harassment, because they can negotiate a collective bargaining agreement that enforces employees' rights to be free from such conduct.

Democrats and Republicans together have insisted that our trading partners abide by and enforce basic labor rights anytime we do a trade deal. And Congress has repeatedly required these obligations in trade agreements, but today the House will vote on a bill that takes away the assurance that employees have for the freedom of association if they are employed in many Tribal casinos.

This creates a fair question: Would this legislation place the United States Government in breach of any of the trade agreements that are now in effect? According to the International Labor Organization, in an opinion on a similar bill a few years ago, it would, in fact, put us in breach of trade agreements.

We should be able to fashion compromises that, frankly, protect both workers' rights and Tribal sovereignty, but what is before us today fails that test. There is no principled basis for stripping hundreds of thousands of workers from the right to join a union and negotiate better wages simply because they happen to work in a commercial enterprise on Tribal lands.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding and for his work on this bill.

As he mentioned in the opening statements, there is a provision in the bill that allows the Santa Clara Ohkay Owingeh 99-year leasing program to move forward. That is in resolution to the long-standing problems that we face there. So just a significant provision that affects these two units but also the underlying concept that we are going to recognize the sovereignty of our Tribes.

As many people know, some of the Tribes are faced with just very difficult poverty conditions throughout the history of their Tribes since they have been on the reservations, and I work with close friends of mine who are trying to solve these problems and to find resolution to long-term prosperity on the Indian reservations.

So when the National Labor Relations Board reversed its long-standing status of recognizing the sovereignty of our nations—70 years they had recognized that. In 2004, they simply reversed it without much explanation, without any warning, and certainly without precedent.

□ 1700

It has caused things to be much more difficult, especially in States like New Mexico. So the Tribal leaders are saying: We should be sovereign. We should be allowed to make these sorts of decisions ourselves without the Federal Government coming in and putting the bureaucracy there.

The underlying concept of the bill is one that simply says we want prosperity on Native American lands, we want their sovereign actions to take care of themselves, to move themselves forward. That is what the entire Nation says is the American Dream. Let's let that occur for the Native Americans in this country. I think the provisions of the bill are very important.

We have been working for 6 years now in Native American housing, another way to help move prosperity into Native American lands. Again, I support the concept of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLÁN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. SABLÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 140 because it includes H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2017.

The effect of this legislation would be to strip employees who work at businesses owned and operated by an Indian Tribe and located on Indian lands of the protections afforded by the National Labor Relations Act.

I am a Chamorro, one of the native people of the Northern Marianas, and I fully appreciate the importance of

Tribal sovereignty for Native Americans. However, this legislation does not properly reconcile the competing interests between sovereign rights and the rights of workers.

At least 75 percent of employees at Tribal casinos are not Tribal members. In some cases, as few as 1 percent of the employees are members of the Tribes operating the casino. These workers have no say in the decision-making of Tribal governments.

Workers have the right to organize, to collectively bargain, and to protect their right to fight for a safe workplace, fair pay to provide a living for themselves and their families, and good benefits. They should not be stripped of these rights simply due to the geography of the workplace.

Federal law and Tribal sovereignty should be able to coexist at Tribal casinos without stripping workers of their rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S. 140, which would strip protections from workers who are employed by a Tribally-owned business but are not Tribal members. This includes protection from harassment and discrimination in the workplace.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which prohibits employers from discriminating against employees, does not apply to Tribal enterprises. A non-Tribal worker employed by a Tribally-owned casino, for example, cannot file a harassment or discrimination claim in Federal court or with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Instead, collective bargaining agreements fill the gap by including provisions that enforce their right to a fair workplace.

By stripping their collective bargaining rights, this legislation eliminates the only recourse that these workers have against discrimination and harassment. This is one of the many unacceptable consequences of this bill.

Now, I have two letters. One from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and one from the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, both of which raise strong objections to the majority's attempt to exclude workers from the rights enshrined in the National Labor Relations Act.

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

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD

OF TEAMSTERS,

Washington, DC, December 6, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, I am again writing to

express our strong opposition to H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. This legislation would exempt all Tribally-owned and -operated commercial enterprises on Indian lands broadly defined from the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). We urge you to vote no when the House considers this legislation.

If H.R. 986 were to become law, hundreds of thousands of workers at these enterprises, including Teamsters, would be stripped of their protections and rights under the NLRA, including the right to organize and collective bargaining. It would deprive both Tribal members and non-member employees of the right to form or join unions and to bargain collectively for better wages, hours, and working conditions. We should be working to expand the rights and ability of workers to earn a decent living for themselves and their families and to secure a safe and healthy workplace.

While Tribal casinos have been the focus of discussion, this legislation affects not just casino workers. Since the 1980's Tribes have expanded business interests beyond casinos. They now operate many different revenue producing commercial enterprises—construction companies, mining operations, and power plants, to hotels, water parks and ski resorts, to name a few.

In 2004, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) (in San Manuel) ruled that Tribal casino workers should have NLRA protections. Shortly after the San Manuel decision, legislation, in the form of amendments, was twice offered to block the NLRB from enforcing the San Manuel decision.

These amendments were rejected. Since then, the NLRB has proceeded in a measured fashion asserting jurisdiction on a case-by-case basis. The NLRB will not assert jurisdiction where it would interfere with internal governance rights in purely intramural matters or abrogate treaty rights. Otherwise, the NLRB will protect workers' rights at tribally owned enterprises by asserting jurisdiction. With its case-by-case approach, San Manuel takes a careful approach to balancing of tribal sovereignty interests with Federal labor law.

It should be noted that other important federal laws that protect workers apply to Indian businesses, such as the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, and Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Indeed, courts have denied attempts to gain exemptions on numerous occasions ruling commercial tribal enterprises should not be excluded from such laws. NLRA rights and protections should not be treated differently.

Proponents assert that they are seeking the same exemption as state and local governments. However, this is inaccurate. The NLRA only exempts actual government employees and not private sector employees performing contracted out government functions. Also, a substantial majority of workers at these enterprises are not Indian or Tribe members, and thus have no ability to influence tribal governance, since non-tribal members are prohibited from petitioning a tribe.

The bill could also undermine enforcement of existing labor contracts and the decision workers made to organize and bargain collectively. When a collective bargaining agreement expires, a Tribe could unilaterally terminate the relationship with the union without consequence under the NLRA. The employer's obligation to bargain could be eliminated.

Employees of tribal enterprises have no constitutional rights to protect against employers. Only the NLRA gives them free speech rights. Absent the NLRA they have

no protection. Workers cannot be left without any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively just because they are employed at tribally owned enterprise.

Finally, the United States requires its trading partners to implement and abide by internationally recognized labor standards, while H.R. 986 deprives workers at these tribal enterprises of these core rights—the right to organize and bargain collectively.

To focus solely on the NLRA raises the question of the true motivation for this legislation. It is regrettable that the principle of tribal sovereignty is being used to cloak an attack on the basic rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively. The Teamsters Union respects tribal sovereignty. However, we do not believe that this principle should be used to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. We urge you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act and to VOTE NO on H.R. 986 when the legislation comes to a vote in the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,

Washington, DC, January 9, 2018.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing to urge to oppose S. 140, as currently amended to expand the exemption of employers under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

S. 140, as amended, is Just another attempt at passing the so-called Tribal Sovereignty Act, which would deny protection under the NLRA to many workers employed by tribal-owned and -operated enterprises on Indian land. A great majority of these workers are not Native Americans and in recent years there has been a substantial expansion of enterprises that would be impacted by this legislation, including not only casinos, but mining operations, power plants, saw mills, ski resorts, high-tech firms, hotels, and spas.

AFSCME supports the principle of sovereignty for tribal governments, but does not believe that this principle should be used to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. We oppose any effort to exempt on an across-the-board basis all tribal enterprises from the NLRA, without regard to a specific review of all the circumstances, as is currently provided by National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) standards. Workers must not be left without any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively, especially in instances where they are working for commercial operations competing with other businesses.

AFSCME strongly urges you to oppose S. 140, as amended, when it comes before the House for a vote.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Government Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this Federal Government has had a very spotty record over the many decades of its treatment of Native American Indian Tribes in this Nation, and for us to not

act in order to countermand what the National Labor Relations Board has done on its own would be a mistake. It would be wrongheaded, in that if we are going to have the types of relations, these government-to-government relations with Indian Tribes in this country, that level of respect, then Congress needs to act, Congress needs to maintain that relation.

So for local governments, State governments to have this protection from the NLRA and the Tribes not to, then we would be making a severe mistake to not take action here today with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for all portions of S. 140 today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

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

I respect and support Tribal sovereignty. I also support workers' rights to unionize and collective bargaining to improve their workplace and the lives of their families. Those rights must be balanced, but they are not in this bill.

Union members have a collective voice to fight for higher wages, better benefits, safer workplaces, fewer injuries, fewer deaths, lower rates of gender-based violence.

After Unite Here, a union, found that 58 percent of hotel workers and 77 percent of casino workers in the Chicagoland, where I am from, had been sexually harassed, they won a contract that includes panic buttons to protect workers.

Labor rights are fundamental, but under this bill, workers at Tribally-owned businesses, casinos and hotels, construction, and other industries would lose those rights.

Remember, three out of four workers employed in Tribal casinos are not Tribal members. Those workers could end up with no way to bargain for fair wages, appeal unfair disciplinary action, or act against sexual harassment.

Looking at a similar bill in the last Congress, the International Labour Organization stated: "It would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the National Labor Relations Act and its mechanisms would give rise to a failure to ensure to these workers their fundamental freedom of association rights absent any assurances that there were Tribal labor laws that provide the same rights to all workers."

Mr. Speaker, there is no such requirement in this bill. Protect workers. Reject this unfair and unbalanced bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the opinion from the International Labour Office.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE,
Genève 22.

Mr. R.L. TRUMKA,
President, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. TRUMKA: I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 22 October 2015 requesting an informal opinion and guidance from

the International Labour Organization in respect of a Bill being considered by the United States Congress.

In particular, you have raised concerns about the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 511) which you state would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of a large number of workers employed by tribal-owned and tribal-operated enterprises located on tribal territory and ask for the informal opinion of the Office as to whether such an exclusion of workers employed on tribal lands would be in conformity with the principles of freedom of Association which are at the core of the ILO Constitution and the ILO's Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.

In conformity with the regular procedure concerning requests for an informal opinion from the International Labour Office in respect of draft legislation and its possible impact on international labour standards and principles, the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labour standards or principles on freedom of association.

Your links to committee reports of the congressional majority and minority and other background information have enabled the Office to consider the views of the parties both for and against the proposed amendment and they all appear to confirm recognition of the United States' obligation to uphold freedom of association and collective bargaining. While the proponents of the Bill assert that this can be achieved through the labour relations' regimes autonomously determined by the tribal nations, the opponents—and you yourself in your request—maintain that excluding tribal lands from the NLRA will in effect result in a loss (or at the very least inadequate protection) of their trade union rights. Not only do you refer to tribal labour relations ordinances which in your view provide inadequate protections in this regard, but you also refer to instances where there are no tribal labour relations ordinances at all.

While elements of indigenous peoples' sovereignty have been invoked by the proponents of this Bill, the central question revolves around the manner in which the United States Government can best assure throughout its territory the full application of the fundamental principles of freedom of association and collective bargaining. From an ILO perspective, while the variety of mechanisms for ensuring freedom of association and collective bargaining rights may differ depending on distinct sectoral considerations or devolution of labour competence, it is critical that the State (the national authority) takes ultimate responsibility for ensuring respect for freedom of association and collective bargaining rights throughout its territory.

