



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2018

No. 10

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.

January 17, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID G. VALADAO 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.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, here we are again, facing the possibility of a government shutdown. It is one of the most foolish acts possible. What we have seen in the past when this occurs where there are some people who decide they want to force the government to shut down.

It only hurts our employees, and it hurts the public, having a denial of

service in many instances. The employees are sent home. They are off the payroll temporarily. But what has always happened is that we always end up paying them because it is not their fault, and, as a result, the taxpayer loses twice. They lose the services, and they end up having to pay, essentially, public employees to take a forced vacation.

Now, the current controversy is largely about the fate of almost 700,000 undocumented young people who were brought here as children. This shouldn't be a matter of major debate. We can take care of the immigration issues if we allow the process to work.

Remember a couple years ago the Senate passed a bipartisan immigration reform bill—not perfect, maybe a C-plus on the scale, but it would have fixed the problem in the short and intermediate term. Unfortunately, the House leadership never allowed us to vote on it, probably because they knew it would pass.

Now we are facing anxiety again. We have had people arguing about what vulgarity the President used or who is acting in good faith, but the fact is that we have a proposal from Senator DURBIN and Senator GRAHAM, a bipartisan proposal, that met the broad outlines that the President earlier talked about that looks as though it will pass the Senate, and we have a strong possibility of passing here in the House.

Now, there is some controversy. People are suggesting Democrats want to shut the government down. Absolutely not. My Republican friends are in complete control of the House and the Senate and the White House, and they can, as they did recently with the short-term extension, pass it themselves. But if they want to work with us, they ought to include us in this effort.

I would suggest that we stop governing behind closed doors and having the majority party cater to a small handful of people who are making de-

mands that would not be acceptable to the broad House and probably aren't even acceptable to most Republicans. Let's bring the best approaches forward.

It is pretty simple. Allow the House to vote on the Graham-Durbin proposal. I understand there is one from our friend Mr. GOODLATTE, Congressman MCCAUL. Bring them forward.

There are legislative processes—queen of the Hill, king of the Hill—where you can have multiple votes on issues that are related, and at the end there is one that is left standing that represents the majority.

I would suggest that there is no reason to play games with the integrity of government services, play games with our employees, and play games with providing key services to the public; and, most importantly, stop using almost 700,000 young people and millions of their family members, their employers, and their fellow workers as pawns.

Let's bring the proposals forward, allow an up-or-down vote, and resolve this rather than threaten the possibility of wasting money, wasting services, and further frustrating the American public. They deserve better. This is a simple resolution that was in our capacity this week.

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, each year we commemorate National School Choice Week to celebrate a family's right to select the best school for their children. This year we are starting the celebration on January 21.

Americans like to have options, and when it comes to options in postsecondary education, there are more opportunities than ever. School choice is

☐ 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.

H415

also about bringing those options to America's children in elementary and secondary schools.

One of the best examples of options is the expansion of school choice. In the expansion of school choice is the growth of charter schools. Over the last 12 years, public charter school enrollment has tripled, and America now has 3 million students attending these schools.

Along with the growing demand for charter schools, homeschooling and private school choice programs are increasing. There are 2.3 million students being homeschooled, and enrollment in private school choice programs has increased more than 100 percent.

Making school choice available to more families should be a priority for all of us. It is clear that parents are looking for options, and we want opportunity for them to be open to everyone.

HONORING CRYSTAL WINEBARGER

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to wish Crystal Winebarger of the Fifth District a very peaceful and happy retirement. For the last 16 years, Ms. Winebarger selflessly served as the Hunger and Health Coalition director of operations located in Watauga County, North Carolina. The Hunger and Health Coalition's mission is to lift up the community by providing resources such as food, medications, and heat in the winter to those in need.

Crystal worked with members in the faith community and local churches to ensure the well-being of many individuals and families. It is my belief that North Carolina will benefit from her tireless efforts for years to come.

A lasting legacy of service is something that is becoming all too rare in our neighborhoods today. I will remain forever grateful to Ms. Winebarger for her service to our community. I wish her a happy retirement.

RECENT RHETORIC

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, in bizarre Washington news of the last week, the raging controversy is whether the President of the United States referred to other countries and a continent as s---holes or s---houses. As if either word means a drop of difference, especially when you insult other nations in the world as our President did.

Equally worrisome is that the leadership of this branch of government, the U.S. House of Representatives, a coequal branch of government, has been complicit or silent about how to respond to the comments made by our President. In fact, Speaker PAUL RYAN took 19 hours and 53 minutes to respond.

And with all of that time, enough time to have driven from Washington, D.C., to Dallas, Texas, or to watch the movie "Jaws" nine times, what was his stinging and necessary rebuke after

that much time and thought? "Unfortunate." The Speaker said the President's comments were unfortunate and unhelpful.

Look, it is unfortunate when you walk outside and step in a puddle of water. This was more like walking into a global-sized pile of S.

We are not on the staff of the White House. We are a coequal branch of government, and it is about time we acted like it. Saying nothing, or basically nothing, is unacceptable. We need to put our country before our political party.

Calling other countries, and even a continent, names like s---holes or s---houses puts our servicemembers and our Americans overseas at greater risk. Weak words or silence makes Congress complicit with the President's racist rhetoric.

And, by the way, people outside the beltway just think Congress is full of S. Everyone else had the proper response to the President's comments, that they were pure BS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

HONORING BOB DOLE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because today former Senator Bob Dole will receive the Nation's highest civilian honor to recognize his decades of service as a soldier, a lawmaker, and a statesman. House and Senate leaders will present the 94-year-old former Senator with the Congressional Gold Medal.

Senator Dole represented Kansas for 35 years: first as a Representative of this House, and later lending his leadership to the U.S. Senate. In 1996, he was the GOP candidate for President.

President Ronald Reagan, in 1989, said that Senator Dole served America heroically and "has . . . been a friend to veterans, farmers, and Americans from every walk of life. Bob Dole has stood for integrity, straight talk, and achievement throughout his years of distinguished public service."

Senator Dole has served this country, this Nation, on the battlefield, enlisting with the U.S. Army during World War II. During a military offensive in Italy, he was seriously wounded while trying to save a fellow soldier. Despite his grave injuries, Dole recovered and was awarded two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star with an oak cluster for his service, among other medals.

I am proud that we will honor Senator Dole today for his life of service to the United States both in the military and here on Capitol Hill. It is sure to be a moving ceremony in honor of a real American hero.

HONORING ARMY SECRETARY MARK ESPER

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, service to one's country

is among the most notable and selfless acts throughout history. Our military men and women have shown uncompromising honor, dedication to duty, and genuine love of country.

This evening, Members of Congress will have an opportunity to meet the 23rd Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Mark T. Esper. Secretary Esper is a 1986 graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He served on Active Duty for more than 10 years before transitioning into the Reserve, achieving the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Secretary Esper's service included deployment with the 101st Airborne Division during Operation Desert Storm. For his valor during that operation, he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal.

Proudly, the Secretary is a Pennsylvania native. He graduated from Laurel Highlands High School in Uniontown, Pennsylvania, in 1982. Secretary Esper later earned a master's degree in public administration from Harvard and a doctorate from George Washington University.

I am looking forward to meeting the Secretary tonight thanks to the reception hosted by the House Army Caucus.

In addition to the Secretary, we will be joined by General Mark Milley, the 39th Chief of Staff of the Army. The Army senior leaders and members of the Army staff will also attend.

This reception provides an important opportunity for Members to meet directly with Secretary Esper and General Milley as well as the Army staff to gain their perspectives on the strategic environment facing the Army during the 115th Congress and discuss issues facing our Army, our soldiers, and their families.

Two outstanding events will take place today in the Capitol, and I look forward to both of these historic occasions.

CONGRATULATING THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE SHOWMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association on the occasion of their 50th anniversary. I look forward to joining them Friday evening at their annual Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association convention as they celebrate this monumental milestone.

The Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association has served to keep the outdoor amusement industry alive and strong through their combined efforts. The PSSA has grown because its members have learned to put their individual goals aside for the common goals of the industry. This unity really has given them the strength and foresight necessary to continue their work into the next century.

Their annual convention and trade show brings together board members, volunteers, and staff from most of the 109 Pennsylvania county and local fairs.

For 14 years, their supportive scholarships have generated more than \$200,000.

□ 1015

Their investment in our Commonwealth's next generation of leadership is to be commended.

Thanks to all the members of the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association for the work that they do, to the best of their human ability, to keep the outdoor amusement industry the best of America's family entertainment. Congratulations and happy 50th.

HONORING TOBY COSGROVE

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Dr. Toby Cosgrove, an innovative leader and the recently retired president and CEO of the Cleveland Clinic Hospital System. I am fortunate to know Dr. Cosgrove personally, and I am privileged to call him a friend.

Some say a picture is worth 1,000 words. That was certainly true of Toby Cosgrove. Toby was an accomplished sailor as a young man. That was his path until he saw a photo of his neighbor in an operating room. That photo inspired Dr. Cosgrove to become a surgeon.

He graduated from Williams College in Massachusetts and earned his medical degree from the University of Virginia School of Medicine.

After medical school, Dr. Cosgrove served our Nation in Vietnam as a captain in the U.S. Air Force. He was awarded a Bronze Star and the Republic of Vietnam Commendation Medal for his service during the war.

Dr. Cosgrove joined the Cleveland Clinic staff in 1976. Dr. Cosgrove was a world-renowned heart surgeon for more than 30 years. He performed more than 22,000 operations and pioneered the first minimally invasive heart valve surgery. Throughout his remarkable career, he acquired 31 registered patents.

Dr. Cosgrove took the helm of the Cleveland Clinic in 2004 and made the health of the clinic employees a priority. Some of his wellness initiatives included implementing a smoking ban on all campuses, ensuring healthier food options in cafeterias, and opening weekly farmers' markets.

During his tenure, Dr. Cosgrove focused on enhancing patient outcomes and a better patient experience. Dr. Cosgrove is credited with instilling a vision and culture that has led to the Cleveland Clinic being described as "a role model of healthcare delivery."

He coined the phrase "Patients First" and made headlines by hiring America's first chief experience officer to ensure caregivers were meeting the medical, physical, and emotional needs of patients.

Dr. Cosgrove led the expansion of Cleveland Clinic's footprint to over 100 locations in northeast Ohio, including 10 regional hospitals and 21 family health centers.

Under his leadership, the Cleveland Clinic has become Ohio's largest employer. Total visits increased to 7.1 million and research funding grew to \$260 million.

The Cleveland Clinic health system includes facilities in Florida, Nevada, Canada, Abu Dhabi, and a new London facility scheduled to open in 2020.

Dr. Cosgrove stepped down at the end of 2017. In tribute, the Cleveland Clinic community came together to raise over \$50 million for the Cosgrove Transformation Campaign to honor his career and legacy.