As you have indicated, the 2004 San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino decision assures possible recourse to the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), an overarching mechanism aimed at ensuring the protection of freedom of association, while also maintaining deference to the sovereign interests of the tribal nations so as to avoid touching on exclusive rights of self-governance.

Full abdication of review via an exclusion from the scope of the NLRA for all workers employed on tribal lands as described might make it very difficult for the United States Government to assure the fundamental trade union rights of workers. In cases like those mentioned where there are no tribal labour relations ordinances, undue restrictions on collective bargaining, excessive limitations on freedom of association rights or lack of

protection from unfair labour practices, workers on tribal territories would be left without any remedy for violation of their fundamental freedom of association rights, short of a constitutional battle. Furthermore, the exclusion proposed, with no avenue for federal review or overarching mechanism for appeal should there be an alleged violation of freedom of association, would give rise to discrimination in relation to the protection of trade union rights which would affect both indigenous and non-indigenous workers simply on the basis of their workplace location.

Given the concerns that you have raised, it would be critically important that, at the very least, a complete legal and comparative review be undertaken to support assurances that all rights, mechanisms and remedies for the full protection of internationally recognized freedom of association rights are available to all workers on all tribal lands. In the absence of such assurances, it would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the NLRA and its mechanisms would give rise to a failure to ensure to these workers their fundamental freedom of association rights.

In accordance with ILO procedure concerning requests for informal opinions on draft legislation, this communication will also be brought to the attention of the United States Government and the representative employers' organization, the US Council for International Business.

Yours sincerely,

CORINNE VARGHA,
Director of the

International Labour Standards Department.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 140, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, a provision in the pending legislation that will end the National Labor Relations Board's alarming overreach into businesses operated on sovereign Tribal lands.

In March of 2017, the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, which I have the privilege of chairing, held a hearing on this legislation and heard from Native American business leaders on how the NLRB's arbitrary use of its jurisdiction had been harming businesses large and small on Tribal lands.

Leaders of the Native American community testified before the subcommittee on how the NLRB had meddled in the day-to-day operations and management of Native American businesses, often dragging out matters for years.

To make matters worse, the proceedings led by the NLRB are creating burdensome legal costs for businesses who are seeking to provide high-quality goods and services to Native American communities.

While members of the NLRB have changed and have begun to make great progress in reversing some of the Board's most damaging decisions, Congress needs to make it clear that Tribal labor sovereignty must be safe from future Washington overreach.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act will clarify the National Labor Relations Act and reverse the troubling encroachment of the Federal Government on Tribal lands.

Congress has the opportunity here to stand up for sovereign rights of Native Americans and the businesses they own and operate on their lands. These Tribes have created their own system of labor protections for employees and employers consistent with their lands and traditions, and it is not for Washington bureaucrats to tamper with those protections.

I urge my colleagues to support the sovereignty of all Native American Tribes and pass the underlying bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the bill before us that takes away National Labor Relations Act protections for hundreds of thousands of workers.

I support Tribal sovereignty. In my home State of Wisconsin, I am proud the Ho-Chunk Nation is in my district. Potawatomi, Oneida, Menominee, St. Croix, Stockbridge-Munsee, Lac du Flambeau, Lac Corte Oreilles, Red Cliff, Bad River, and other Tribes all reside in my home State, and I am glad to support the autonomy of those Tribal nations. But this bill isn't about Tribal sovereignty. It is about going after workers' rights.

Look at the track record of the majority in this Congress. The Republicans have continued to go after workers' rights, as they have so far. They have repealed the rule that required companies seeking large Federal contracts to disclose violations of labor law. They made it harder for people whose jobs are shipped overseas to get unemployment insurance. They have made it harder for workers whose employers don't offer retirement plans to save for retirement. They have repealed an OSHA rule requiring employers to maintain accurate records of serious workplace injuries for 5 years, while the administration drastically reduces the number of OSHA inspectors.

This bill isn't about meaningful sovereignty. It is about selective sovereignty, because it only goes after labor rights.

If this were a bill about sovereignty, it would include a number of other areas that Tribes are compelled to follow in addition to the National Labor Relations Act: the Occupational Safety and Health Act; the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA; the Family and Medical Leave Act; and the public accommodations of Americans with Disabilities Act, just to start.

If this bill was about sovereignty, it would exempt OSHA and ERISA and the FMLA and the ADA, for starters. But it doesn't do that. This bill only exempts labor protections for hundreds of thousands of workers, Tribal members and nonmembers, because the majority in this Congress isn't really worried about sovereignty. It is concerned

about taking away the rights of workers, and that is what this bill is really about.

Mr. Speaker, if this body wants to help Tribes, I am here to help. Bring a bill to the floor that covers all exempted areas, and that is a bill that I could support. But that is not what is in front of us today.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of opposition from the International Union of Operating Engineers, the United Auto Workers, United Food and Commercial Workers, and Unite Here.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
OPERATING ENGINEERS,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The International Union of Operating Engineers opposes the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, legislation contained in S. 140 (115-54) that would eliminate the labor protections currently guaranteed to hundreds of thousands of American workers. Indeed, if enacted into law, this bill would constitute the biggest rollback in labor law since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947.

The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) represents nearly 400,000 men and women across North America. Members of the International Union of Operating Engineers maintain and operate Native American and non-Native American gaming facilities around the United States, from Connecticut to California, and this legislation would have a dramatic effect on their lives and livelihoods. The IUOE is the second-biggest union in the hospitality sector. But this legislation extends beyond casinos and gaming. IUOE members work in mining and energy facilities on Native American lands in a number of locations, and those workers eventually could lose their rights as a result of this legislation.

In a few short words, this bill changes current law by exempting the National Labor Relations Act from tribal enterprises on tribal lands. Today, the National Labor Relations Board (Board) implements a case-by-case review of whether labor law applies to tribal enterprises.

The precedent-setting case that comes from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians is instructive. The Tribe operated a 92,000-sq.ft. casino (over two acres), with 1,400 employees. Only five of the workers were Native American. The Board determined that this large commercial establishment should not receive the exemption from labor law provided to states and local government because its operations were fundamentally different than a government. The San Manuels were not providing a public good to members of the tribe. They were not behaving like a government. Instead, the Board determined that when the tribal operation in question is commercial in nature, employs significant numbers of non-Indians, and caters to a non-Native American clientele, "the special attributes of sovereignty are not implicated." The Board determined that private labor law applies to the San Manuel casino, just as it would with any other commercial operation. Federal courts have supported this interpretation. Sovereignty does, however, apply to governmental functions of the tribe, just as they would with any state government.

If passed, the exemption from labor law would unfairly advantage commercial tribal operations at the expense of non-Native

American private-sector companies. Competitors with Native American commercial operations must comply with labor law; Native American operations will not. As mentioned above, the bill's reach extends well beyond the gaming industry. Tribes are engaged in a variety of commercial enterprises, from mining and energy development, to manufacturing and construction. Over time, it is reasonable to expect that tribal enterprises will expand and compete more aggressively with non-Native companies in a wide variety of commercial sectors, without any concern for the rights of workers.

Tribal labor law is woefully inadequate—virtually non-existent in most tribes around the country. It is no replacement for the nation's basic legal framework that protects workers' rights. Eliminating the NLRA for tribal enterprises will strip away freedoms guaranteed to Americans today, including hundreds of thousands of workers at tribal casinos who are not Native American. S. 140 (115-54) would immediately eliminate the rights of thousands of Operating Engineers in workplaces all over the United States.

The International Union of Operating Engineers opposes S. 140 (115-54), which eliminates nearly one-million workers' individual right to take collective action to improve their working conditions, and respectfully urges you to oppose it when it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives on Wednesday.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED
AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND AG-
RICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS
OF AMERICA—UAW,

Washington, DC, January 9, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than one million active and retired members of the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), I urge you to vote against S. 140, because it includes provisions from the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 986). This misguided bill would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to hundreds of thousands of workers employed by tribal casinos. This legislation could also impact dozens of other businesses, including power plants, mining operations, and hotels.

UAW believes strongly in tribal sovereignty and has a strong record of supporting civil rights. This bill, however, is misleading. It is an attack on fundamental collective bargaining rights and would strip workers in commercial enterprises of their rights and protections under the NLRA. Under the terms of this bill, when a labor contract expires, a tribe could unilaterally terminate the bargaining relationship with the union without legal consequence under the NLRA, because the employer's obligation to bargain could be eliminated. As a result of having a union and a legally binding contract, hundreds of dealers have been promoted to benefited and supervisory positions because of provisions in the contract that maintain minimum percentages of full-time, part-time, and supervisory positions. Work rules, wages, and benefits have all improved because of the right to collectively bargain. This bill would jeopardize these hard-fought gains.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act seeks to overturn a decision by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) in San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2004). In that decision, the Board concluded that applying the NLRA would not interfere with the tribe's autonomy and the effects of

the NLRA would not "extend beyond the tribe's business enterprise and regulate intramural matters." The ruling does not apply in instances where its application would "touch exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters" or "abrogate Indian treaty rights." The NLRB has taken a nuanced view on this matter and has ruled on a case-by-case basis. Congressional interference is not justified.

Supporters of the bill argue that the bill creates parity for the tribes with state and local governments who are not covered under the NLRA. However, there are some significant differences. Tribes are exempt from employment laws (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act) that apply to state and local governments, whereas private sector contractors work extensively on behalf of state and local governments and generally must comply with the NLRA. Non-tribal members cannot petition a tribe for labor legislation, while workers employed by a state or local government have a voice with their elected leaders. This is significant because 75 percent of Native American gaming employees are not tribal members. At Foxwoods, where the UAW represents the workers, well over 98 percent of employees and patrons are not tribal members. Hundreds of tribal gaming facilities make tens of billions in revenue annually, and these employees are working for what is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

At a time of growing wealth inequality and a shrinking middle class, the last thing Congress should do is deprive workers of their legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively. We urge you to oppose S. 140.

Sincerely,

JOSH NASSAR,
Legislative Director.

UFCW,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2018.

To All Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.3 million members of United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW), I am writing to express our strong opposition to the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act as rolled into a bill that will be reported as S. 140.

UFCW is proud to represent 1,000 members at casinos that operate on tribal lands. These workers have joined together to bargain collectively for good wages, decent benefits, and a voice on the job. Passage of the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act would take that voice away.

We support sovereignty for tribal governments, but the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act is so broad that it would prevent any worker from exercising their freedom of association under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). The vast majority tribal casino workers are not tribal members and therefore have no voice in tribal policy and are not protected under tribal law.

Most federal laws protecting the workplace apply to tribal businesses including the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), and NLRA. The NLRA should not be treated any differently than these other important laws that protect workers.

There are many differences between state and local governments and tribal businesses. State and local governments do not operate multi-billion dollar commercial Enterprises, nor manage enterprises where the majority of the employees and customers are from outside of the jurisdiction. If working people don't like state and local government policy

they can change management by voting for different lawmakers, while non-tribal employees and customers have no meaningful way to influence tribal policy.

Congress should be working to expand the rights of American workers, not take them away. We urge you to stand up for American workers and oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. PERRONE,
International President.

UNITE HERE!,
Las Vegas, NV

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: UNITE HERE represents over 275,000 hardworking men and women in the hospitality industry and strongly urges you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 986).

Like most Americans, our members have a deep respect for Native Americans and their role in shaping our nation. Our members also have a deep and abiding respect for the rights of American workers and to uphold the laws that govern our nation and all of its citizens.

This brings me to H.R. 986. This bill would exempt all businesses owned and operated by Indian nations from the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Tribal businesses, including but not limited to Indian-owned casinos, have workforces and customers that are almost all non-Indian. If this bill were to become law, American citizens working for Native American businesses would lose their U.S. rights under the NLRA, including "full freedom of association" and "self-organization" without "discrimination." Over the last 30 years, as Indian enterprises entered the stream of interstate commerce, a number of federal laws protecting the workplace have been applied to Indian businesses: Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), and National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Congress should not treat the rights Americans have under the NLRA any differently than these other important laws that protect American workers.

Much has been made of the need for this bill to give tribal governments "parity" with state and local governments. This comparison is misleading, if not absurd. States and local governments do not typically operate multi-billion dollar commercial enterprises. States and local governments do not typically run enterprises where the overwhelming majority of the government's employees are from outside of their jurisdiction and the overwhelming majority of customers are also from outside of their jurisdiction. In a state or locality, if the citizens who live there don't like the government's policies, they can vote for people to change those policies. The non-tribal employees and customers have no meaningful way to influence tribal policies.

In this time of incredible income inequality in our country, Congress should be working to expand the rights of American workers, not finding ways to take them away. H.R. 986 is no different than the laws signed by Governors Scott Walker (R-WI) and Rick Snyder (R-MI): they attack the basic rights of workers to organize and collectively bargain.

Please stand up for American workers and join our union to oppose H.R. 986.

Sincerely,

D. TAYLOR.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact of those in opposition, but 150 Tribes and individuals from the Native Americans that are asking for this stand in support of this, and we

are delighted to listen to that and work for a solution here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

□ 1715

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the adoption of the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, an important and long overdue provision included in this legislation before us today.

For nearly 70 years, the National Labor Relations Board respected the sovereignty of Native American Tribes throughout the country and allowed the Tribes to adjudicate labor issues within the laws and standards of each Tribe. However, in 2004, the NLRB began to change its longstanding practices and adopted subjective tests to determine when it wanted to assert its jurisdiction in matters involving Native American Tribes.

These subjective tests are applied on an arbitrary, case-by-case basis and are having an impact on Tribal businesses that are operated on sovereign Tribal lands. Tribal business leaders have been asking Congress to respect their sovereign rights and end the NLRB's inconsistent and misguided decisions when it comes to labor decisions dealing with Tribal businesses.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, sponsored by Representative TODD ROKITA, a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, stops the NLRB from picking winners and losers when it comes to matters dealing with Tribal businesses and ends the bureaucratic overreach conducted by the NLRB in recent years.

Most importantly, this legislation protects the sovereignty Native Americans deserve and ensures that Tribes have control over their own labor relations and, ultimately, determine what works best for workplaces on Tribal lands.

Bipartisan support for Tribal sovereignty has been reaffirmed time and again by Congress, and for more than 180 years, the Supreme Court has held that Tribes possess a nationhood status and retain inherent powers of self-government. It is time that we strip unelected bureaucrats of the power they abuse and respect the rights of Native American Tribes.

I wish to thank Representative TODD ROKITA for introducing and championing the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act and urge Members to support this important clarification to Federal law.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will you advise as to how much time is left on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Virginia has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Appropriations Sub-

committee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

It was in 1935 that this body enacted the National Labor Relations Act. It guaranteed basic rights to private sector workers to organize into trade unions, to engage in contractual bargaining for decent wages and better conditions at work, and to take joint action, if necessary.

But in 1935, just like today, here, 2018, the Republican Party and business interests vehemently opposed passage of any laws that help workers. Little has changed. Once again our Republican colleagues trample on the backs of workers.

This legislation rolls back proven protections that allow wages to rise in places like California, and their casinos, from \$10 an hour to \$13 an hour. Now, these modest pay increases have helped elevate the workers who work in those casinos above the Federal poverty level.

Who has ever tried to buy a house in California or tried to live on \$13 an hour or \$10 an hour? You are not talking about a whole lot of money there, especially from a party that just gave \$1 trillion away to the people at the very top.

But with this bill, our Republican colleagues chose to strip these hundreds of thousands of workers, the majority of whom are not members of Tribes but work in those casinos, of decent wages and their right to a voice in the workplace.

Wow.

Beneath their sheepskin costumes hides another Republican attack on worker rights in this country, this time under the guise of Tribal sovereignty.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentlewoman from Ohio an additional 1 minute.

Ms. KAPTUR. Let me remind my colleagues though, throughout our National Labor Relations Board's history, it has never and will not assert jurisdiction where it would interfere with a Tribe's internal governance rights in purely intramural matters.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this bad bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the strong opposition to it from the United Steelworkers of America and from the Communications Workers of America. As a proud daughter of labor, I am proud to stand here today in opposition to this bill.

UNITED STEELWORKERS,

Pittsburgh, PA, January 9, 2018.

Re United Steelworkers oppose inclusion of anti-worker H.R. 986, Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2017 in S. 140.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 850,000 members of the United Steelworkers (USW), we strongly urge you to oppose S. 140 on the House floor this week. Rather than

being identical to the Senate bill, this version includes the anti-worker and undemocratic Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2017 (H.R. 986).

H.R. 986 would exempt all employees of federally recognized Native American-owned commercial enterprises operated on Indian lands from the protections of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and would authorize over 567 distinct and separate labor law jurisdictions in the United States.

To be absolutely clear, this legislation strips workers—both Native American and non-Native American—of their NLRA protections. While some organizations have falsely attempted to paint tribal governments as similar entities to states (which are exempt from the NLRA), tribal governments are substantially different than states in one key democratic principal: state governments allow workers an ability to vote for their legislators no matter their ancestry, while most tribal governments require blood quantum or lineal descent to determine who is eligible for membership or citizenship.

Simply put, if H.R. 986 becomes law by inclusion in S. 140, U.S. citizens working in the United States for tribal commercial enterprises would not be able to vote for the elected representatives who set their labor laws. These workers will lose the ability to petition the government that oversees their working conditions.

The gaming industry, which is an employer for approximately 246 of the 567 federally recognized American Indian tribes; has over 600,000 casino workers on tribal lands, the overwhelming majority of whom are not Native Americans. In 2011 before the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, the National Indian Gaming Commission testified that the vast majority of employees (up to 75 percent) were non-tribal members.

Our union understands the importance of the principle of tribal sovereignty; however the fundamental human rights of employees are not the exclusive concern of tribal enterprises or tribal governments. As the International Labor Organization highlighted in a letter on a previous version of this bill, “it is critical that the State (the national authority) takes ultimate responsibility for ensuring respect for freedom of association and collective bargaining rights throughout its territory”. That is why we believe the current test set by the NLRB is the best course of action until labor laws are strengthened in the United States.

In 2004, the NLRB under the Bush Administration ruled for the first time that Tribal casino workers should have the benefit of NLRA protections, San Manuel, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2204). Yet, since the San Manuel ruling, the NLRB has asserted jurisdiction on a case-by-case basis. In 2015, the NLRB declined jurisdiction citing the 1830 Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek and 1866 Treaty of Washington stating:

“We have no doubt that asserting jurisdiction over the Casino and the Nation would effectuate the policies of the Act. However, because we find that asserting jurisdiction would abrogate treaty rights specific to the Nation.” Chickasaw Nation Windstar World Casino, 362 NLRB 109 92015).

Similarly the NLRB declined jurisdiction: “. . . when an Indian tribe is fulfilling a traditionally tribal or governmental function that is unique to its status, fulfilling just such a unique governmental function [providing free health care services solely to tribal members],” Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation, 341 NLRB 139 (2004).

The NLRB has developed a reasonable and responsible test to determine jurisdiction. H.R. 986 creates significant confusion and jurisdictional issues over labor law enforcement and grossly undermines worker's

rights. Our union urges you to oppose S. 140, with the inclusion of H.R. 986, and asks you to instead work to expand worker's rights not restrict them further.

Sincerely,

LEO W. GERARD,
International President.

JANUARY 9, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members and officers of the Communications Workers of America (CWA), I am writing to express our strong opposition to S. 140. CWA has no objections whatsoever to Sections 1 and 2 of the bill as amended. Unfortunately, these non-controversial, sensible bills have been hijacked to also pass H.R. 986, a bill that would strip hundreds of thousands of workers at tribal-owned and -operated enterprises of their protections for the right to bargain collectively.

H.R. 986 seeks to overturn a National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) decision in San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, which applied the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to a tribal casino enterprise. The NLRB's finding in San Manuel adopted a test to determine whether the NLRA is applicable to businesses operating on tribal lands—if it would “touch exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters” or “abrogate Indian treaty rights,” the NLRA would not apply, but otherwise the decision will be based on a series of factors including whether an entity is a purely commercial enterprise or employs or caters to individuals who are not tribal members.

The San Manuel test balances two crucial issues—tribal sovereignty and the right of workers to bargain collectively. The test ensures that truly internal matters of self-governance will continue to be handled by sovereign tribes, while also ensuring that the fundamental rights of workers to organize and advocate for their own interests are properly respected. H.R. 986 would overturn this balance by exempting any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian tribe and located on its land from the requirements of the NLRA—or any other guarantee of workers' fundamental right to organize and collectively bargain.

The practical impact of H.R. 986 would be to exempt a broad swath of businesses from the NLRA, even though, in many cases, they are purely commercial enterprises. For many of these companies—particularly casinos—the majority of their workforces are not members of the tribe employing them and therefore do not have full access to internal, tribal mechanisms for grievance issues or petitioning for change in tribal policies. This is why the International Labour Organization stated in 2015 that “it would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the NLRA and its mechanisms would give rise to a failure to ensure these workers their fundamental freedom of association rights.”

I urge you to oppose S. 140 as amended and instead work to advance an agenda that protects both workers' fundamental human right to organize and tribal sovereignty. CWA will consider including votes on this bill in our Congressional Scorecard Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

SHANE LARSON,
Legislative Director,
Communications Workers of America (CWA).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) for introducing this very important legislation that restores a

simple promise: the sovereign rights of Native Americans will be protected.

For almost 70 years following the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, Tribal sovereignty was upheld and Tribes were given the equal right to self-governance enjoyed by our State and local governments. For the Tribes in my district, sovereignty meant the freedom to advance their own economic development and provide critical government services to their Tribal members.

With the NLRB's San Manuel decision, unelected bureaucrats tossed aside this longstanding precedent and began to assert themselves in Tribal matters on an arbitrary, case-by-case basis. The agency granted itself the right to navigate Tribal law and decide when a Tribal enterprise is for commercial purposes, a requirement that would never be imposed on revenue-generating activities of State and local governments.

As the Federal bureaucracy expands its own power, Tribes face legal confusion and uncertainty, hindering their self-sufficiency and the ability to provide for their members.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act restores the well-established legal standard of Tribal sovereignty. As State and local governments are excluded from the Federal requirements of the NLRA, this bill simply ensures Tribal governments receive equal treatment, not lesser status. It provides our Tribes with needed clarity that, when an enterprise is owned and operated by the Indian Tribe and located on Tribal land, Tribal sovereignty will be protected.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation, and I am glad it was included in this package, which I urge my colleagues to support.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, what a sad state of affairs. There are scores of critically important issues that need to be considered by this House, not the least of which is funding our government. We failed to do that, and now we are confronted with a bill that is recycled, and we have added two natural resources bills on it that could have passed unanimously.

I am a big defender of Native Tribes' rights and sovereignty, and I know that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle remain committed to their sovereignty as well. This bill, however, is about undermining the National Labor Relations Act, not about Tribal sovereignty.

That act, the National Labor Relations Act, safeguards workers' rights to organize and bargain collectively. Most of my friends on the other side of the aisle are not for that. I know that. I have seen them vote that way.