The Cosgrove Transformation Campaign will ensure Cleveland Clinic remains a world leader in innovation, research, education, and improving the patient experience.

On behalf of the people of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, I thank Dr. Cosgrove for his years of innovative leadership at Cleveland Clinic and his commitment to improving the health and wellness of those we serve.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that Dr. Cosgrove's impact will continue to be felt for decades to come.

HONORING THOMAS COWARD

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of one of Alachua County, Florida's, true trailblazers—Alachua County, Florida, is my home county in northeast central Florida—Mr. Thomas Coward, who passed away on December 23, 2017.

Mr. Coward was drafted into the Navy in 1942 and served during World War II. After his honorable discharge, he went on to pursue higher education, graduated with his bachelor of science in social studies from Lincoln University in Missouri, and followed it with a master of science from Tuskegee University in Alabama.

Upon completion of his master's, he returned to his alma mater, Lincoln High School in Gainesville, to teach civics and history. His interactive style of teaching that included mock government scenarios encouraged students to get involved in government affairs.

He later went on to serve as the dean of students for Lincoln High School, then transferred as the dean of students to the newly opened Buchholz High School in Gainesville, Florida, in 1971.

He ended his career in the school system in the county administrator's office, having served in the Alachua County school system for over 31 years.

While his students remember him for his dedication to shaping young minds, Mr. Coward is known in the community at large for being the first African American elected to serve on the Alachua County Commission in 1974. It is a seat he held for over 18 years. Incidentally, it was the first time since the Reconstruction Era that an African American had been elected to the Alachua County Commission.

During his tenure, he helped to establish the first Office of Equal Opportunity and focused on economic development through the community, in particular east Gainesville.

In fact, his document "Plan East Gainesville" is still frequently referred to as a planned vision for that community.

His time on the county commission inspired him to help found the National Forum for Black Public Administrators and the National Association of Black County Commissioners.

Additionally, he owned and operated Thomas Coward Realty for 25 years, he was the first African American to receive his brokerage license in Alachua County, and he was a member of the National Association of Realtors.

Throughout his life, he continued to lead and inspire his community through positions such as the president of the State Regional Planning Board and as a board member for the East Gainesville Task Force and the Chamber of Commerce.

Additionally, he was involved in organizations such as the Gainesville Cotton Club, the Elks, the Phi Beta Sigma fraternity, all of which focused on serving the community and, in the case of the Cotton Club, helping to preserve history while revitalizing the building to reopen as a museum and cultural center.

His leadership and dedication to our community led to the Alachua County Commission dedicating their Community Support Services Auditorium to him in 2016.

Once quoted as saying "My idea is if you are going to change things, then you have got to be involved," Mr. Coward embodied this idea and held the title of many firsts throughout his life. I have no doubt his legacy of leadership and service will go on to better our community through future generations.

Mr. Speaker, his legacy has and will inspire the future of our county, our State, and yes, our Nation. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Coward for his service to all. He will be missed.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA 2018 NCAA FOOTBALL NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Alabama Crimson Tide on their NCAA Football National Championship win against the University of Georgia Bulldogs.

In a historic comeback, the Crimson Tide overcame a 13-0 deficit to win the game in overtime and to return the title to Tuscaloosa. With this year's victory, the University of Alabama wins its 17th national title, by far the most of any school in the modern era of football.

This is head coach Nick Saban's fifth championship win in just nine seasons.

Mr. Speaker, no other school has won, even, any more than three national championships in any 10-year period.

This year's victory is an extraordinary record which further cements Coach Saban's status as one of the greatest college football coaches of all times.

Likewise, I want to congratulate the players. As Coach Saban said, this was a true team victory. From running backs Bo Scarbrough and Damien Harris to wide receivers Calvin Ridley and Devonta Smith to defensive powerhouses Minkah Fitzpatrick and Raekwon Davis to true freshman quarterback Tua Tagovailoa, every player stepped up to the challenge and demonstrated resilience and grit for all four quarters and into overtime.

I also want to recognize quarterback Jalen Hurts. While he did not finish the game, Jalen led the Tide all the way to the national championships twice, with an impressive 25-2 record in his two seasons. Thank you to Jalen for his leadership and his gracious sportsmanship and being such a good sport throughout the whole game.

Finally, I want to commend the Georgia Bulldogs on a fantastic season and a hard-fought championship game. Coach Kerby Smart and the Dogs were a worthy opponent, and I know that they will give us a run for our title next season.

My friend Representative JODY HICE, who represents the University of Georgia, made a friendly bet with me before the game, and he will honor his wager this week. On Thursday, he will join me on the Capitol steps wearing a Bear Bryant houndstooth hat, as well as an Alabama tie, to commemorate and celebrate Alabama's victory.

He will also serve Georgia barbecue to my staff for lunch. I thank JODY for being such a good sport.

In closing, I want to again congratulate the University of Alabama Crimson Tide on their 17th national football title. What a game. And as we say in Alabama: Roll Tide.

ADDRESSING THE PENSION CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, gradually, many of America's largest multi-employer pension funds are slipping into insolvency, threatening the retirement income of millions of Americans. Funds such as the United Mine Workers of America, the Central States Pension Fund, the Boilermakers, the IBEW, and over 50 others are in critical condition.

Failure of these funds would leave retirees who have paid their dues throughout their entire career without the income that they were expecting and promised.

This pending economic crisis for families could mean a loss of hundreds of billions of dollars in funds and must be avoided.

I have worked with representatives of the coal miners and the construction building trades preparing a resolution. If we fail to act soon, our options become increasingly limited and extremely expensive.

For example, the UMWA pension fund has been predicted to collapse by 2022, or sooner. But the real culprit to their pension crisis comes not from Wall Street, the management of the operations, but from right here in Washington. Environmental regulations aimed at putting coal out of business have resulted in the loss of over 470 coal mines, 350 coal-fired generating plants, and 86,000 coal jobs as a result of the bankruptcy of mining companies.

Some have suggested that the funds could fall into the Pension Benefits Guaranty Corporation, but the Pension Benefits Guaranty Corporation says it, too, is underfunded. Assuming the liability of one or more of these troubled funds will lead to their own insolvency.

H.R. 3913, the American Miners Pension Act, would allow their funds to recover by borrowing funds that will be paid back. It is important to emphasize this point. The loans are designed to be paid back. It is not a bailout.

A bipartisanship Pension Protection Caucus that I co-chair with Representatives RICHARD NOLAN and DEBBIE DINGELL shares this common goal of raising attention to this crisis before it is too late.

Congress must come together and find a bipartisanship solution that works for all of these critical funds and takes care of the families that need peace of mind.

So on behalf of the American coal miners, the Teamsters, the builders, bakers, boilermakers, and many others, we must act now.

□ 1030

INJUSTICE ANYWHERE IS A
THREAT TO JUSTICE EVERY-
WHERE

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 am always honored to stand here in the well of the House. Today is no exception. I love my country, but I am not proud of my President.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to say that the level of discourse in our country has been brought to an all-time low. There are people who were very much concerned when the President indicated that there would be a ban on persons from certain countries, a ban on Muslims, if you will.

There were people who were saddened when they learned that the President was of the opinion that members of the LGBTQ community could not serve in the military.

There were people who were saddened by the President's comments about SOBs playing football. Others were dis-

heartened by the President's comment with reference to Charlottesville and some very fine people being among the racists, the bigots, the KKK.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the latest commentary has really caused an international uproar. People around the world cannot believe that the President has made his latest comments. Mr. Speaker, these comments are words that are hurtful and harmful, but this is just not another person making these comments. This is the President of the United States of America.

The President of the United States of America has the ability, the power, and the wherewithal to do more than simply speak these words. These words can be converted into policy, into policy of the United States of America.

The Muslim ban comments, there was an attempt that is still going on to ban Muslim persons from certain countries.

The comments about Charlottesville were encouraging persons who were there, many of whom were interacting with persons of color, minorities, and Jewish people on their jobs and in other places. It encouraged them to continue to do those dastardly things that they do and had in mind when they were saying: "Jews will not replace us."

The comments that were made about the s---hole, or s---house, the kind of profanity that ought not emanate from the Presidency, those comments were made as there was an effort afoot to deal with immigration, to draft an immigration policy.

The President can put his comments into policy. The President can drive policy with these ugly comments. The President's comments are not only hurtful when you hear them, but they are hurtful to people who have to suffer when they become policy.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to accept what the President is doing. I refuse to accept it because if you tolerate something, you will not change it. You will do little to change it. I am going to do everything that I can to change it, and it is within my power as a Member of the Congress of the United States of America to bring Articles of Impeachment against this President for what he has done. I have done it before, and I will do it again and again and again. I will not allow it to happen unchallenged.

I know that there are many who would say that this is not appropriate, but I can only say, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere," since we are just now removed 1 or 2 days from Dr. King's celebration. We are still celebrating him in my neck of the woods. But injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

If we allow this injustice to persist, then what is happening and said in the White House is going to impact every house in this country. We must take a stand against this President and his bigoted comments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

REPEAL MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the burdensome medical device tax. Originally passed as part of the Affordable Care Act, this ill-conceived tax places a 2.3 percent sales tax on manufacturers of medical devices.

Although Congress successfully suspended the tax, it, unfortunately, went back into effect on January 1, 2018, and is beginning to derail much of the progress we have made to foster job growth and innovation.

The medical device industry has a significant impact in my State's economy. It employs more than 4,000 individuals. Merit Medical Systems, Inc., a local Utah company, believes this tax could cost them over \$7 million, having a devastating impact on their ability to expand jobs and continue medical research.

The current situation is a lose-lose for everybody. Not only does it increase medical healthcare costs, the tax is stifling job growth of our best medical technology innovators and slowing the cutting-edge research that leads to breakthroughs in patient care and treatment.

Surely, we can do better for the American people. I call upon my colleagues to join me and, together again, repeal this tax once and for all.

MEDICAL DEVICE TAX BURDENS HOOSIERS

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, after a 2-year delay, one of the worst parts of ObamaCare went back into effect at the first of this year. The medical device tax prevents Indiana companies from innovating, expanding, and hiring. This tax was created when ObamaCare was created, and that result has been a burden for the tens of thousands of Hoosier workers all over the State, including those in Warsaw, Bloomington, Mishawaka, and Indianapolis. It must be repealed.

This tax is bad for patients because it drives up the cost of much-needed medical devices, and it is bad for workers because it makes America's medical device industry less competitive around the globe.

Fortunately, this week, some relief may soon be on the way. After weeks of debate and a lot of work, the government funding bill we are voting on this week would provide immediate relief by repealing the medical device tax for another 2 years.