No matter where you work, the basic protections for American workers, however, ought to apply. It is already

settled law that the National Labor Relations Act and other worker protection laws apply to businesses even on Tribal lands outside the context of inherently governmental functions carried out by Tribal governments. This was not decided by some faceless bureaucrat. This was a court of our land that made this decision.

Instead of undermining workers' rights, this House ought to be moving forward with policies that help our workers and their families make it in America as part of a strong middle class. That means raising wages. It means making childcare more affordable. It means expanding access to opportunities like higher education, homeownership, and a secure retirement. Those are the issues that Democrats continue to be focused on.

That is not what this bill focuses on. Instead, Republicans are focused not on helping workers, but trying to pit one group, Tribes, against another group, workers. That is not what we ought to have in this country.

And they are attaching popular, non-controversial natural resources bills to this legislation. They have nothing to do with this legislation and would pass overwhelmingly.

I am going to vote against this bill, and I hope they will bring the natural resources bills back so we can pass those, as everybody wants to do.

This is not the kind of regular order Speaker RYAN promised when he took the gavel and that Republicans promised when they took the majority.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. As I said at the beginning, we are bringing this bill to the floor, a retreat. This is not new legislation that they are offering. The only thing new about it is they put two natural resources bills attached to it.

We should be focused, as I said before, on reaching agreement on appropriation bills, on caps, on protecting DREAMers, on making sure that CHIP children aren't left aside, not this bill. But those bills aren't scheduled today, and they are not scheduled next week as far as I know. Maybe the majority leader will give me better information tomorrow.

In fact, what we really ought to be working on now, as I say, are those appropriation bills. But, under the Republican majority, we are still stuck working on fiscal year 2018 when we are already nearly halfway through.

I urge my colleagues not to oppose Tribal sovereignty, not to oppose the rights of our Native American brothers and sisters. We are for them, but not to be pitted against workers making a decent, acceptable wage so they can live with some quality of life.

It is not enough to give the upper 1 percent a huge tax cut and pretend that you are helping the middle class, the workers. In fact, in this bill, you are doing exactly the opposite.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and stand up for workers, whether they are Native Americans or whoever they may be. Stand up for workers. Respect workers. Understand that workers made this country great, and they deserve our support and our protection. Defeat this bill.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a gentleman who had a distinguished record of supporting and helping and enabling workers.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 140 and its inclusion of H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act.

There are more than 560 federally recognized Native American Tribes across the United States, and each of these Tribes has a unique history and distinct culture that have helped shape who we are today as a nation. Each Tribe has an inherent right to self-govern, just like any other sovereign government does.

That right to self-governance is rooted in the Constitution and has been reaffirmed by courts for almost 200 years. Because of it, Tribal leaders are able to make decisions that affect their people in a way that makes the most sense for their Tribe and best protects the interests of their members—or, rather, they should be able to make those decisions.

We are here today because, for the past 14 years, the National Labor Relations Board has ignored longstanding labor policy and involved itself in Tribal activities. Since its 2004 San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino decision, the Board has used a subjective test to decide on a case-by-case basis whether a Tribal business or Tribal land is for commercial purposes, and, if it is, the Board has asserted its jurisdiction over that business.

□ 1730

Among its other provisions, the bill under consideration would amend the National Labor Relations Act to reaffirm that the NLRB cannot assert its authority over enterprises or institutions owned or operated by a Tribe on Tribal land. It very simply reasserts a legal standard that was in place for decades and returns to Tribes the ability to manage their own labor relations as a sovereign right has.

I want to thank my friend and fellow member of the Education and the Workforce Committee from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) for his leadership on this issue and for continuing to work on those in Congress who have helped lead the fight to protect Tribal sovereignty over the years.

It is time for all of us to join that fight and stand with the Native American community and restore to Indian Tribes the ability to govern their own labor relations.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how you support Tribal sovereignty, which, by definition, is a sovereign state, but not allow Tribes to self-govern. I don't understand that, and I also don't under-

stand, Mr. Speaker, if our friends on the other side of the aisle today are so worried about getting our work done, why I had to leave committee hearings to come over here three times today to vote not adjourning this body. I would like to know that.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, the land of opportunity is right here. It is called the United States of America. But, unfortunately, there is not always a level playing field when it comes to that land of opportunity. This year is the 83rd anniversary of the National Labor Relations Act, the act that gave workers a voice, a voice in the workplace. It gave them the ability to bargain—along with their employers—a living wage, pensions, the ability to retire with dignity.

But today, we are really debating how to hurt workers—that somehow you get treated outside of the reservations in a humane way, where casinos are operating in a very profitable way, but you cross that line, and you are being treated differently. You are being treated less than and doing it all under the guise of Native American sovereignty.

The vast majority of casinos on their properties are treated with respect by employees. But they were able to get to some folks to introduce this piece that somehow let them try to do it differently on that line. When we cross it, you are less than. We can take advantage of you, and we see that happen time after time.

I have been before the NLRB many times, had cases. I won many, but I also lost them. But I always felt as if I was treated fairly. And that is what we should be doing here, treating employees, no matter where you are in this great country, fairly. It has been a decade since we raised the minimum wage. And somehow, we are just looking for no reason to hurt employees.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, we want to respect the sovereign nations, but we can't pick and choose the way we treat them. Certainly, everybody who works in this great country deserves an opportunity to be treated fairly.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Transport Workers Union of America that talks about being fairly treated.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO,

January 10, 2018.

VOTE ALERT: VOTE NO ON THE TRIBAL LABOR SOVEREIGNTY ACT (S. 140)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Transport Workers Union of America (TWU), AFL-CIO, we write urging you to oppose the

Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. This bill (introduced as H.R. 986) has been paired with unrelated bills and packaged as part of S. 140, which the House is expected to vote on today. We urge you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act by voting NO on S. 140.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act would exempt from the protections of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) workers employed by tribal-owned and -operated commercial enterprises located on tribal lands. Under this bill, the NLRA rights and protections would be denied to more than 600,000 tribal casino workers, the vast majority of whom are not Native American.

This bill would overturn a 2004 decision by the Bush Administration's National Labor Relations Board (Board), in which the Board applied the NLRA to a tribal casino (San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2004)). In reaching this decision, the Board applied a test: the NLRA will not apply if its application would "touch exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters." And, the NLRA will not apply if it would "abrogate Indian treaty rights." The Board also considered other factors, including that the casino in question was a typical commercial enterprise that catered to non-Native American customers and employed non-Native Americans. While the Board asserted NLRA protections in the San Manuel decision, it ruled the opposite way, denying its jurisdiction in a companion case (Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation, 341 NLRB No. 139 (2004)).

We understand the importance of tribal sovereignty and support the principle in true self-governance matters. But the fundamental human rights of employees are not the exclusive concern of tribal enterprises or tribal governments. While proponents of the bill falsely compare tribal governments to state governments, they miss a glaring truth: while state governments are exempt from NLRA protections, their workers are eligible to vote for those who set their labor laws. But the vast majority of the 600,000 casino workers who would be impacted by the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act are not Native Americans, and therefore have no voice in the selection of those setting tribal policy nor the ability to petition the tribal government to protect their rights.

We object to a sweeping exemption of all tribal enterprises from the NLRA, and believe the test used by the Board to determine whether the NLRA is applicable should remain. Unfortunately, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act has been packaged with unrelated bills in an attempt to pressure support for this particular bill. While TWU has no position on the other bills contained in S. 140, we urge you vote NO in opposition to the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to really look inside yourself. Is this the best way to treat employees? Is this how we help lift up all of those workers? I think not, and I urge Members to reject this attempt to hurt workers and not protect sovereignty.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of yielding 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the sponsor of this legislation, as well as the chair of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I rise in strong support of this bill which includes a provision identical to the legislation that I have been cosponsoring

the last two Congresses, H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. I also want to thank all of the Members who came in support of this legislation here today and last Congress from this side of the aisle who stood up for the rights of sovereign nations, our friends, Native Americans, and who made very clear the issue before us today.

It was mentioned by the naysayers on the other side of the aisle that the NLRA, the National Labor Relations Act, started in 1935. If you go back to that legislation—and it still exists today in the same form—you see that Federal, State, and local governments are exempted from the act for good reason.

This was supposed to always be a private sector labor relations act and bill. Now, we can argue the pros and cons of that all day long, but that is not the debate here today. The fact of the matter is that governments were specifically exempted.

Mr. Speaker, why does that not include our Native American friends who have sovereign nations? You know, I took my two boys—Kathy and I took my two boys, Ryan and Teddy, to a water park this year and last year—two different cities in my district. Those cities operated the water park. They owned it. We paid the fee. We went in. We used it.

The employees who worked there—and they were excellent—were exempt from the NLRA. Yet the Democrats who pander to groups left and right are now saying that they are for the sovereign rights of the government, of our Native American Tribes, but they say this isn't that bill. No, it is. It is that simple.

You are either for their sovereignty, Mr. Speaker, or you are not. And that is all this bill does. It doesn't choose between friends. The Democrats do not need to worry. It is either you are for people in believing in their own destiny and manifesting it, or you think that you have to subject them to your will. That is all this bill is about.

By the way, I think it is absolutely ridiculous—Dr. ROE asked the question. I won't ask the question. I will put it in statement form. I think it is absolutely ridiculous that some Members, Mr. Speaker, can come to the floor of the House today and say that this is not an important bill, that the rights of the governments of sovereign nations aren't important, and that there are other things to do.

Yet, three times today, the Democrats motioned to adjourn the House, wasting precious legislative time. This bill is supported by more than 150 Tribes. The chamber of commerce supports the bill. Four Democrats cosponsor the bill, and I thank each of them for it. Last Congress, the bill passed the House with bipartisan support. And, Mr. Speaker, I suspect it will again today.

Let's get this job done. Let's support our Native American friends. Let's support the sovereignty of the govern-

ments at the Federal, State, and local level. Support this bill, especially subsection 3.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter in opposition to the bill from the AFL-CIO.

AFL-CIO LEGISLATIVE ALERT

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, January 9, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The AFL-CIO urges you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, H.R. 986, which would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to a large number of workers employed by tribal-owned and -operated enterprises located on Indian land. Among these workers are over 600,000 tribal casino workers, the vast majority of whom are not Native Americans. In recent years, the number and type of enterprises affected has grown well beyond the gaming industry, and would now include mining operations, power plants, smoke shops, saw mills, construction companies, ski resorts, high-tech firms, hotels, and spas. Many of these are commercial businesses that compete with non-Indian enterprises. As proposed, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act would strip all workers in these enterprises of their rights and protections under the NLRA.

The House bill, introduced by Representative ROKITA, would overturn a decision by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) in San Manuel Indian Bingo & Casino, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2004), which applied the NLRA to a tribal casino enterprise. In San Manuel, the NLRB looked to Supreme Court and circuit court precedent to articulate a test for whether the NLRB should assert jurisdiction over tribal enterprises, whether located on tribal lands or outside them. (Before San Manuel, NLRB jurisdiction was determined based solely on location: On tribal land, the NLRB would forego jurisdiction; off tribal land, the NLRB would assert jurisdiction. Under the San Manuel test, the NLRA will not apply if its application would "touch exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters." Nor will the NLRA apply if it would "abrogate Indian treaty rights." The Board in San Manuel also considered other factors, including whether the casino in question was a typical commercial enterprise, employed non-Native Americans, and catered to non-Native American customers.