This result will be good for Hoosier workers and good for Indiana's econ-

omy. In the long run, repealing the medical device tax will provide certainty in the marketplace and help keep good-paying jobs in Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the 2-year repeal of the medical device tax in the bill this week, and then continue working to find a long-term solution by permanently repealing the medical device tax.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE ELECTIONS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Western Hemisphere is set to see many key Presidential, parliamentary, and municipal elections this year, and those will have far-reaching implications.

Sadly, one place where we know we won't see elections is in my native country of Cuba. The Cuban people continue to be denied the right to choose their own leaders. The system in Cuba is a farce. The President of Cuba—using that term loosely—is selected by the National Assembly, and the National Assembly is selected by the regime in what can only be described as a circle of corruption.

Raul Castro claims that he will step down and allow for a transition of power in April. The reality is, even if there is a so-called transition, the balance of power will remain with Raul Castro and the Cuban people will continue to suffer.

The U.S. must not give Castro any concessions until we see the regime meet the basic conditions laid out in our laws, U.S. law. We want to help the people of Cuba work toward freedom of expression; freedom of assembly; and free, fair, and transparent elections.

Then there is Castro's protege in Venezuela: Maduro. Venezuela is set to hold elections this year, but with Maduro in power, there is little that we can expect. Even if elections are held, Mr. Speaker, we know that it will be a fraudulent process, just as the municipal elections were last year.

Maduro's grip on the supreme court and the supreme electoral tribunal make it impossible for the voice of the people to be heard. The administration has, thankfully, taken action against Maduro regime officials, but there is so much more that we can do, Mr. Speaker. There is a severe food and medicine shortage in Venezuela as a result of Maduro's failed and oppressive socialist policies.

That is why ELIOT ENGEL and I introduced and the House passed last month the Venezuelan Humanitarian Assistance and Defense of Democratic Governance Act. Our bill mandates a strategy from the USAID to provide humanitarian aid to the people of Venezuela. The bill also aims to fight widespread corruption among Venezuelan govern-

mental officials. I hope that our colleagues in the Senate will take action and pass this measure so we can get help to these individuals rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, Brazil is another country that has important Presidential elections this year. With public opinion at an all-time low, increasing public debt, and high-profile corruption allegations reaching the highest levels in Brazil, the country is at a crossroads.

In December 2016, the Department of Justice reached a plea agreement with Brazilian conglomerate, Odebrecht, for at least \$3.5 billion in global penalties to resolve charges of bribery and what has amounted to be the largest case of its kind in history.

Last January I wrote a letter to then-Attorney General Lynch urging the DOJ to disclose the names of the officials referenced in the Odebrecht case. I again followed up this month, but, unfortunately, the Department of Justice will not disclose the names of officials in Latin America that it knows to have been involved in these corruption schemes. It is very troubling because many of these officials could very well be standing for elections in the region this year.

Mr. Speaker, we worked so hard over the years to help root out corruption in these countries, and it would be a shame to set progress back if these corrupt officials are allowed to continue to act with impunity.

We will also see critical Presidential elections in Colombia this year. Colombia is still at a pivotal point in the aftermath of the failed agreements between the government and the terror group, FARC. Colombia still has a way to go in bringing justice to the victims of the FARC. With members of the FARC, a terror group, aspiring to government positions, I worry that FARC terrorists will soon be elected officials. Their so-called peace deal allows these terrorists to run for public office.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, this year will be a crucial year. It is crucial for the United States to be engaged and for election observation missions to monitor the electoral process closely to ensure that they are indeed free, that they are fair, and that they are transparent.

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 42 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:

Lord God, architect of the universe and advocate for us all, thank You for giving us another day.

When we rise from sleep, activities of the day stir the mind. Having a job to fulfill sets us into routine as a people with purpose.

Daily work, O Lord, invites us to demonstrate responsibility and manifests our participation in Your creative power. Mind and body together become engaged in productivity, sustenance, or service beyond ourselves.

Because human work bestows a special dignity upon a person and is a way to achieve a just society, we know how important it is for us to pray for the unemployed and those who work but still struggle to make ends meet.

Bless the work of Congress today. May this chosen labor be creative, prove responsible, and have lasting results to the benefit of our Nation. And 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. FITZPATRICK. 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. FITZPATRICK. 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 Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BONAMICI 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Gabrielle Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

THE MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this very Nation was founded upon the belief that all men are entitled to the most precious right to life. It is a right that I fought to defend in the United States Air Force, and it is a right I continue to defend in this United States Congress. That is why, this week, I will proudly vote in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

It is my hope folks across the country are brought together with the uplifting message that life is a blessing.

RESCINDING THE COLE MEMO

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that the Department of Justice is ignoring States' rights and encouraging the prosecution of small cannabis businesses, many of which are in Oregon.

Earlier this month, the Department of Justice rescinded the Cole memo, which had provided Federal guidance to discourage prosecutors from charging individuals and businesses with Federal marijuana-related crimes in States where marijuana is legal. Oregon is one of those States.

Today, more than 700 small cannabis businesses operate across the State, where, like with alcohol, marijuana businesses are licensed, regulated, and taxed. These small businesses follow State law, create jobs in their communities, and pay taxes, yet now their livelihood is threatened because this administration wants to revive the futile war on weed.

This is absurd, especially when the Department of Justice should be putting its efforts and its resources into the extremely dangerous and addictive heroin and fentanyl.

Our small cannabis businesses should not be jeopardized by this misguided Federal policy. The voters have spoken. Their will must be respected.

PEMBROKE, NORTH CAROLINA, 2017 SMALL TOWN OF THE YEAR

(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 Pembroke, North Carolina, named 2017 Small Town of the Year by the North Carolina Rural Assembly.

Pembroke, population 3,000, is home to the University of North Carolina at Pembroke, as well as the Lumbee Indian Tribe, two wonderful organizations with whom I am actively involved.

Much of southeastern North Carolina has been decimated by poorly negotiated international trade deals and the loss of traditional industries. Pembroke is fighting back by participating in a first-in-the-Nation innovation and entrepreneurship program and is working to build its economy by focusing on healthcare, construction, and agribusiness.

Congratulations to Mayor Charles Gregory Cummings, Council Members Locklear, Jones, Sampson, and McNeill, Town Manager Tyler Thomas, UNC Pembroke Chancellor Robin Cummings, Lumbee Tribal Chairman Harvey Godwin, and the entire Pembroke community on this outstanding achievement.

WE MUST FIGHT CLIMATE CHANGE

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 2017 alone, there were 16 extreme weather and climate events that devastated the United States and its territories, including Hurricane Harvey, which ravaged my great State of Texas and brought Houston's third 500-year flood in 3 years. Since 2006, the contiguous U.S. has experienced five of the warmest years on record. Year after year, new temperature and weather severity records are broken.

As researchers attempt to answer why this is occurring, it has become clear that there is a link between the severity of these events and human-caused climate change. Last year, in a study published by Nature magazine, scientists concluded that the frequency of extreme weather events in the Northern Hemisphere were amplified by anthropogenic climate change.

It is time to face the fact that climate change is real and admit that we are directly contributing to it. We must continue to find innovative ways to address this challenge before it is too late.

I will continue to speak out in support of all research that furthers our understanding of our planet's climate and helps identify ways of reducing the harmful impacts on it.

RECOGNIZING DR. TIMOTHY M. BLOCK

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my constituent Dr. Timothy M. Block, president of the Hepatitis B Foundation, Baruch S. Blumberg Institute, and the Pennsylvania Biotechnology Center in my district in Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Block was recently named as a fellow of the U.S. National Academy of Inventors. Being elected as an NAI fellow is the highest professional recognition for academic inventors who have shown a lifelong commitment to innovation, specifically by facilitating or creating inventions that make a measurable impact on quality of life, economic development, and the welfare of society.

Dr. Block is being recognized for his contributions to therapeutic drug and biomarker of disease screening and discovery. Dr. Block also holds more than nine patents and has been involved, for more than 30 years, in viral hepatitis research.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives thanks Dr. Block for the work that he has done in this field, which has undoubtedly impacted the lives of constituents in my district and people around the world.

RISING TO SAVE LIVES PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to save lives.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the CR for its repetitiveness and its inability to save lives, frankly, the lives of DREAMers or the lives of those who depend upon the Children's Health Insurance Program.

In the vulgar statement that was made by the White House, how shocking this week of Dr. King's birthday of the deafening silence of my Republican friends and the faith community, the broad-based faith community.

Let me read from the network:

The slave codes created servitude for natural life for African laborers. 250-plus years slave labor of millions of African and Black people was the foundation of the American economy and global force that it eventually became. On the eve of the Civil War, Black slaves were valued at an estimated \$3.5 billion—and that is scaled for modern inflation—and none of the Black slaves were able to cash in on that value.

That is the vulgar statement about Africa from which many of us have come. And so I would argue that it is time, now, for this House to stand up for people such as those who are starving in Somalia, those who are starving in Sudan and Nigeria, those who have been called a vulgar word.

Where is the morality of this Congress, the morality of this administration, the morality of this Nation?

Enough is enough.

RISING IN SUPPORT OF THE BORN- ALIVE SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4712, the Born-

Alive Survivors Protection Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important pro-life legislation.

The Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act is a simple but critical bill to strengthen the protections for babies who survive abortion. It ensures that these precious babies are provided with the same degree of medical care that any other child would receive in order to save their life.

We all expect doctors and nurses to follow their oath to help and heal. This bill simply codifies that expectation into law for babies who survive abortion and deserve a chance at life.

Just think about this. Right now we are debating whether a living, breathing baby should be given a chance to live. I know that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree that these babies deserve our compassion, and most importantly, our protection, and I hope they will join in me in supporting this important legislation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. JIM MELIUS

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Dr. Jim Melius, who passed away on January 1.

Possessed of a technical expertise and a fierce sense of justice, Dr. Melius was a tireless advocate for people who, due to no fault of their own, were exposed to toxic and deadly substances in the workplace. He was a powerful force in our efforts in helping thousands of western New Yorkers get long overdue relief for suffering caused by their unknowing exposure to uranium at long-shuttered plants like Linde Ceramics, Hooker Chemical, Carborundum, and Bethlehem Steel, where, today, over \$300 million in compensation and medical bills have been paid out to former employees. With a calm and steady demeanor, he gave instant credibility to any fight. He was a tremendous resource and he was a good man.

While our fight to provide full and fair relief for all of these citizens continues, we will never forget this fighter for all the Cold War warriors.

KATE'S KART MARKS 10 YEARS

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

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kate's Kart, a group founded in memory of Kate Layman.

Monday marked 10 years since Kate's life was cut short due to a heart condition at the age of 18 months. During Kate's final moments here on Earth, listening to stories brought a sense of comfort and joy.

Today, Kate's memory lives on through Kate's Kart. This organization brings joy to thousands of hospitalized

children throughout northeast Indiana by giving them free books. In the 10 years that it has operated, Kate's Kart has passed out over 186,000 books.