In San Manuel, the Board concluded that applying the NLRA would not interfere with the tribe's autonomy, and the effects of the NLRA would not "extend beyond the tribe's business enterprise and regulate intramural matters." However, the test articulated in San Manuel provides a careful balancing of tribal sovereignty interests with the NLRA's federal labor law protections. In a companion case, Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corp., 341 NLRB No. 139 (2004), the Board tipped the balance the other way and didn't assert jurisdiction.

The AFL-CIO supports the principle of sovereignty for tribal governments, but does not believe that employers should use this principle to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. While the AFL-CIO continues to support the concept of tribal sovereignty in truly internal, self-governance matters, it is in no position to repudiate fundamental human rights that belong to every worker in every nation. Workers cannot be left without any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively in instances where they are

working for a tribal enterprise which is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

The International Labour Organization (ILO), an agency of the United Nations, has confirmed this view in response to a question about whether excluding (from the NLRA) workers employed on tribal lands would conform with principles of freedom of association. These values are at the core of the ILO Constitution and the ILO's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. The Director for the International Labour Standards Division wrote that in the absence of tribal ordinances offering full protection of internationally recognized rights, "it is critical that the State (the national authority) takes ultimate responsibility for ensuring respect for freedom of association and collective bargaining rights throughout its territory." In other words, if the tribes themselves don't guarantee these basic rights—and many do not, the U.S. government must not abdicate its responsibility to protect them.

Notwithstanding the importance of the principle of tribal sovereignty, the fundamental human rights of employees are not the exclusive concern of tribal enterprises or tribal governments. In fact, the vast majority of employees of these commercial enterprises, such as casinos, are not Native Americans. They therefore have no voice in setting tribal policy and no recourse to tribal governments for the protection of their rights.

The AFL-CIO opposes any effort to exempt on an across-the-board basis all tribal enterprises from the NLRA, without undertaking a specific review of all the circumstances—as current NLRB standards provide. Where the enterprise employs mainly Native American employees with mainly Native American customers, and involves self-governance or intramural affairs, leaving the matter to tribal governments may be appropriate. However, where the business employs primarily non-Native American employees and caters to primarily non-Native American customers, there is no basis for depriving employees of their rights and protections under the National Labor Relations Act.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL, *Director,
Government Affairs Department.*

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about State and local being exempt and Tribes not being exempt. Well, that was a decision made way back when. The law specifically exempts State and local. Maybe it should; maybe it didn't; but it did. Tribes were not specifically exempted.

So in conclusion, this bill will strip hundreds of thousands of employees of the right to join a union. Where some Tribes have Tribal labor ordinances that are fair and workable, others do not. And at least one expressly prohibits the formation of unions.

There is no principal basis for excluding these workers from coverage under labor law just because they happen to work in a commercial enterprise on Tribal lands. If this bill will come into law, it will be the first rollback of workers' rights under Federal law in over 70 years, and it may well place the United States in violation of several international trade agreements.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this has been a telling debate. Again, I think the key question here, as has been asked by so many colleagues: Are Native American Tribes government entities; are they sovereign? The only answer that we can respond with is: Absolutely, yes. They are sovereign. This is not an issue debating NLRB or NLRA. It is going back to what we have established already that, in fact, a sovereign nation, just like a State or local government, is free from the intervention of NLRB.

In this case, a sovereign nation has that right. Just as a reminder, over 150 Native American organizations have asked for this legislative effort to be achieved. Why? Because it was working fine up until 2004, and NLRB then came arbitrarily in—sometimes yes, sometimes not—intervening, but, ultimately, they were changing the system in place.

While we are moving back to letting the sovereignty reign in these Native American Tribes, yet we need to make it very clear for the future and not go back to what has precipitated this change.

The bill amends the National Labor Relations Act to clarify that the law does not apply to any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian Tribe and located on Tribal land. It protects the sovereignty of Native American Tribes, reaffirming they are afforded the same rights and protections enjoyed by State and local government.

It ensures Tribes have control over their labor relations and can determine what is best for the workplaces. It eliminates legal confusion and uncertainty that is hindering the ability of Tribal governments to serve their citizens.

Mr. Speaker, that is what it does. It reasserts and reaffirms what we have already said in law. And for that reason, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 681, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of S. 140 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4567; and

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

AYES—239

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Abraham | Gosar | Olson |
| Aderholt | Gowdy | Palazzo |
| Aguiar | Granger | Palmer |
| Allen | Graves (GA) | Paulsen |
| Amash | Graves (LA) | Pearce |
| Amodel | Graves (MO) | Perry |
| Arrington | Griffith | Peterson |
| Babin | Grothman | Pittenger |
| Bacon | Guthrie | Poe (TX) |
| Banks (IN) | Handel | Poliquin |
| Barletta | Harper | Posey |
| Barr | Harris | Ratcliffe |
| Barton | Hartzler | Reed |
| Bergman | Heck | Reichert |
| Beyer | Hensarling | Renacci |
| Biggs | Herrera Beutler | Rice (SC) |
| Billirakis | Hice, Jody B. | Roby |
| Bishop (MI) | Higgins (LA) | Roe (TN) |
| Bishop (UT) | Hill | Rogers (AL) |
| Black | Holding | Rogers (KY) |
| Blackburn | Hollingsworth | Rohrabacher |
| Blum | Hudson | Rokita |
| Brady (TX) | Huizenga | Rooney, Francis |
| Brat | Hultgren | Rooney, Thomas J. |
| Bridenstine | Hunter | Roskam |
| Brooks (AL) | Hurd | Ross |
| Buchanan | Issa | Rothfus |
| Buck | Jenkins (KS) | Rouzer |
| Bucshon | Johnson (LA) | Royce (CA) |
| Budd | Johnson (OH) | Ruiz |
| Burgess | Johnson, Sam | Russell |
| Byrne | Jones | Rutherford |
| Calvert | Jordan | Sanford |
| Cárdenas | Kelly (MS) | Schrader |
| Carter (GA) | Kelly (PA) | Schweikert |
| Carter (TX) | Kildee | Scott, Austin |
| Chabot | Kilmer | Sensenbrenner |
| Cheney | King (IA) | Sessions |
| Coffman | Knight | Sewell (AL) |
| Cole | Kustoff (TN) | Shimkus |
| Collins (GA) | Labrador | Simpson |
| Collins (NY) | LaHood | Smith (MO) |
| Comer | LaMalfa | Smith (NE) |
| Comstock | Lamborn | Smith (TX) |
| Conaway | Latta | Smucker |
| Cook | Lewis (MN) | Stefanik |
| Correa | Lieu, Ted | Stewart |
| Cramer | Long | Stivers |
| Crawford | Loudermilk | Taylor |
| Cuellar | Love | Tenney |
| Culberson | Lucas | Thompson (PA) |
| Curbelo (FL) | Luetkemeyer | Thornberry |
| Curtis | Lujan Grisham, | Tiberti |
| Davidson | M. | Tipton |
| DelBene | Luján, Ben Ray | Trott |
| Denham | Marchant | Upton |
| Dent | Marino | Valadao |
| DeSantis | Marshall | Vela |
| DesJarlais | Massie | Wagner |
| Deutch | Mast | Walberg |
| Diaz-Balart | McCarthy | Walden |
| Duffy | McCaul | Walker |
| Duncan (SC) | McClintock | Walorski |
| Duncan (TN) | McCollum | Walters, Mimi |
| Dunn | McMorris | Walz |
| Emmer | Rodgers | Weber (TX) |
| Estes (KS) | McSally | Webster (FL) |
| Farenthold | Meadows | Wenstrup |
| Faso | Meehan | Westerman |
| Ferguson | Meeks | Williams |
| Fleischmann | Messer | Wilson (SC) |
| Flores | Mitchell | Wittman |
| Fortenberry | Moolenaar | Womack |
| Fox | Mooney (WV) | Woodall |
| Frelinghuysen | Moore | Yoder |
| Gallagher | Mullin | Yoho |
| Garrett | Newhouse | Young (AK) |
| Gianforte | Noem | Young (IA) |
| Gibbs | Norman | Zeldin |
| Gohmert | Nunes | |
| Goodlatte | O'Halleran | |

NOES—173

| | | |
|----------|-----------------|----------------|
| Barragán | Bishop (GA) | Bost |
| Bass | Blumenauer | Boyle, Brendan |
| Beatty | Blunt Rochester | F. |
| Bera | Bonamici | Brady (PA) |

Brown (MD) Gutiérrez
Brownley (CA) Hastings
Bustos Higgins (NY)
Butterfield Himes
Capuano Hoyer
Carson (IN) Huffman
Cartwright Jackson Lee
Castor (FL) Jayapal
Castro (TX) Jeffries
Chu, Judy Johnson (GA)
Cicilline Johnson, E. B.
Clark (MA) Joyce (OH)
Clarke (NY) Kaptur
Clay Katko
Clever Keating
Clyburn Kelly (IL)
Cohen Kennedy
Connolly Khanna
Cooper Kihuen
Costa King (NY)
Costello (PA) Kinzinger
Courtney Krishnamoorthi
Crist Kuster (NH)
Crowley Lance
Davis (CA) Langevin
Davis, Danny Larsen (WA)
Davis, Rodney Larson (CT)
DeFazio Lawrence
DeGette Lawson (FL)
Delaney Lee
DeLauro Levin
Demings Lewis (GA)
Dingell Lipinski
Doggett LoBiondo
Donovan Loeb sack
Doyle, Michael Lofgren
F. Lowenthal
Ellison Lowey
Engel Lynch
Eshoo MacArthur
Espallat Maloney
Esty (CT) Carolyn B.
Evans Maloney, Sean
Fitzpatrick Matsui
Foster McEachin
Frankel (FL) McGovern
Fudge McKinley
Gallego Meng
Garamendi Moulton
Gomez Murphy (FL)
Gonzalez (TX) Nadler
Gottheimer Napolitano
Green, Al Neal
Green, Gene Norcross
Grijalva O'Rourke

NOT VOTING—19

Adams Hanabusa
Brooks (IN) Jenkins (WV)
Carbajal Kind
Cummings McHenry
DeSaulnier McNerney
Gabbard Nolan
Gaetz Scalise

□ 1809

Messrs. CROWLEY, KATKO, and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. HECK, BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and ZELDIN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS OVERSEAS PERSONNEL
ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4567) to require a Department of Homeland Security overseas personnel enhancement plan, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—415

Abraham Culberson
Aderholt Curbelo (FL)
Aguilar Curtis
Allen Davidson
Amash Davis (CA)
Amodei Davis, Danny
Arrington Davis, Rodney
Babin DeFazio
Bacon DeGette
Banks (IN) Delaney
Barletta DeLauro
Barr DelBene
Barragán Demings
Barton Denham
Bass Dent
Beatty DeSantis
Bera DesJarlais
Bergman Deutch
Beyer Diaz-Balart
Biggs Dingell
Bilirakis Doggett
Bishop (GA) Donovan
Bishop (MI) Doyle, Michael
Bishop (UT) F.
Black Duffy
Blackburn Duncan (SC)
Blum Duncan (TN)
Blumenauer Dunn
Blunt Rochester Ellison
Bonamici Emmer
Bost Engel
Boyle, Brendan Eshoo
F. Espallat
Brady (PA) Estes (KS)
Brady (TX) Esty (CT)
Brat Evans
Bridenstine Farenthold
Brooks (AL) Faso
Brooks (IN) Ferguson
Brown (MD) Fitzpatrick
Brownley (CA) Fleischmann
Buchanan Flores
Buck Fortenberry
Bucshon Foster
Budd Foy
Burgess Frankel (FL)
Bustos Frelinghuysen
Butterfield Fudge
Byrne Gallagher
Calvert Gallego
Capuano Garamendi
Cárdenas Garrett
Carson (IN) Gianforte
Carter (GA) Gibbs
Carter (TX) Gohmert
Cartwright Gomez
Castor (FL) Gonzalez (TX)
Castro (TX) Goodlatte
Chabot Gosar
Cheney Gottheimer
Chu, Judy Long
Cicilline Loudermilk
Clark (MA) Love
Clarke (NY) Lowenthal
Clay Lowey
Clever Lucas
Clyburn Luetkemeyer
Coffman Lujan Grisham,
Cohen M.
Cole Luján, Ben Ray
Collins (GA) Lynch
Collins (NY) MacArthur
Comer Maloney,
Comstock Carolyn B.
Conaway Maloney, Sean
Connolly Marchant
Cook Marino
Cooper Marshall
Correa Massie
Costa Mast
Costello (PA) Matsui
Courtney McCarthy
Cramer McCaul
Crawford McClintock
Crist McCollum
Crowley McEachin
Cuellar McGovern
Hollingsworth