Kate's Kart is particularly near and dear to my heart because Mr. Layman, Kate's father, was my middle school history teacher, and he helped spark my interest in government.

I want to recognize the life-changing work of Kate's Kart. Truly, Kate's legacy lives on through this organization and its impact on children throughout northeast Indiana.

□ 1215

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS' CANNABIS DECISION

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to Attorney General Sessions' unproductive and backwards marijuana policies. By rescinding the Cole memorandum on legal marijuana enforcement, Jeff Sessions proved that he has one goal as Attorney General, and that is reviving the failed war on drugs.

These policies have proven to be devastating for communities of color. For example, African Americans are four times more likely to be arrested and incarcerated for marijuana possession than their White counterparts. Instead of embracing outdated drug laws, the Attorney General should be working to create a criminal justice system that treats everyone fairly.

What is worse, by going after legal marijuana businesses and consumers, the Attorney General is really showing a blatant disregard for the will of the American people who have voted, mind you, in their States for more reasonable and fairer laws.

That is why I am proud to introduce H.R. 4779. Actually, we introduced it last week, along with my friend, Congressman DON YOUNG. It is a bipartisan bill called the REFER Act, which would prevent harmful Federal overreach. Also, today we are introducing a bill that will end the Federal prohibition.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTIONS

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that it has been 30 years since it was my first night alone as an OB/GYN resident at Bayfront Health in St. Petersburg, Florida. As fate would have it, I was called about 2 in the morning, stat, to the OB floor.

When I got there, I went into a patient's room and reviewed a lady that I had never met before. I quickly looked at her and determined that she might be 24 weeks pregnant. But more alarmingly, she had blood oozing from the bed, soaking into the cloth beneath the

bed, filling buckets of blood, and I knew I had seconds or minutes to make a decision whether to do a C-section on this lady.

As we rushed her back to the OR and quickly did a C-section, I was calling in neonatologists, anesthesiologists, anybody I could. And you can't imagine, when I reached in there to pull the first baby out, that there was a second baby. We did everything we could to save those babies' lives.

But what I can't really believe, Mr. Speaker, is that an abortion clinic across town where botched abortions occur and babies born this same gestational age are executed in inhumane fashion.

Mr. Speaker, we have a chance Friday to pass the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and I look forward to passing that legislation.

URGENT NATIONAL PRIORITIES

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has total control of Washington. Yet, instead of fulfilling their responsibilities to fund the government, President Trump and the Republicans wasted the last 4 months on their tax scam.

Because they haven't done their jobs, Republicans now tell us we need to kick the can down the road again. Minnesotans and Americans deserve better. We need a budget deal that keeps our government open, protects our national security, meets our commitments to hardworking families. We need to reauthorize community health centers which will otherwise be forced to lay off healthcare workers. We need to protect workers' retirements by enacting responsible pension reform. And, yes, we must pass the Dream Act.

There is bipartisan support for these priorities. The only thing standing in the way is Republican's failure to govern responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for President Trump and the Republicans to end the chaos and to work across the aisle to meet the urgent needs of the American people.

NORTH TEXANS ARE BENEFITING FROM HISTORIC TAX REFORM

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, Texas businesses are putting more money in their employees' pockets because of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Companies that employ tens of thousands of my constituents in north Texas are giving bonuses to their employees, increasing investment in their operations, and donating millions of dollars to charities.

These Texas companies are joining thousands of others across the country and doing the same for their workers.

They are growing the American economy because of tax reform. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act reforms an unfair and uncompetitive Tax Code, and that is being fixed in this Tax Code. It provides tax relief at every income level and helps Americans and American businesses to succeed in the future.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF PROFESSOR BEN BARRES

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life and achievements of Ben Barres, a Stanford neurobiologist.

Professor Barres started life as "Barbara." He received a BS from MIT in 1976, an MD from Dartmouth in 1979, and a Ph.D. in neuroscience and neurobiology from Harvard in 1990. Ben started at Stanford in 1993 and made the transition to male in 1997, always championing the cause of women in academia and dignity for everyone.

Ben had 160 scientific publications. Perhaps his greatest achievements were about the glial cells in the brain that are responsible for the formation and regeneration of neurons. He found that the glial cells play a central role in developing the wiring of the brain. Prior to his work, these cells were thought of as the insulation for neurons, much like packing peanuts of the brain.

Professor Barres cofounded Annexon Biosciences, Inc., a company that makes drugs to block neurodegeneration in Alzheimer's. Ben Barres died on December 27 of pancreatic cancer.

RECOGNIZING MARIA ALONSO

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate and recognize the president and CEO of United Way of Miami-Dade County, Maria Alonso.

The United Way of Miami-Dade is an organization committed to helping those most in need to lead successful lives. As its new president and CEO of the United Way chapter of Miami-Dade, Maria will continue to build on its mission of changing lives through education, financial stability, and health.

For more than 3 decades, Maria has dedicated her life to improving the lives of others. Ms. Alonso has also chaired numerous south Florida institutions, such as the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, and served on the boards of The Miami Foundation, Camillus House, the Miami-Dade College Foundation, the March of Dimes, and Teach For America.

Maria's vision of a stronger and united Miami is not only inspiring, but

the very foundation of the work of the United Way of Miami-Dade that it brings to our community.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to represent individuals like Maria, and I thank her for this invaluable work to empower individuals to live healthier and more fulfilling lives.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PAMELA PALANQUE-NORTH

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of Pamela Palanque-North, a dedicated advocate for northern Manhattan and the citywide New York City community.

Ms. North was an unstoppable force of good in her own community. Beginning at Queens College, when she spoke out to increase minority student admissions, she since then served on numerous influential advisory boards across the city. She was the chair of Manhattan Community Board 12, where she served with distinction.

She was also the chair of and president of the Metropolitan Chapter, Jack and Jill, Inc., and founder of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's trustees' Multicultural Audience Development Initiative Advisory Committee. Her legacy should and will be remembered in her enthusiasm for giving back and the strong work that the entities she influenced continue to do.

Ms. North left a permanent mark in the northern Manhattan community, for which she will be forever fondly remembered for years to come.

PROVIDE PERMANENT STATUS FOR DREAMERS

(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, the situation that so many DREAMers—aspired Americans who know no other country—face is becoming more and more urgent in the face of President Trump's cancellation of their legal status in March.

I want to point out that over 100 are losing status every day and losing their permission to be able to go to work—their legal status—in our country. If we fail to act, one million aspired Americans will be unable to work legally and live legally in the only country they know, instantly creating over one million more people who are here illegally—the opposite of what President Trump ran on and the opposite of what the American people want.

I know that we can pass a solution through this body. I have heard so many Republicans and Democrats talk passionately about providing permanent status for the DREAMers. Let's pass the Dream Act, any of these bills.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor a new one yesterday that will finally provide some certainty for young people who want to do nothing more than work hard, play by the rules, and contribute to make our country, the only country they know, the United States of America, even greater.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 17, 2018.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 17, 2018, at 11:20 a.m.:

Appointment:
Health Information Technology Advisory
Committee.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 3326, WORLD BANK AC-
COUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017, AND
PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 2954, HOME MORTGAGE
DISCLOSURE ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 693 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 693

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3326) to increase accountability, combat corruption, and strengthen management effectiveness at the World Bank. 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 Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member des-

ignated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2954) to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BUCK. 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.

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

This rule makes in order two bills reported favorably by the Committee on Financial Services. In addition, the rule makes in order a majority of the amendments submitted.

These bills were the subject of hearings in the Financial Services Com-

mittee, and both were marked up and reported favorably to the House. Both bills received bipartisan support in the committee, and I expect that we will see bipartisan support for both bills on the floor this week.

Mr. Speaker, formed in 1944, the World Bank is the oldest multilateral development bank. As a post-World War II effort of international cooperation, the goal of the World Bank was to fund reconstruction efforts in war-torn nations.

In 1960, the United States pushed for the creation of the International Development Association within the World Bank. Where the original World Bank division funded middle-income countries, the IDA was created to make concessional loans; that is, loans with low interest rates and long repayment periods to the world's poorest countries.

The number of countries served by the IDA currently stands at 75. The IDA is typically the single largest source of funding for critical social programs in these low-income countries. However, the bill before us reduces the United States' contribution to the IDA.

The IDA is funded through replenishments by donor countries. We are currently in the 18th replenishment period, known as IDA-18. The bill reduces the United States' contribution in IDA-18 by 15 percent. Further, the bill requires that the Treasury Department certify that the World Bank reform its practices and lending controls in relation to the IDA.

A 2016 report commissioned by the World Bank reveals serious problems with one particular IDA project in Uganda. While IDA's role is to reduce inequality and support the development of civil society, the report outlines numerous failures to achieve these objectives on the part of the IDA.

The report details how IDA financing of a project in Uganda led to systemic spreading of HIV/AIDS, sexual abuse of minors, child labor, retaliation against local citizens, gender-based violence, and other gross abuses of powerless Ugandans. While the IDA took several steps, including withdrawing some loans from this particular project, there is much concern that this project is indicative of many others.

The House Committee on Financial Services held a hearing at which testimony was received from the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists indicating that governments that allow or participate in the abuse of their citizens and the subjugation of the poor have not been turned away by the World Bank.

The testimony reads in part: "We found instead that the bank repeatedly funded governments that not only failed to adequately resettle communities, but in some cases were accused of human rights abuses such as rape, murder, and violent evictions associated with bank projects. We found in several cases that the World Bank continued to bankroll these borrowers

even after evidence of these abuses came to light.”

Mr. Speaker, the IDA has a quality control problem, and we are right in reducing their funding.

As if the abuse of citizens by corrupt governments is not enough, the committee has also uncovered evidence that the World Bank has serious internal problems as well.

According to the World Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank staff has long been incentivized to simply get more loans out the door without any incentive to ensure the quality of the projects. This has been a long-standing trend documented since the early 1990s.

But it is not just perverse incentives. The World Bank has not focused enough on rigidly guarding itself against internal corruption. A professor from Caltech testified before the committee that it was common for World Bank projects to be captured by corrupt governments and that World Bank staff try to suppress corruption investigations.

She said: “Corruption investigations can shut down projects and derail careers. They are also inconvenient for senior management in the bank who are balancing delicate relationships with their country clients.”

Due to these problems, the underlying bill protects American taxpayers by withholding funding from the World Bank until these deficiencies are fixed.

Mr. Speaker, not only should we be holding international organizations accountable, we should also be holding our own government accountable, and the second bill made in order under this rule does just that.

In 2011, Dodd-Frank transferred to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau regulatory authority over home mortgages. Since then, CFPB has made information reporting by lenders more extensive.