McMorris Rodgers
McSally Roby
Meadows Roe (TN)
Meehan Rogers (AL)
Meeks Rogers (KY)
Meng Rohrabacher
Messer Rokita
Mitchell Rooney, Francis
Moolenaar Rooney, Thomas
Mooney (WV) J.
Moore Ros-Lehtinen
Moulton Rosen
Mullin Roskam
Murphy (FL) Ross
Nadler Rothfus
Napolitano Rouzer
Neal Roybal-Allard
Newhouse Royce (CA)
Noem Ruiz
Norcross Ruppertsberger
Norman Rush
Nunes Russell
O'Halleran Rutherford
O'Rourke Ryan (OH)
Olson Sánchez
Palazzo Sanford
Pallone Sarbanes
Palmer Schakowsky
Pametta Schiff
Pascarella Schneider
Paulsen Schrader
Payne Schweikert
Pearce Scott (VA)
Pelosi Scott, Austin
Perlmutter Scott, David
Perry Sensenbrenner
Peters Serrano
Peterson Sessions
Pingree Sewell (AL)
Pittenger Shea-Porter
Pocan Sherman
Poe (TX) Shimkus
Poliquin Simpson
Polis Sinema
Posey Sires
Price (NC) Slaughter
Quigley Smith (MO)
Raskin Smith (NE)
Ratcliffe Smith (NJ)
Reed Smith (TX)
Reichert Smith (WA)
Renacci Smucker
Rice (NY) Soto

NOT VOTING—16

Adams Hanabusa
Carbajal Jenkins (WV)
Cummings Kind
DeSaulnier McHenry
Gabbard McNerney
Gaetz Nolan

□ 1816

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays

178, answered “present” 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—231

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Abraham | Garamendi | Napolitano |
| Aderholt | Garrett | Newhouse |
| Aguilar | Gianforte | Noem |
| Allen | Gibbs | Norman |
| Amodei | Gonzalez (TX) | Nunes |
| Arrington | Gosar | O'Rourke |
| Babin | Granger | Olson |
| Bacon | Griffith | Palazzo |
| Banks (IN) | Grothman | Panetta |
| Barletta | Guthrie | Pascrell |
| Barr | Handel | Perlmutter |
| Beatty | Harper | Peters |
| Billakis | Harris | Pingree |
| Bishop (UT) | Hartzler | Pocan |
| Black | Heck | Poe (TX) |
| Blackburn | Hensarling | Polis |
| Blumenauer | Higgins (LA) | Posey |
| Blunt Rochester | Himes | Quigley |
| Bonamici | Hollingsworth | Reichert |
| Brady (TX) | Huffman | Roby |
| Brat | Hultgren | Roe (TN) |
| Bridenstine | Issa | Rogers (KY) |
| Brooks (IN) | Jackson Lee | Rooney, Francis |
| Brown (MD) | Johnson (GA) | Rooney, Thomas J. |
| Buchanan | Johnson (LA) | Ross |
| Bucshon | Johnson, E. B. | Rothfus |
| Budd | Johnson, Sam | Royce (CA) |
| Bustos | Joyce (OH) | Ruppersberger |
| Byrne | Kaptur | Russell |
| Calvert | Kelly (IL) | Rutherford |
| Carter (TX) | Kelly (MS) | Sanford |
| Cartwright | Kelly (PA) | Schneider |
| Castro (TX) | Kennedy | Schweikert |
| Chabot | Kildee | Scott (VA) |
| Cheney | King (IA) | Scott, David |
| Chu, Judy | King (NY) | Serrano |
| Ciulline | Kuster (NH) | Sessions |
| Clark (MA) | Kustoff (TN) | Shea-Porter |
| Clarke (NY) | Labrador | Sherman |
| Clay | LaMalfa | Shimkus |
| Cole | Lamborn | Simpson |
| Collins (GA) | Langevin | Smith (MO) |
| Collins (NY) | Larsen (WA) | Smith (NE) |
| Comer | Lawrence | Smith (NJ) |
| Comstock | Lawson (FL) | Smith (TX) |
| Conaway | Lewis (MN) | Smith (WA) |
| Cook | Lipinski | Smucker |
| Cooper | Long | Speier |
| Cramer | Loudermilk | Stefanik |
| Crawford | Love | Stewart |
| Cuellar | Lowenthal | Takano |
| Curtis | Lucas | Taylor |
| Davidson | Luetkemeyer | Thornberry |
| Davis (CA) | Lujan Grisham, | Tiberi |
| Davis, Danny | M. | Titus |
| DeGette | Marchant | Trott |
| DeLauro | Marino | Tsongas |
| DeBene | Marshall | Wagner |
| Demings | Massie | Walden |
| Dent | Matsui | Walker |
| DesJarlais | McCarthy | Walorski |
| Deutch | McCaul | Walters, Mimi |
| Dingell | McClintock | Walz |
| Doggett | McCollum | Wasserman |
| Donovan | McEachin | Schultz |
| Duffy | McMorris | Waters, Maxine |
| Duncan (SC) | Rodgers | Weber (TX) |
| Duncan (TN) | Meadows | Webster (FL) |
| Dunn | Meehan | Wenstrup |
| Ellison | Meeks | Westerman |
| Engel | Meng | Williams |
| Estes (KS) | Messer | Wilson (SC) |
| Evans | Moolenaar | Womack |
| Ferguson | Mooney (WV) | Yarmuth |
| Fleischmann | Moore | Yoho |
| Fortenberry | Moulton | Young (IA) |
| Foster | Mullin | |
| Frankel (FL) | Murphy (FL) | |
| Frelinghuysen | Nadler | |

NAYS—178

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| Amash | Boyle, Brendan | Cleaver |
| Barragan | F. | Clyburn |
| Barton | Brady (PA) | Coffman |
| Bass | Brooks (AL) | Cohen |
| Bera | Brownley (CA) | Connolly |
| Bergman | Buck | Correa |
| Beyer | Burgess | Costa |
| Biggs | Capuano | Costello (PA) |
| Bishop (GA) | Cárdenas | Courtney |
| Bishop (MI) | Carson (IN) | Crist |
| Blum | Carter (GA) | Crowley |
| Boat | Castor (FL) | Culberson |

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Curbelo (FL) | Keating | Richmond |
| Davis, Rodney | Khanna | Rogers (AL) |
| DeFazio | Kihuen | Rohrabacher |
| Delaney | Kilmer | Rokita |
| Denham | Kinzinger | Ros-Lehtinen |
| DeSantis | Knight | Rosen |
| Diaz-Balart | Krishnamoorthi | Roskam |
| Doyle, Michael | LaHood | Rouzer |
| F. | Lance | Roybal-Allard |
| Emmer | Larson (CT) | Ruiz |
| Eshoo | Latta | Ryan (OH) |
| Espallat | Lee | Sánchez |
| Esty (CT) | Levin | Sarbanes |
| Farenthold | Lewis (GA) | Schakowsky |
| Faso | Lieu, Ted | Schiff |
| Fitzpatrick | LoBiondo | Schrader |
| Flores | Loebbeck | Scott, Austin |
| Foxx | Lofgren | Sensenbrenner |
| Fudge | Lowey | Sewell (AL) |
| Gallagher | Lujan, Ben Ray | Sinema |
| Gallego | Lynch | Sires |
| Gohmert | MacArthur | Slaughter |
| Gomez | Maloney, | Soto |
| Gottheimer | Carolyn B. | Stivers |
| Gowdy | Maloney, Sean | Suozzi |
| Graves (GA) | Mast | Swalwell (CA) |
| Graves (LA) | McGovern | Tenney |
| Graves (MO) | McKinley | Thompson (CA) |
| Green, Al | McSally | Thompson (MS) |
| Green, Gene | Mitchell | Thompson (PA) |
| Gutiérrez | Neal | Tipton |
| Hastings | Norcross | Torres |
| Herrera Beutler | O'Halleran | Upton |
| Hice, Jody B. | Pallone | Valadao |
| Higgins (NY) | Palmer | Vargas |
| Hill | Paulsen | Veasey |
| Holding | Payne | Vela |
| Hoyer | Pearce | Velázquez |
| Hudson | Perry | Visclosky |
| Huizenga | Peterson | Walberg |
| Hunter | Pittenger | Watson Coleman |
| Hurd | Poliquin | Welch |
| Jayapal | Price (NC) | Wittman |
| Jeffries | Raskin | Woodall |
| Jenkins (KS) | Ratcliffe | Yoder |
| Johnson (OH) | Reed | Young (AK) |
| Jones | Renacci | Zeldin |
| Jordan | Rice (NY) | |
| Katko | Rice (SC) | |

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—21

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Adams | Goodlatte | Nolan |
| Butterfield | Grijalva | Pelosi |
| Carbajal | Hanabusa | Rush |
| Cummings | Jenkins (WV) | Scalise |
| DeSaulnier | Kind | Shuster |
| Gabbard | McHenry | Turner |
| Gaetz | McNerney | Wilson (FL) |

□ 1823

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HONORING JERRY RUELF

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Mr. Jerry Ruelf, an American hero from Ocala, Florida, who passed away this year on January 7.

At the age of 17, Mr. Ruelf joined the 101st Airborne Division during World War II and received many decorations for his courageous actions overseas, among which are the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Purple Heart. I had the distinct honor several years ago to present him with a collection of medals, which required him to get a larger jacket.

Following the end of the war, Mr. Ruelf continued to serve the American people as a teacher at Dixie Hollins High School in St. Petersburg, Florida,

where he led the school's swim team through an undefeated season in 1971. Mr. Ruelf is honored in the Swimming Hall of Fame for his accomplishments at both Boca Ciega High School and Dixie Hollins High School in Florida.

Mr. Ruelf was an outstanding patriot, and he will be dearly missed by all in his community. His example of leadership through service is one we can all learn from.

To Mr. Ruelf, along with the others from that Greatest Generation era, I thank you, my family thanks you, and our Nation thanks you for the life you lived, for your service to your country, community, and for making this world a better place.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN ROBERT WEYGAND

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great Rhode Island public servant, educator, and dear friend, my predecessor, Congressman Robert Weygand.

During his time in government, Bob served as a Rhode Island State legislator from 1985 to 1993, Lieutenant Governor from 1993 to 1997, and United States Representative for the Second Congressional District of Rhode Island from 1997 to 2001.

Bob has always fought passionately for the people of the State of Rhode Island, and in the decades since, he has shared his wealth of knowledge with the students at the University of Rhode Island, dedicating himself to preparing the next generation of leaders.

As he retires from that position, I want to say that Bob served for the right reasons: to make a positive difference in his community and improve the lives of the people around him.

I am proud to call him my predecessor in the Halls of Congress, my dear friend and mentor to this day, and I happily congratulate him on his retirement from URI.

I know that, in one way or another, Bob will continue to serve his community as he always has: with integrity, passion, and wisdom.

HONORING OFFICERS COREY HELMS AND DYLAN COLE

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Officers Corey Helms and Dylan Cole of the Monroe, North Carolina, Police Department, who, on December 26, risked their lives to save two families trapped in a burning home.

Officer Helms was first to arrive but was pushed back by the thick cloud of smoke. Officer Cole arrived next, and together, the two men attempted to

find a ladder to rescue the five people trapped on the second floor. Unable to find a ladder, Monroe's two heroes disregarded their own safety by charging into the burning home and up the stairs before carrying and guiding the young families to safety.

Officers Cole and Helms rescued two adult sisters and their children, ages 3 years, 10 months, and 5 months. There were no injuries as a result.

Officers Corey Helms and Dylan Cole are living examples of what it means to serve and to protect. Please join me in honoring these two brave officers and all the men and women of the Monroe Police Department who work on our behalf every day. God bless them.

□ 1830

DACA

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, Congress must stop deferring the American Dream for bright young people simply because they were brought here as children.

DACA recipients represent the best of our Nation. These are young people who are in school, got their education, or served in our Armed Forces. These are people who never committed a felony offense or significant misdemeanor. These are people who pose no threat to public safety. These are people who just want to live the American Dream, and each day that passes without Congress voting on the Dream Act darkens their futures.

Mr. Speaker, if it is numbers my esteemed colleagues on the other side of the aisle want, I have got them. Deporting DACA recipients would cost the U.S. economy \$400 billion. Deporting the 5,300 eligible people for DACA in my district alone would cost the economy \$140 million.

Aren't we supposed to be growing the economy, not shrinking it?

CONGRATULATING MUGSHOTS GRILL & BAR ON THEIR 14TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ron Savell and the entire Mugshots Grill & Bar staff on 14 years of successful business.

On January 10, 2004, the first Mugshots Grill & Bar was opened in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, near the campus of my alma mater, the University of Southern Mississippi. While the original, unfortunately, burned down in 2011, there are now more than 18 restaurant locations spanning three States.

Ron is a fellow USM Golden Eagle that continues to expand his businesses

in south Mississippi. Most recently, he has opened Brewsky's in Hattiesburg and Patio 44 in Hattiesburg and Biloxi. His restaurants continue to fuel the economies of my district.

The success that Ron has had in such a short amount of time is a testament to his entrepreneurial spirit and his hard work, persistence, and determination. And, of course, he has a great partner: his wife, Caitlin, and their beautiful family.

Next time you are in south Mississippi, be sure to stop by Mugshots Grill & Bar and have yourself a delicious peanut butter burger.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Ron on his 14th anniversary.

DREAMERS DREAM OF THE GREATNESS OF AMERICA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, a little clarity I think is very important on a very, very important issue.

I would like to call 140,000 young people in my State DREAMers because they dream of the greatness of America. The status that they are under is something called DACA, which was instituted by President Barack Obama because this Republican Congress could not provide legislative relief, so he saw the lives that were being impacted. In a few months, however, the present President, who feigns not knowing what happened, was the individual who removed that DACA status.

So let me be very clear: it is a dire situation, and the reason is because there are individuals whose status is now expiring or has already expired, therefore, they are living in limbo. These are doctors, lawyers, teachers, and young people with families.

It is crucial that we move quickly for a DACA fix, and we do it without impacting family reunification or diversity visas. We do it out of humanity, caring, and respect. Let's do it now. Let's do it for America.

RECOGNIZING TOM BARTON

(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 longtime editorial page editor of the Savannah Morning News, Mr. Tom Barton, who officially retired on January 5, after 39 years of service.

He began his time in Savannah writing for the former Savannah Evening Press covering crime and police stories. His first stories included a murder trial of an elderly woman and a man who violated city code by killing a chicken and leaving its remnants on city sidewalks.

These stories quickly taught Mr. Barton lessons in journalism while his

gripping, clear, and insightful writing helped him become an influential and trusted writer and editor in Savannah.

Since those first stories, he has covered the most important topics in Savannah over the past decades, including interviews with the infamous Jim Williams, photos of running back Herschel Walker, and stories about political elections.

Mr. Barton not only knows the unique character of Savannah better than anyone in our area, but he has also contributed greatly to its development over the last 39 years.

His regular contributions to the Savannah Morning News will be missed. I thank him for his dedication to making Savannah a better place to live.

OPPOSE OFFSHORE DRILLING

(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, last week, the Trump administration announced a proposal to open our Nation's Federal waters to potential oil and gas exploration.

Immediately, leaders and lawmakers from the West Coast to the East Coast, and Republicans and Democrats from the leftwing to the rightwing came out against such a proposal for offshore oil drilling.

Being from the central coast of California, I know how important our oceans and our coastlines are for our economy, our businesses, our communities, and our families. That is why we have long fought to protect our coast from drilling with zoning laws and limiting onshore oil infrastructure to the designation of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, and legislation to protect our oceans and coasts.

I believe that, in Congress, we will work to uphold those laws and legacy of protection and preservation, but the Trump administration needs to hear from you. So I ask my constituents and all Americans to share why they also oppose this proposal for oil drilling off our coast. Participate in the public comment period that is now open until March 9, for it is your opportunity to speak directly to the administration, to stand up for your community, and to protect our environment and our future.

WELCOME HOME, LONNIE EICHELBERGER

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, the men and women who defend our country have one sacred creed: leave no one behind, and they all come home.

It took 72 years and 234 days, but today, at Houston's VA cemetery, Lonnie Eichelberger came home.

At 16, Lonnie left China Spring, Texas, to fight the Nazis and Adolph

Hitler in Germany in World War II. He was a Buffalo Soldier, the all-Black 92nd Division of our Army. He never returned to see his family.

His remains were found in Italy in 1945, but they could not be identified. So Lonnie, for 17 years, was known as "Unknown X-193."

In 2016, his remains were identified. At 11:15 a.m. this morning, Texas time, Lonnie was laid to eternal rest.

Welcome home, soldier.

SMEAR CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE AUTHORS OF THE INFAMOUS DOSSIER EXPOSING TRUMP'S RUSSIA CONNECTIONS

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, character assassination is Donald Trump's favorite trick when people make him look bad. This month, Trump and his allies have been desperately smearing the authors of the infamous dossier, which exposes disturbing facts about Trump's Russia connections. By attacking Chris Steele and Fusion GPS, they are trying to divert attention from the damning content of the dossier and also to impugn the FBI for launching its investigation.

Here is the problem: the dossier didn't start the FBI investigation. It was a Trump policy adviser, George Papadopoulos, boasting to an Australian diplomat that Russia had stolen emails to interfere in our election. That was 2 months before those stolen emails were put online, and that smacks of collusion.

Thankfully, our Australian allies shared this information with the FBI and the investigation began. The dossier came along and corroborated what the FBI had already heard.

There is another problem with this smear campaign: It wasn't just the FBI that took the dossier seriously. Senator JOHN MCCAIN deemed it credible enough to turn it over to the FBI.

This is a serious document, corroborated by a host of other evidence, and the truth is coming out, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASO). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it has only been a few weeks since Congress passed the historic tax reform bill, but I am afraid it has got to be very tough for the opponents and our friends across the aisle because, well, you have to wonder: At some point, don't they tire of being wrong so often?

You might recall some claim before we passed the bill that it would raise taxes on the middle class, yet a major-

ity of Americans will now see a tax decrease. In fact, the average family of four in Minnesota's Second District, which I am proud to represent, will see a tax cut of \$3,154.

Then they claim that reducing taxes on businesses would never benefit Americans, but employers have already responded by giving a combined total of \$1 billion in bonuses and wage increases to their employees. That equates to over 1 million Americans and counting getting a bonus.

Finally, they said the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act would never jump-start economic growth. Well, now, after two quarters of well over 3 percent growth, approaching 4 percent, it is as if the opponents of the tax reform bill are left telling the American people: Are you going to believe me or your own eyes?

The fact of the matter is our opponents rely on hyperbole, but the facts speak for themselves.

FUNDING FOR CHIP

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today pleading with my colleagues that we must come together to support a long-term funding solution for the traditionally bipartisan Children's Health Insurance Program, commonly known as CHIP.

Mr. Speaker, there is a family in Chesapeake, a locality in my district, that demonstrates the dire challenges families across Virginia and this country face without CHIP.

CHIP serves as a lifeline for this family with four children, ages 8, 7, 4, and 2. Before this family had access to CHIP, these children did not have health insurance or well child visits with a doctor. The parents limited the 7- and 8-year-old children to indoor activities because they were afraid the children might break a bone or sustain a serious injury.

The mother also missed visits to the doctor's office for vital prenatal care because she was worried about doctor bills. The parents missed work and kept the children home during flu season because they could not afford a doctor's visit.

With CHIP, the mother and children all have health insurance, they are up to date on their wellness exams, and the children play outside again.

Mr. Speaker, for the health of my constituents and millions of other Americans, we must immediately come together for long-term funding for CHIP.

CONGRATULATING TEHAMA COUNTY FARM BUREAU

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Tehama

County Farm Bureau in my district on their 100th annual meeting. This on the heels of their centennial of being in business in Tehama County.

They are headquartered in Red Bluff, California. They have been an organization very dedicated, obviously, to farming, ranching, and agriculture in all its forms in Tehama County and its neighboring counties as partners as well.

Just last month, it was actually recognized as the Midsize Farm Bureau of the Year, according to the California Farm Bureau Federation Annual Meeting.

The Farm Bureau is very important and very involved in the fiber of rural communities with ag production, farming, ranching, hay, and all those operations that make what agriculture needs go round, as well as the activities at the fair with the kids, and with their future. The Farm Bureau, indeed, is an important part of the future of agriculture and feeding people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, again, I congratulate Tehama County Farm Bureau's membership, board, and leadership for hanging in there and serving that group of people for 100 years.

□ 1845

NON-METRO AREA AGENCY ON AGING

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, New Mexico decimated its behavioral health system when it terminated nearly every behavioral health provider in the State.

In fact, thousands of New Mexicans did not have access to medicine, counselors, or treatment, increasing their risks of substance abuse, health issues, and homelessness.

Many New Mexicans suffered, were incarcerated, or died because of the State's negligence. Today, we are potentially seeing an even more catastrophic State-created crisis in the making.

Just a few weeks ago, the State announced it intended to cancel its contract with the Non-Metro Area Agency on Aging, which manages and oversees critical services like adult daycare, meal services, caregiving, transportation, and respite care for vulnerable seniors and their families.

Decimating the current system without public hearings, due process, or having a public plan to ensure the continuity of services will disrupt these lifesaving safety net programs that serve nearly 80,000 seniors; and these seniors are going to suffer because of this reckless and hasty decision.

I have written to HHS demanding that they immediately investigate the State's negligent behavior.

HUMAN RIGHTS FOR THE IRANIAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the dramatic struggle for freedom and human rights that we are witnessing in the country of Iran.

The oppressive, theocratic regime in Iran has a bloody track record of abuses and has long neglected its citizens' most basic rights and needs.

The Government of Iran has squandered the precious resources of its people by supporting proxy armies throughout the Middle East and wreaking havoc across the globe instead of providing for the basic needs of its citizens. Courageous Iranians are proving each day that they are no longer willing to accept the indignities and repression from the ruling elite.