The impact of these increased regulations has led to greater costs to lenders. Consequently, smaller lenders have had to pass on these costs directly to potential borrowers. This has reduced access to affordable credit to borrowers who would typically seek out smaller lending institutions.

The underlying bill is simple: exempt small lenders from CFPB’s onerous reporting requirements.

Under the leadership of Chairman HENSARLING, House Republicans have consistently put forward a plan to reform the CFPB. However, until we can pass broader reforms, we should do everything we can to protect Americans from harmful regulations pushed on them by the CFPB.

Today, we have two bills before us that hold powerful organizations accountable to American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and these bills, and 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, once again, Congress finds itself rushing to try to pass legislation to keep the government open; ensure that our youngest, most vulnerable Americans have access to health insurance; and protect young, aspiring Americans from being deported from the only country they have known as home. Yet here we are debating other things with the clock running out in the eleventh hour—issues that, no doubt, have a few people here and there who care about them, but zero people have called my office on, Mr. Speaker.

My constituents are demanding that we address access to the childhood healthcare insurance program and demanding that we act on the DREAMers with the deadline approaching and 100-plus DREAMers every day losing their status.

It sounds like, from all we are hearing, that the House is going to consider yet another short-term spending bill to maybe keep the government running for another 4 weeks or 6 weeks. It is actually the fourth short-term spending bill for this year, not allowing the Department of Defense to plan to keep our country safe and not allowing any of the departments across the Federal Government to make any of the investments they need or have any degree of certainty that contractors will be paid.

It is no way to govern, Mr. Speaker. Part of the reason that we are left doing this is we are using our precious floor time on all of these other issues like the ones before us today.

It is not that these issues don’t deserve their day in the sun, and we will talk about them for the rest of the day today, apparently, but we are facing the closure of the entire Federal Government in 3 days if we don’t act. We are doing the equivalent of fiddling while Rome burns. This is an absurd exercise in doing some narrowly tailored special interest bills rather than addressing what we all know to be the 1,000-pound gorillas in the room.

Seniors, military veterans, and people with disabilities shouldn’t have to question whether they will actually receive their benefits month to month because we don’t know whether the government will remain open. In the meanwhile, Republicans, Democrats, and the White House are all trying to put forward bipartisan solutions for the hundreds of thousands of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals recipients and DREAMers, and we could be debating that on the floor and putting together the final package now to do that by this Friday. But instead, we are discussing these bills that my constituents aren’t telling me that they are sending me to Washington to pass.

A lot of my colleagues say that the deadline for DACA isn’t until March, but, in reality, over 100 deferred action DREAMers every day lose their protected status as their benefits expire. Every day the Republicans fail to act, they are creating over 100 more illegal immigrants in this country. If Republicans fail to act by March, they will

have created over 800,000 more people here illegally in our country.

We have about 18,000 DREAMers in Colorado able to work legally today. They have come from countries near and far in search of a better life for themselves and their families. They grew up in our schools, sports teams, cheerleaders, don’t know any other country, and many of them don’t speak any other language.

One DREAMer that I have gotten to know from Colorado is Anarely, whose family stayed in Colorado to help take care of their grandmother. Anarely is a triple major at Colorado State University, studying political science, ethnic studies, and international relations. She has built a life in Colorado—the only life she knows—and continues to build a bright future in the U.S. if we can give her the certainty with regard to her legal ability to work and, of course, take her place alongside other American citizens.

What makes America so great is we are a country of immigrants made up of people from all backgrounds, all quarters of the world. We embrace people from different cultures and different countries. We value the contributions based on the individual and the values of individual responsibility and hard work. That is what makes our country and our communities vibrant and our economy successful.

Mr. Speaker, a group of bipartisan House and Senate Members are working together to find a solution to protect DREAMers and improve border security. I am proud to cosponsor the USA Act, which we dropped yesterday with Mr. HURD and Mr. AGUILAR which would provide DREAMers long-term protections and improve our border security to prevent this kind of situation from happening again.

But instead of legislation that addresses long-term funding or protects aspiring Americans, here we are bringing bills to talk around the fringes about consumer protections and, of course, a bill that would chip away at reproductive health rights.

The rule we are debating today considers two pieces of legislation that are not anything to do with the expiration at the end of this week of government funding or the over 100 DREAMers who lose their status every day—the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and the World Bank Accountability Act.

The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act has long been a tool to monitor the mortgage lending practices and patterns of financial institutions to ensure equal and fair access to credit. The information that lenders are required to report shows that they are meeting the housing financing needs of their communities. HMDA data is very important in fair lending assessments and helps make determinations of where to target community development resources.

Congress has made changes to HMDA as a response to legitimate concerns about the role that widespread predatory lending played in the financial

crisis. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was charged with updating how lenders report HMDA.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau adopted a standard for the new reporting requirements that took into account the burdens imposed on banks by new standards to ensure that the data is being reported to monitor fair lending practices to prevent another systemic meltdown like we had in 2008 and 2009.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau even temporarily raised the reporting threshold eliminating the need for low-volume banks to report through 2019, in order to conduct research to determine the right way to document open-ended loans. We should not codify this threshold, removing the flexibility of the agency that we in Congress set up to prevent another financial meltdown. It would literally tie their hands and prevent them from acting, even if there was a need to, to prevent a financial meltdown.

I strongly support regulatory relief for community banks and small financial institutions. This bill would actually exempt 85 percent of depository financial institutions and 48 percent of nondepository lenders.

Congress should want to encourage increased access to housing finance and combat unlawful practices that can prey on vulnerable home buyers or lead to systemic risk which leads to people coming to this town demanding another Republican taxpayer bailout.

This rule also considers debate for H.R. 3326, the World Bank Accountability Act—another issue that does not relate to the expiration of government funding at the end of the week, does not relate to the illegal aliens that the Republicans are creating every day, and does not relate to the Children's Health Insurance Program expiring.

What it does is it places a restriction on funding to the World Bank International Development Association—again, something I am not hearing from my constituents on, that they are not sending me to Washington and demanding that I take action on—and try to get them to reform to improve their management accountability and fight extremism, which I am sure is fine. It is true that, of course, they probably need to improve accountability and oversight, and Congress can have this discussion, but here we are, backs to the wall, the government is about to close, DREAMers are facing deportation, children are going without healthcare, and, yes, of course, World Bank accountability, great, let's discuss it, but can't we do it next week after we get through this?

In fact, I believe the Republicans are sending us all on vacation next week. I think most Americans wish they had 10 days off at the end of January. I don't understand this. It makes no sense. I think Congress is about to do a last-minute funding bill and then send every Member of Congress on a 10-day

vacation saying: Good job, we dealt with World Bank accountability. That is what the voters want. Forget about government shutdowns, forget about Republicans creating more illegal aliens, forget about Republicans plunging our Nation deeper into debt with their tax-and-spend policies. That is where we are headed, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1245

Of course, we should have a debate on the best way to make reforms in the U.S. and engage the World Bank to encourage those reforms.

Again, fiddling while Rome burns, Mr. Speaker, it is a common theme over here, and the American people are seeing through it, which is why the approval rating of this institution is under 15 percent—no shock.

We can be debating World Bank accountability every day for the next year if you want. That is why people think this body is out of touch. We are just not addressing or dealing with the issues the American people sent us here to deal with: skyrocketing debt; over 12 million people who are here illegally, and yet this Congress fails to take up comprehensive immigration reform; expiration of the Children's Health Insurance Program; fixing the Affordable Care Act.

Withholding funds to the IDA has a lot of positives and negatives. We could influence them to act. Others fear it could punish people in the developing world. It could hamper their ability to fight famine. It could force the necessary reforms.

Again, fine, we will have that discussion under this rule for an hour or two and Congress will debate that. Congress will pass a bill, and we will see whether the Senate even takes it up. They often don't.

But, again, it is backs to the wall, fiddling while Rome burns, the eleventh hour, record debt, Republicans creating more illegal immigrants every day, and here we are debating accountability for different aid programs.

The 15 percent must be, like, the family members and cousins of the Republican Members. I don't know anybody who is satisfied with this Congress, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I remind my friend from Colorado that the House did pass the Children's Health Insurance Program bill in November. We did send it to the Senate. Perhaps if he could talk to the leadership in his party over in the Senate, we could get that bill passed in the Senate instead of blocked, and we could deal with a very important issue, an issue in Colorado that is absolutely essential, because the money is running out in Colorado, one of the few States where it is even more important than many of the other States.

I appreciate my colleague's concern on this issue. I share his concern. The

House acted responsibly in a broad, bipartisan bill. Hopefully, we can get our friends over in the Senate to get more done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), my good friend and the sponsor of one of the bills today.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, every citizen in our Nation deserves a chance to achieve their American Dream. For thousands across the country, their American Dream consists of owning a home or starting their own business. Some laws have proven helpful in achieving this dream; others have created obstacles by codifying government overreach.

In 1975, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act was enacted. This important law exposed and helped eliminate discriminatory lending practices, particularly against minorities. In short, this law helped more Americans realize their dream of owning a house.

Over the years, however, the disclosure required by the law has expanded away from the original intent and has actually become an obstacle preventing small, medium, and local lenders from helping aspiring homeowners.

In 2015, the Dodd-Frank-created agency, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, or CFPB, demanded from lenders more than double the amount of data originally required under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act. That double-the-data rule took effect on the first of this month.

Larger financial firms are able to adapt. In fact, most, if not all, continue to be in the home mortgage business; but for smaller financial firms, for the family-owned bank on Main Street, USA, the double-the-data rule means making fewer mortgages or none at all. This unintended result is something each of us has heard over and over again in our home districts.

Again, these are not the Wells Fargos, Bank of Americas, or J.P. Morgans. These are the small guys on Main Street, in small towns all across Minnesota and our country.

As a direct result of having fewer and fewer small, medium, and local lenders in the home mortgage business or offering the capital necessary for their neighbor's small business to get off the ground, the CFPB's rule has put the American Dream out of reach for many Americans.

Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to rightsize government regulation to create more opportunity. We have the opportunity to encourage small and medium financial institutions in our local communities to keep their doors open, to make mortgages again, to make loans to would-be entrepreneurs, in short, to fund the dreams of their neighbors and friends. We have the opportunity to expand not the law but, rather and instead, the number of Americans who can own a home or start their own business.

I first introduced the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act when I

came to Congress in 2015. It is a bill that will keep the original intent of the 1975 HMDA law. Nothing will overwrite or exempt any financial institution, big or small, from reporting data related to race or gender. It is a bill that will put a stop to the loss of lenders we see in our home districts by providing desperately needed regulatory relief for Main Street banks and credit unions. I am proud to say it is a bill that has been perfected with input from both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers.

Our goal today shouldn't be to expand the law. Our goal today should be to expand the number of Americans who want to get one step closer to achieving their American Dream, whether it is owning a home or starting a business. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2954 will help us achieve this goal.