It is tragic, but not shocking, to see the regime in Iran respond to the recent wave of protests with violence, cutting off communications, media, and, predictably, blaming the United States of America.

I am a cosponsor of H. Res. 676, a resolution passed by the House of Representatives yesterday in support of the rights of the people of Iran to express themselves freely, and condemning the oppressive Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests.

I stand with the brave Iranians who are facing down the violent and brutal regime for the sake of liberty.

OFFSHORING GOP TAX SCAM

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight another scam in the GOP tax giveaway just signed into law. President Trump promised in November: "Factories will be pouring back into this county."

Really?

The Republican tax scam taxes earnings of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. firms at half the rate of what is earned here in the United States by those same companies. If that isn't an invitation for more job outsourcing, I don't know what is.

The corporate tax rate, which Republicans slashed at the expense of the middle class, Social Security, and Medicare, is now at 21 percent; but the rate at which American companies' overseas subsidiaries will be taxed is half that much, 10.5 percent.

Why does the Republican tax bill incentivize U.S. companies to move profits and capital overseas?

Call President Trump, let him know, because that is what he just did.

The Republican bill does nothing to address the job outsourcing crisis. It makes it worse.

Isn't this economic madness?

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM FUNDING

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, nearly 9 million children across the Nation, more than 55,000 in my district alone, rely on the Children's Health Insurance Program for their healthcare.

The deadline to fund CHIP passed and Congress has failed to provide long-term funding for the program, kicking the can down the road and leaving parents worried about whether or not their child will get the healthcare they need, because they are no longer covered, in the middle of a flu season no less.

For decades, Republicans and Democrats have come together to fund the bipartisan and noncontroversial CHIP. It is unacceptable that this time around, Republican leaders proposed paying for CHIP by cutting other critical public health programs that CHIP recipient kids rely on, like vaccines. This is unconscionable.

Stop using children's healthcare as a partisan weapon. Kids and parents deserve better. We must put our children's needs above partisanship and provide for the health of our children with a bipartisan, long-term funding solution for CHIP.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION BACKLOG

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to a dangerous backlog at the Social Security Administration that is harming millions of Americans across the Nation, especially in and around the city of Philadelphia.

Philadelphians face the longest delays in the Nation, where thousands of applicants wait as long as 26 months, on average, for a basic preliminary hearing. Last year alone, 9,000 Americans died awaiting an SSA benefits determination.

In 1974, we made a promise to be there for our elderly, blind, and disabled Americans who have little or no income. They, in turn, rely upon the Social Security Administration to approve their eligibility and administer these life-sustaining benefits.

On Monday, I led a letter with my Democratic colleagues from the Philadelphia area and New Jersey demanding answers from the SSA's leadership.

Today I rise to stand up for the millions of Americans who are on their own, suffering from a crisis of public service that threatens their ability to afford basic necessities through no fault of their own. I will not stand down until this problem is fixed.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF CANDICE BOWERS

(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 Candice Bowers.

Candice was a single mother to her three children: Kurtis, Katie, and her recently adopted daughter, Ariel.

She was a hardworking waitress who was selfless and always ensured she was able to take care of her family. Candice had a loving heart, a big smile, and an infectious laugh.

She went to the Route 91 music festival in Las Vegas with her best friend so she could take some rare time for herself.

Candice was known for her strength, fierce loyalty, and generosity. She would give her last dollar to anyone who was in need.

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

HONORING THE MEMORY OF LISA HANSEN

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of an extraordinary constituent, Lisa Hansen.

Lisa was an Air Force veteran, a longtime civil servant, and an inspiration to many as an ovarian cancer survivor.

In the final years of her career, Lisa worked as a defense contractor at the legendary Arsenal in Watervliet, New York.

During her 14-year battle with cancer, Lisa became an expert in cancer research and treatment. She used that knowledge and experience to become an advocate and a mentor to fellow survivors.

Ovarian cancer will affect 1 in 75 women. There is no diagnostic tool for it. Raising awareness is one of the best and only ways to get women diagnosed sooner.

Lisa made it her personal mission to reach as many women as possible in New York's capital region and beyond through her leadership at Caring Together, Inc. She also participated in the Survivors Teaching Students program, sharing personal experiences with medical and nursing students.

Lisa passed away on January 6. We will remember her passion and selfless dedication to ovarian cancer research and the extraordinary power in her voice and in her story.

Thank you for a lifetime of service to others, Lisa. You will be sorely missed, but thank you for the inspiration you have provided to so many.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ADAMS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for January 8 through January 11 on account of recovering from surgery.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 11, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

3646. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of the anticipated use of Selected Reserve units that will be ordered to active duty, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 12304b(d); Public Law 112-81, Sec. 516(a)(1); (125 Stat. 1396); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3647. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Board of Actuaries, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2017 Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund Report, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1114(c); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 713(a)(1) (114 Stat. 1654A-180); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3648. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that additional time is needed to collect, compile, and analyze submissions for the third quarter inventory of activities performed report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3649. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock [Regulation I; Docket No.: R-1560] (RIN: 7100-AE 68) received December 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3650. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Renewal of Determination of a Public Health Emergency from the consequences of Hurricane Maria on the Territory of the U.S. Virgin Islands and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3651. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety and Effectiveness of Health Care Antiseptics; Topical Antimicrobial Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-0101] (RIN: 0910-AH40) received December 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3652. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Accel-

erating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment [WC Docket No.: 17-84] received December 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3653. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of defense articles and services associated with six (6) Presidential Determinations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(2); Public Law 87-195, Sec. 506(b)(2) (as amended by Public Law 96-92, Sec. 5(b)); (93 Stat. 702); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3654. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-043, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3655. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-046, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3656. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-012, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3657. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-088, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3658. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-140, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3659. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3660. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, General Services Administration, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, change in previously submitted reported information, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3661. A letter from the General Counsel, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting a notice of a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3662. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 108-199, Sec. 647(b); (118 Stat. 361); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3663. A letter from the White House Liaison, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3664. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's summary of the inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities performed by federal em-

ployees for fiscal year 2016, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3665. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0476; Product Identifier 2016-NM-110-AD; Amendment 39-19111; AD 2017-24-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3666. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1044; Product Identifier 2017-NE-38-AD; Amendment 39-19110; AD 2017-24-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3667. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0709; Product Identifier 2016-NM-200-AD; Amendment 39-19115; AD 2017-25-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3668. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0708; Product Identifier 2017-NM-035-AD; Amendment 39-19113; AD 2017-24-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3669. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1097; Product Identifier 2013-NM-015-AD; Amendment 39-19117; AD 2017-25-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3670. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0340; Product Identifier 2017-NM-002-AD; Amendment 39-19114; AD 2017-24-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3671. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1098; Product Identifier 2012-NM-216-AD; Amendment 39-19116; AD 2017-25-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3672. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-

2017-0556; Product Identifier 2016-NM-098-AD; Amendment 39-19119; AD 2017-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3673. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1117; Product Identifier 94-ANE-39-AD; Amendment 39-19112; AD 2017-24-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3674. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0622; Product Identifier 2016-NM-192-AD; Amendment 39-19120; AD 2017-25-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3675. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1103; Product Identifier 2014-NM-063-AD; Amendment 39-19128; AD 2017-25-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3676. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2018-3 received December 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3677. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Shared Savings Program: Extreme and Uncontrollable Circumstances Policies for Performance Year 2017 [CMS-1702-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AT51) received December 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

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. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3548. A bill to make certain improvements to the security of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-505, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2504. A bill to ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms (Rept. 115-506, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 1285. An act to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes

of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands (Rept. 115-507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 453. A bill to deem the Step 2 compliance date for standards of performance for new residential wood heaters, new residential hydronic heaters, and forced-air furnaces to be May 15, 2023 (Rept. 115-508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1917. A bill to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule (Rept. 115-509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2504 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources, Agriculture, Oversight and Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3548 ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3548. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than March 23, 2018.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 4750. A bill to terminate the granting of temporary protected status to aliens, to provide for adjustment of status for former temporary protected status holders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASO (for himself and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 4751. A bill to reauthorize the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 4752. A bill to establish an Independent Financial Technology Task Force, to provide rewards for information leading to convictions related to terrorist use of digital currencies, to establish a FinTech Leadership in Innovation Fund to encourage the development of tools and programs to combat terrorist and illicit use of digital currencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 4753. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require the Vice Chairman for

Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to provide a written report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 4754. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide prospective construction contractors with information about an agency's policies on the administration of change orders to allow such contractors to make informed business decisions regarding the pricing of bids or proposals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 4755. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to bring the non-monetary policy related functions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System into the appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4756. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to establish a blackout period for public communications by the Federal Open Market Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 4757. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to modify the appointment process for presidents of Federal Reserve Banks; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4758. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require the Federal Open Market Committee to establish interest rates on balances maintained at a Federal Reserve Bank by depository institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4759. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to revise the membership of Federal Open Market Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 4760. A bill to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Homeland Security, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Armed Services, Oversight and Government Reform, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, 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. BORDALLO (for herself, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. SABLON):

H.R. 4761. A bill to address the challenges of providing public services to citizens of the Freely Associated States residing in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, Foreign Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, Agriculture, 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 Mrs. DEMINGS:

H.R. 4762. A bill to require the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP code for particular communities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4763. A bill to require the pursuit of technologies to remove space debris; to the

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 4764. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish an Office for Under-Banked and Un-Banked Consumers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 4765. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to prohibit the removal of certain items under category I, II, or III of the United States Munitions List for purposes of transferring the item to or controlling the item under any portion of the Commerce Control List of dual-use items in the Export Administration Regulations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 683. A resolution recognizing January 2018 as "National Mentoring Month", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 4750.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 states that "Congress shall have the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization."

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 4751.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 4752.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, providing the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states."

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 4753.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

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

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 4754.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect

Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" in order to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 4755.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8. "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 Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4756.

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

Article I, 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. PITTINGER:

H.R. 4757.

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

The explicit power of Congress to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified in to law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed in to law by the President.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4758.

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

Article I, 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. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4759.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes").

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 4760.

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

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution—The Congress shall have Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 4761.

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

Article I Section 8

Article IV Section 3

By Mrs. DEMINGS:

H.R. 4762.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4763.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 4764.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 4765.

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

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 422: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 506: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 547: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 592: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 719: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 850: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 936: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 982: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1038: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 1178: Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 1227: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1243: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1316: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 1322: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1360: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1406: Mr. CORREA and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1409: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1542: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1606: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1749: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 1841: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1972: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1987: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2000: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2001: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2147: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2267: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2345: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2452: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2482: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2528: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2683: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2723: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 2740: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 2832: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 2845: Mr. McEACHIN.

H.R. 2996: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 3030: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 3067: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 3145: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3174: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 3232: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 3272: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3307: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3492: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 3528: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 3566: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 3602: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3637: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3692: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3782: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3790: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 3792: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3826: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3931: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 3964: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3976: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 4075: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4079: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 4099: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 4124: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 4143: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4179: Ms. TSONGAS and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4215: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4229: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARR, Mr. REED, Mr. HECK, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 4236: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4253: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 4256: Mr. HIMES and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 4265: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4268: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 4274: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 4311: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 4392: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4444: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4479: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 4494: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 4507: Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 4547: Mr. STEWART, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 4584: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 4610: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 4635: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 4647: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4660: Mr. STEWART, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 4681: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 4693: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 4704: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4712: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BRAT, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4715: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 4736: Mr. LONG and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 4737: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 4747: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 35: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 613: Mr. DELANEY.

H. Res. 661: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. HECK, and Mr. CORREA.

H. Res. 673: Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 675: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.