If my colleagues share the goal, then I ask you to vote "yes" on H.R. 2954 and pass the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, last week, President Trump tweeted: "The Democrats are all talk and no action. They are doing nothing to fix DACA." That is deeply insulting to those of us who have worked so hard for years. I was even here when the Democrats passed the DREAM Act in December of 2010.

This is the 18th time we have attempted to bring up the bipartisan bill, H.R. 3440. We are about to do it again with my colleague, Mr. GOMEZ. The Dream Act makes our position clear. We want immigration policies that make America safer. We want to make sure that our aspiring, de facto Americans can take their place alongside of us with the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

Unfortunately, President Trump made his position clear, as well. I am not sure which position; he changes every other day. But at times, he said he will sign whatever we do. At other times, he said:

My standard is very simple: America first, and Make America Great Again.

That is an easy one. This bill we bring up if we defeat the previous question will absolutely make America greater. According to the conservative think tank CATO, repealing DACA would actually cost the government over \$60 billion, reduce economic growth by \$280 billion, and make us all poorer.

We just want to make America wealthier, make us better, and recognize the aspiring Americans and let them work hard and play by the rules and pay taxes and live the American Dream. That is an America first policy that we can all get behind.

This is the 18th attempt here to do this. But I am a Jewish American, and 18 is actually a lucky number. "Chai" means "life," when you do the numerology. Mr. GOMEZ is lucky to be here for number 18. For our Jewish friends watching on C-SPAN, Mr. Speaker,

they will recognize that. It is kind of like seven. I don't know if seven is a Christian lucky number or pagan or what, but I have heard seven is a lucky number, too.

But 18 means life, and this is life for the DREAMers. That is what Mr. GOMEZ's motion is all about: it is letting young people who have that uncertainty and don't even know if they can go to their job and work hard come March, or even come today or tomorrow for the over 100 a day whose status is expiring.

I really hope that my Republican colleagues join Mr. GOMEZ and me in defeating the previous question so we can bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, which would pass this body, Mr. Speaker. You and I know that. It is bipartisan, bicameral. It would help thousands of young people who are Americans in every single way—de facto Americans, aspiring Americans—except on paper.

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 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) to discuss our proposal for the 18th time: chai, or life.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues about the American Dream and why their families came to our great country.

Was it to build a better future for their children so they could live and attend school in the greatest country in the history of the world?

Was it so they could work and live in a safe place without fear of violence?

Was it because they knew that, if they came here, no matter where they are from, no matter what God they worship, if they work hard, contribute to our country, and believe in the ideals of America that all men and women are created equal, then you deserve a place here in the United States of America?

The answer to these questions is "yes." Our ancestors and parents came to the United States for all these reasons and more.

That answer holds true for hundreds of thousands of DREAMers and their parents who live and work and attend school here in the United States without fear of deportation thanks to DACA. Yet, on September 5, the Trump administration destroyed the American Dream for 800,000 young people and their families by recklessly terminating DACA.

One of those 800,000 DREAMers is Itayu Torres, a proud DACA recipient from my district, the 34th Congressional District of California. She was born in Oaxaca, Mexico, and arrived in my district before she turned 1. The United States is the only place she has

ever known as her country, and she is as American as you and I, but she was forced to live with the burden of her legal status.

At the age of 14, she found out she didn't have legal status when she tried to travel out of State to play in a soccer tournament. That fear of being deported if she left her State of California prevented her from leaving.

But her life changed when she became a DACA recipient. Thanks to DACA, she enrolled in a liberal arts college in Maryland. She no longer had to live in crippling fear as she goes about her day-to-day life.

DREAMers like Itayu deserve the chance to succeed and contribute to our great country. That is why I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, so we can bring up the Dream Act to give 800,000 DREAMers a shot at the American Dream.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), chair of the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this combined rule that will enable the people's House to consider both the World Bank Accountability Act and the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act.

Before I speak about why I support this rule, I do want to respond to the other gentleman from Colorado saying that this House is not doing the people's business. In fact, this House is dealing with year-end spending, and we are doing it right now. We are working on immigration reforms. To suggest otherwise is simply not true.

In fact, on year-end spending, this House passed all appropriations bills ahead of time, ahead of schedule, before the end of the fiscal year. Those bills were sent over to the Senate.

This House also dealt with the issues related to the Children's Health Insurance Program, dealt with community health centers and a whole range of other issues. Those pieces of legislation went over to the Senate.

So the issue is really with the Senate, it is not with this House.

Furthermore, this House has passed historic tax reform that has become law. It has passed over 16 Congressional Review Acts rolling back Obama-era regulations and rules that were holding back our economy. The result is millions of jobs were created and the best economy we have seen in a decade.

So it is just simply not true to suggest that this House is not doing the people's business. We are dealing with some important additional issues this week. We can do both: plan for the year-end spending debates with the Senate and also reauthorize the World Bank.

The World Bank's mission is to reduce poverty around the globe. However, during congressional oversight hearings, it has become clear that the World Bank is falling short of its anti-poverty mission.

As early as 1992, outside reviews of the World Bank—and, later, its own reviews—concluded that a “pressure to lend” on staff, through the staff evaluation process, has created perverse incentives for some World Bank employees to focus on loan volume in order to receive a raise or a promotion rather than what really matters, which is poverty reduction outcomes.

In addition, there are numerous examples of where the very group of people that was supposed to be helped through World Bank assistance was actually harmed by a corrupt government or its cronies. From violent evictions to rape, to murder, the list of human rights violations goes on and on.

One of the most egregious examples of human rights violations was the Uganda crisis, where contractors were sexually abusing a dozen or more girls, and it took the World Bank years to stop it. Even more perplexing, the World Bank’s country manager for the Uganda project was, disturbingly, promoted to become World Bank country director for the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where allegations, not surprisingly, of sexual and gender-based violence have resurfaced in 2017.

□ 1300

For these reasons and more, I support the World Bank Accountability Act, which requires the World Bank to fix its problems or face a 15 to 30 percent reduction of the U.S. contribution to the World Bank’s International Development Association fund, or, as it is commonly called, IDA.

More specifically, the bill authorizes \$3.3 billion for IDA over the next 3 years and mandates that the World Bank must align its incentives for employees with the World Bank’s goals of poverty reduction, ending the “pressure to lend” problem that is pervasive today. Throwing money at this problem is not the answer, but getting results and doing so without these kind of terrible, horrific scandals is critically important.

The legislation also requires the World Bank to fix failures identified in the Uganda sexual abuse crisis so that nothing like that ever happens again.

Additionally, the legislation requires the World Bank, through its various tools, to support property rights, due process of law, and economic freedom. The World Bank must also demonstrate that none of its resources have been used to fund terrorism, and must also improve its ability to detect and minimize corruption. If the World Bank does all of these commonsense reforms, then it will receive its full U.S. contribution for IDA. But if it fails to do this, then the World Bank doesn’t deserve the full funding backed by U.S. taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I also am a strong supporter of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act. This much-needed legislation exempts community financial institutions, such as small

banks and credit unions, from the onerous doubling of Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act reporting requirements if they make 500 or fewer mortgages and 500 or fewer home equity lines of credit each of the preceding 2 years.

The lenders I have spoken to say that, without relief, they will have to devote more resources to compliance costs, rather than deploying more capital into our economies to benefit working families and businesses.

Instead of having to collect superfluous redundant data, let’s allow and liberate our community financial institutions to do what they want to do, and what they should be doing, in their core mission, and that is serving their customers and providing loans.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman EMMER for his hard work on the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act. I thank Chairman HENSARLING also for his leadership on both of these bills.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both of these important pieces of legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, here we go. We are finding ourselves staring down self-created deadlines, and I want to be clear about that. The deadline for the expiration of the DREAMers in March and the fact that 100 are expiring every day is self-created by President Trump. It is a manufactured crisis. We, of course, could do immigration reform while not having our backs to the wall on that issue.

This shutdown of the government is a construct of this body, this House. They said that they would only fund the government through January 19. So we are facing another deadline. Again, I believe, from what I am hearing, that Congress will then create another artificial crisis sometime in February, when we are going to be facing a government shutdown again.

All in the face of record deficits and tax-and-spend Republican policies, the American people have had enough.

Hundreds of thousands of DREAMers are at risk of deportation by this administration.

Millions of children are at risk of losing their health insurance.

We are all being plunged deeper and deeper into debt, not just for ourselves, but our future generations: my kids and many of our grandkids, for those who have them.

We are facing another government shutdown of necessary, important government services, including economic drivers in areas I represent, like Rocky Mountain National Park, with over 3 million tourists a year. It would close down if the government shuts down.

Air traffic controllers. So many other important parts of our necessary infrastructure to succeed as a country faces an expiration this Friday.

Even if somehow the Republicans say, “Okay, here is another 2 or 3 weeks of funding,” the uncertainty

that that creates—meaning they can’t plan for short- to medium-term capital projects: a simple repair that might take more than 3 weeks; knocking down a wall; fixing a building; making a hire and an employee not knowing whether they are going to have a job in 3 weeks, or contractors not knowing whether they are going to be paid, and then having to reflect that in their pricing and ultimately charging the taxpayers more for the work they are doing because they don’t know if the government will pay.

What kind of country are we running, Mr. Speaker?

I know we can do better, and that starts by defeating the previous question so that we can just pass the Dream Act and move on. It will pass. Sixty, seventy, or eighty percent of this body will probably vote for it. I know there are people who don’t like it. Let the people’s House work its will. Let us vote. That is what we are here to do, Mr. Speaker—Republicans and Democrats. Let us work our will.

We have the votes on the Dream Act and we have the votes to keep the government open, if you simply allow us to have an open process to do it. That is what this floor time should be used for today. This is precious floor time—the time that we are in session debating—especially considering Republicans are sending Congress on a 10-day vacation at the end of this week. Let’s use this floor time to do what matters.

Sure, there will be a day to discuss the finer points of World Bank policies and the finer points of the threshold for regulatory forbearance for mortgage cutoffs. Those things are fine, Mr. Speaker. Those are fine to discuss, but not while the Republicans are creating over 100 more illegal immigrants a day and they are going to create 800,000 more in just a couple of months; not when the Republicans are plunging our Nation deeper and deeper into debt with their tax-and-spend policies; not when Republicans are forcing another government shutdown, if not this week, then in 3 weeks or in 4 weeks.

Crisis to crisis to crisis, manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis, the American people count on us to be stewards of the greatest Republic that has ever been created on the face of this Earth. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, Congress is letting them down. Let’s defeat the previous question and defeat this rule.

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

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

Overlooking corruption and abuse is unacceptable in any governing body, particularly one funded by the United States.

It is clear that serious reforms and oversight are needed at the World Bank. The International Development Association has strayed from its mission to help combat inequality around the world.

The World Bank Accountability Act puts our international partners on notice that the United States is not simply going to stand by and allow abuses to continue.

And while we stand up for the underprivileged around the world, we also must ensure that every American has equal access to our own financial institutions.

The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act amendment Act ensures that CFPB regulations do not shut out certain groups of Americans.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING for putting these bills forward. I thank my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee, who have joined me on the floor today to make the case for these efforts. I thank Chairman SESSIONS for his leadership on the Rules Committee and for providing the debate on these issues today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the rule and supporting the underlying bills. We must ensure that American taxpayer money is not spent on corrupt regimes and that all Americans have access to financing here in the U.S.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 693 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC 3. 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. 4. 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. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). 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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting House Resolution 693, if ordered; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4258.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—230

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

NAYS—187

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

NOT VOTING—13

Amodei Lewis (GA) Scalise
 Barletta Long Schneider
 Brady (TX) Noem Vela
 Cummings Poe (TX)
 Kind Rush

□ 1335

Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. GABBARD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BUDD and BISHOP of Michigan changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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 is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 188, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

AYES—228

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

NOES—188

Adams Brady (PA)
 Aguilar Brown (MD)
 Barragán Brownley (CA)
 Bass Bustos
 Beatty Butterfield
 Bera Capuano
 Beyer Carbajal
 Bishop (GA) Cárdenas
 Blumenauer Carson (IN)
 Blunt Rochester Cartwright
 Bonamici Castor (FL)
 Boyle, Brendan Castro (TX)
 F. Chu, Judy

Crowley Kihuen Polis
 Cuellar Kildee Price (NC)
 Davis (CA) Kilmer Quigley
 Davis, Danny Krishnamoorthi Raskin
 DeFazio Kuster (NH) Rice (NY)
 DeGette Langevin Richmond
 Delaney Larsen (WA) Rosen
 DeLauro Larson (CT) Roybal-Allard
 DelBene Lawrence Ruiz
 Demings Lawson (FL) Ruppertsberger
 DeSaulnier Lee Rush
 Deutch Levin
 Dingell Lieu, Ted Ryan (OH)
 Doggett Lipinski Sánchez
 Doyle, Michael Loeb sack Sarbanes
 F. Lofgren Schakowsky
 Ellison Lowenthal Schiff
 Engel Lowey Schrader
 Eshoo Lujan Grisham, Scott (VA)
 Espallat M. Scott, David
 Esty (CT) Luján, Ben Ray Serrano
 Evans Lynch Sewell (AL)
 Foster Maloney, Shear-Porter
 Frankel (FL) Carolyn B. Sherman
 Fudge Maloney, Sean Sinema
 Gabbard Matsui Sires
 Gallego McCollum Slaughter
 Garamendi McEachin Smith (WA)
 Gomez McGovern Soto
 Gonzalez (TX) McNerney Speier
 Gottheimer Meeks Suozzi
 Green, Al Meng Swalwell (CA)
 Green, Gene Moore Takano
 Grijalva Moulton Thompson (CA)
 Gutiérrez Murphy (FL) Thompson (MS)
 Hanabusa Nadler Titus
 Hastings Napolitano Tonko
 Heck Neal Torres
 Higgins (NY) Nolan Tsongas
 Himes Norcross Vargas
 Hoyer O'Halleran Veasey
 Huffman O'Rourke Velázquez
 Jackson Lee Pallone Vislosky
 Jayapal Panetta Walz
 Jeffries Pascrell Wasserman
 Johnson (GA) Payne Schultz
 Johnson, E. B. Pelosi Perlmutter
 Kaptur Kuster (NH) Peters Waters, Maxine
 Keating Peters Watson Coleman
 Kennedy Peterson Welch
 Khanna Pingree Wilson (FL)
 Pocan Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Amodei King (IA) Poe (TX)
 Brady (TX) LaMalfa Scalise
 Cummings Lewis (GA) Schneider
 Gaetz Long Vela
 Kind Noem

□ 1345

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.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4258) to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 with public and private resources, to enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, 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 Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 5, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—412

Abraham Demings Jordan
 Adams Denham Joyce (OH)
 Aderholt Dent Kaptur
 Aguilar DeSantis Katko
 Allen DeSaulnier Keating
 Arrington DesJarlais Kelly (IL)
 Babin Deutch Kelly (MS)
 Bacon Diaz-Balart Kelly (PA)
 Banks (IN) Dingell Kennedy
 Barletta Doggett Khanna
 Barr Donovan Kihuen
 Barragán Doyle, Michael
 Barton F. Kilmer
 Bass Duffy King (IA)
 Beatty Duncan (SC) King (NY)
 Bera Duncan (TN) Kinzinger
 Bergman Dunn Knight
 Beyer Ellison Krishnamoorthi
 Bilirakis Emmer Kuster (NH)
 Bishop (GA) Engel Kustoff (TN)
 Bishop (MI) Eshoo Labrador
 Bishop (UT) Espallat LaHood
 Black Estes (KS) LaMalfa
 Blackburn Esty (CT) Lamborn
 Blum Evans Lance
 Blumenauer Farenthold Langevin
 Blunt Rochester Faso Larsen (WA)
 Bonamici Ferguson Larson (CT)
 Bost Fitzpatrick Latta
 Boyle, Brendan Fleischmann Lawrence
 F. Flores Lawson (FL)
 Brady (PA) Fortenberry Lee
 Brat Foster Levin
 Bridenstine Foxx Lewis (MN)
 Brooks (IN) Frankel (FL) Lieu, Ted
 Brown (MD) Frelinghuysen Lipinski
 Brownley (CA) Fudge LoBiondo
 Buchanan Gabbard Loeb sack
 Buck Gallagher Lofgren
 Bucshon Gallego Loudermilk
 Budd Garamendi Love
 Burgess Garrett Lowenthal
 Bustos Gianforte Lowey
 Butterfield Gibbs Lucas
 Byrne Gohmert Luetkemeyer
 Calvert Gomez Lujan Grisham,
 Capuano Gonzalez (TX) M.
 Carbajal Goodlatte Lujan, Ben Ray
 Cárdenas Gosar Lynch
 Carson (IN) Gottheimer MacArthur
 Carter (GA) Gowdy Maloney,
 Carter (TX) Granger Carolyn B.
 Cartwright Graves (GA) Maloney, Sean
 Castor (FL) Graves (LA) Marchant
 Castro (TX) Graves (MO) Marino
 Chabot Green, Al Marshall
 Cheney Green, Gene Mast
 Chu, Judy Griffith Matsui
 Cicilline Grijalva McCarthy
 Clark (MA) Grothman McCaul
 Clarke (NY) Guthrie McClintock
 Clay Gutiérrez McCollum
 Cleaver Hanabusa McEachin
 Clyburn Handel McGovern
 Coffman Harper McHenry
 Cohen Harris McKinley
 Cole Hartzler McMorris
 Collins (GA) Hastings Rodgers
 Collins (NY) Heck McNeerney
 Comer Hensarling McSally
 Comstock Herrera Beutler Meadows
 Conaway Hice, Jody B. Meehan
 Connolly Higgins (LA) Meeks
 Cook Higgins (NY) Meng
 Cooper Hill Messer
 Correa Himes Mitchell
 Costa Holding Moolenaar
 Costello (PA) Hollingsworth Mooney (WV)
 Courtney Hoyer Moore
 Cramer Hudson Moulton
 Crawford Huffman Mullin
 Crist Huizenga Murphy (FL)
 Crowley Hultgren Nadler
 Cuellar Hunter Napolitano
 Culberson Hurd Neal
 Curbelo (FL) Issa Newhouse
 Curtis Jackson Lee Nolan
 Davidson Jayapal Norcross
 Davis (CA) Jeffries Norman
 Davis, Danny Jenkins (KS) Nunes
 Davis, Rodney Jenkins (WV) O'Halleran
 DeFazio Johnson (GA) O'Rourke
 DeGette Johnson (LA) Olson
 Delaney Johnson (OH) Palazzo
 DeLauro Johnson, E. B. Pallone
 DeBene Johnson, Sam Palmer

Panetta Ruppertsberger Thompson (PA)
 Pascrell Rush Thornberry
 Paulsen Russell Tipton
 Payne Rutherford Titus
 Pearce Ryan (OH) Tonko
 Pelosi Sánchez Torres
 Pirlmutter Sanford Trott
 Perry Sarbanes Tsongas
 Peters Schakowsky Turner
 Peterson Schiff Upton
 Pingree Schrader Valadao
 Pittenger Schweikert Vargas
 Pocan Scott (VA) Veasey
 Poliquin Scott, Austin Velázquez
 Polis Scott, David Visclosky
 Posey Sensenbrenner Wagner
 Price (NC) Serrano Walberg
 Quigley Sessions Walden
 Raskin Sewell (AL) Walker
 Ratcliffe Shea-Porter Walorski
 Reed Sherman Walters, Mimi
 Reichert Shimkus Walz
 Renacci Shuster Wasserman
 Rice (NY) Simpson Schultz
 Rice (SC) Sinema Waters, Maxine
 Richmond Sires Watson Coleman
 Roby Slaughter Weber (TX)
 Roe (TN) Smith (MO) Webster (FL)
 Rogers (AL) Smith (NE) Welch
 Rogers (KY) Smith (NJ) Wenstrup
 Rohrabacher Smith (WA) Westerman
 Rokita Smucker Williams
 Rooney, Francis Soto Wilson (FL)
 Rooney, Thomas Speier Wilson (SC)
 J. Stefanik Wittman
 Ros-Lehtinen Stewart Womack
 Rosen Stivers Woodall
 Roskam Suozzi Yarmuth
 Ross Swailwell (CA) Yoder
 Rothfus Takano Yoho
 Rouzer Taylor Young (AK)
 Roybal-Allard Tenney Young (IA)
 Royce (CA) Thompson (CA) Zeldin
 Ruiz Thompson (MS)

NAYS—5

Amash Brooks (AL) Massie
 Biggs Jones
 Amodei Lewis (GA) Schneider
 Brady (TX) Long Smith (TX)
 Cummings Noem Vela
 Gaetz Poe (TX)
 Kind Scalise

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1354

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to inclement weather, I am unavoidably prevented from voting on today's legislation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 20, "yea" on rollcall No. 21, and "yea" on rollcall No. 22.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TERRORISTS WHO THREATEN TO DISRUPT THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-90)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2018.

The crisis with respect to grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 23, 1995, has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities that have the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process and that are hostile to United States interests in the region. Such actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. I have, therefore, determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12947 with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to maintain in force the sanctions against them to respond to this threat.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
 THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 2018.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT AND MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE ACT MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3445) to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3445

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “African Growth and Opportunity Act and Millennium Challenge Act Modernization Act” or the “AGOA and MCA Modernization Act”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—ENHANCEMENT OF THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

- Sec. 101. Statement of policy.
Sec. 102. Definitions.
Sec. 103. Activities in support of transparency.
Sec. 104. Activities in support of trade capacity building.

TITLE II—MODERNIZATION OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

- Sec. 201. Candidacy status.
Sec. 202. Carryover authority for private-sector members of board of directors.
Sec. 203. Additional reporting to the board on the treatment of civil society in an eligible country.
Sec. 204. Concurrent compacts under the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003.
Sec. 205. Public notification of entering into a compact.
Sec. 206. Disclosure.
Sec. 207. Restriction on the use of assistance under section 616.
Sec. 208. Study on subnational compacts.

TITLE I—ENHANCEMENT OF THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT**SEC. 101. STATEMENT OF POLICY.**

It is the policy of the United States to support efforts to—

- (1) improve the rule of law, promote free and fair elections, strengthen and expand the private sector, and fight corruption in sub-Saharan Africa; and
(2) promote the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

- (1) **AGOA WEBSITE.**—The term “AGOA Website” means the website established pursuant to section 103(a).
(2) **ELIGIBLE SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “eligible sub-Saharan African country” means a country that the President has determined meets the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703).

SEC. 103. ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF TRANSPARENCY.

(a) **AGOA WEBSITE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall establish a publicly available website for the collection and dissemination of information regarding the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The President shall publish on the AGOA Website the information described in paragraph (1), including—

(A) information and technical assistance provided at United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs; and

(B) a link to the websites of United States embassies located in eligible sub-Saharan African countries.

(3) **ACTIONS BY UNITED STATES EMBASSIES.**—The Secretary of State should direct United States embassies located in eligible sub-Saharan African countries to—

(A) encourage individuals and businesses in such countries to use the benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(B) include a link to the AGOA Website on the websites of such diplomatic missions.

(b) **AGOA FORUM.**—After each meeting of the United States–Sub-Saharan Africa Trade and Economic Cooperation Forum, the President should publish on the AGOA Website the following:

(1) The outcomes of the meeting of the Forum, including any commitments made by member countries and the private sector.

(2) An assessment of progress made with respect to any commitments made by member countries and the private sector from the previous meeting of the Forum.

(c) **OTHER INFORMATION.**—The President should disseminate the information required under this section in a digital format to the public and publish such information on the AGOA Website.

SEC. 104. ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF TRADE CAPACITY BUILDING.

The President should—

(1) develop and implement policies that—

(A) encourage and facilitate cross-boundary cooperation among eligible sub-Saharan African countries in order to facilitate trade; and

(B) encourage the provision of technical assistance to eligible sub-Saharan African countries to establish and sustain adequate trade capacity development;

(2) provide specific training for businesses in eligible sub-Saharan African countries and government trade officials of such countries on accessing the benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and other trade preference programs;

(3) provide capacity building for African entrepreneurs and trade associations on production strategies, quality standards, formation of cooperatives, market research, and market development;

(4) provide capacity building training to promote diversification of African products and value-added processing; and

(5) provide capacity building and technical assistance funding for African businesses and institutions to help such businesses and institutions comply with United States counterterrorism initiatives and policies.

TITLE II—MODERNIZATION OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION**SEC. 201. CANDIDACY STATUS.**

(a) **LOW INCOME COUNTRIES.**—Section 606(a) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7705(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “(3)” and inserting “(4)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: “FISCAL YEARS 2005 THROUGH 2012”; and

(B) by striking “fiscal year 2005 or a subsequent fiscal year” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2005 through 2012”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) **FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.**—A country shall be a candidate country for purposes of eligibility for assistance for fiscal year 2013 or a subsequent fiscal year if the country—

“(A) has a per capita income not greater than the lower middle income country threshold established by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for such fiscal year;

“(B) is among the 75 countries identified by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as having the lowest per capita income; and

“(C) meets the requirements under paragraph (1)(B).”.

(b) **LOWER MIDDLE INCOME COUNTRIES.**—Section 606(b) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7705(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: “FISCAL YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2012”; and

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “fiscal year 2006 or a subsequent fiscal year” and inserting “fiscal years 2006 through 2012”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) **FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.**—In addition to the countries described in subsection (a), a country shall be a candidate country for purposes of eligibility for assistance for fiscal year 2013 or a subsequent fiscal year if the country—

“(A) has a per capita income not greater than the lower middle income country threshold established by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the fiscal year;

“(B) is not among the 75 countries identified by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as having the lowest per capita income; and

“(C) meets the requirements under subsection (a)(1)(B).”.

(c) **RECLASSIFICATION.**—Section 606 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7705) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **TREATMENT OF COUNTRIES WITH PER CAPITA INCOME CHANGES.**—A country qualifying for candidate status under this section during the fiscal year such that the country would be reclassified from a low income country to a lower middle income country or from a lower middle income country to a low income country shall retain its candidacy status in its former income classification for such fiscal year and the two subsequent fiscal years.”.

SEC. 202. CARRYOVER AUTHORITY FOR PRIVATE-SECTOR MEMBERS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Section 604(c)(4)(B) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7703(c)(4)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) **OTHER MEMBERS.**—Each member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(B)—

“(i) shall be appointed for a term of 3 years;

“(ii) may be reappointed for a term of an additional 2 years; and

“(iii) may continue to serve in each such appointment until the earlier of—

“(I) the date on which his or her successor is appointed; or

“(II) the date that is one year after the expiration of his or her appointment or reappointment, as the case may be.”.

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL REPORTING TO THE BOARD ON THE TREATMENT OF CIVIL SOCIETY IN AN ELIGIBLE COUNTRY.

Section 607 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7706) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: “A determination whether a country is eligible for a subsequent, non-concurrent Millennium Challenge Compact shall also be based, to the extent practicable, on significantly improved performance across the criteria in subsection (b) that, at a minimum, are relevant to the preceding Compact, compared to the country’s performance with respect to such criteria when selected for such preceding Compact.”

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by adding “and” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) the quality of the civil society enabling environment;”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) REPORTING ON TREATMENT OF CIVIL SOCIETY.—For the 7-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, before the Board selects an eligible country for a Compact under subsection (c), the Corporation shall provide information to the Board regarding the country’s treatment of civil society, including classified information, as appropriate. The information shall include an assessment and analysis of factors including—

“(1) any relevant laws governing the formation or establishment of a civil society organization, particularly laws intended to curb the activities of foreign civil society organizations;

“(2) any relevant laws governing the operations of a civil society organization, particularly those laws seeking to define or otherwise regulate the actions of foreign civil society organizations;

“(3) laws relating to the legal status of civil society organizations, including laws which effectively discriminate against foreign civil society organizations as compared to similarly situated domestic organizations;

“(4) laws regulating the freedom of expression and peaceful assembly; and

“(5) laws regulating the usage of the Internet, particularly by foreign civil society organizations.”.

SEC. 204. CONCURRENT COMPACTS UNDER THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 609 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7708) is amended—

(1) by striking the first sentence of subsection (k);

(2) by redesignating subsection (k) (as so amended) as subsection (l); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (j) the following:

“(k) CONCURRENT COMPACTS.—An eligible country that has entered into and has in effect a Compact under this section may enter into and have in effect at the same time not more than one additional Compact in accordance with the requirements of this title if—

“(1) one or both of the Compacts are or will be for purposes of regional economic integration, increased regional trade, or cross-border collaborations; and

“(2) the Board determines that the country is making considerable and demonstrable progress in implementing the terms of the existing Compact and supplementary agreements thereto.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 613(b)(2)(A) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7712(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “the” before “Compact” and inserting “any”.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section apply with respect to Compacts entered into between the United States and an eligible country under the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. PUBLIC NOTIFICATION OF ENTERING INTO A COMPACT.

Section 610 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7709) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 610. CONGRESSIONAL AND PUBLIC NOTIFICATION.

“(a) CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS AND NOTIFICATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board, acting through the Chief Executive Officer, shall consult with and notify the appropriate con-

gressional committees not later than 15 days before taking any of the actions described in paragraph (2).

“(2) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—The actions described in this paragraph are—

“(A) providing assistance for an eligible country under section 609(g);

“(B) commencing negotiations with an eligible country to provide assistance for—

“(i) a Compact under section 605; or

“(ii) an agreement under section 616;

“(C) signing such a Compact or agreement; and

“(D) terminating assistance under such a Compact or agreement.

“(3) ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION.—Any notification relating to the intent to negotiate or sign a Compact shall include a report describing the projected economic justification for the Compact, including, as applicable—

“(A) the expected economic rate of return of the Compact;

“(B) a cost-benefit analysis of the Compact;

“(C) a description of the impact on beneficiary populations;

“(D) the likelihood that the investment will catalyze private sector investments; and

“(E) any other applicable economic factors that justify each project to be funded under such a Compact to the extent practicable and appropriate.

“(4) RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 60 days before signing each concurrent Compact, as authorized under section 609, the Board, acting through the Chief Executive Officer, shall consult with and provide to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(A) an assessment and, as appropriate, the identification of potential measures to mitigate risks, of—

“(i) the countries’ commitment to regional integration and cross-border cooperation and capacity to carry out commitments;

“(ii) political and policy risks, including risks that could affect country eligibility;

“(iii) risks associated with realizing economic returns;

“(iv) time and completion risks; and

“(v) cost and financial risks; and

“(B) an assessment of measures to be taken to mitigate any identified risks, including—

“(i) securing other potential donors to finance projects or parts of projects as needed; and

“(ii) partnering with regional organizations to support and oversee effective cross-border cooperation.

“(b) CONGRESSIONAL AND PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AFTER ENTERING INTO A COMPACT.—Not later than 10 days after entering into a Compact with an eligible country, the Board, acting through the Chief Executive Officer, shall—

“(1) publish the text of the Compact on the website of the Corporation;

“(2) provide the appropriate congressional committees with a detailed summary of the Compact and, upon request, the text of the Compact; and

“(3) publish in the Federal Register a detailed summary of the Compact and a notice of availability of the text of the Compact on the website of the Corporation.”.

SEC. 206. DISCLOSURE.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR TIMELY DISCLOSURE.—Section 612(a) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7711(a)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “TIMELY” before “DISCLOSURE”; and

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “The Corporation” and inserting “Not later than 90 days after the last day of each fiscal quarter, the Corporation”; and

(B) by striking “on at least a quarterly basis.”.

(b) DISSEMINATION.—Section 612(b) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7711(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) DISSEMINATION.—The Board, acting through the Chief Executive Officer, shall make the information required to be disclosed under subsection (a) available to the public—

“(1) by publishing it on the website of the Corporation;

“(2) by providing notice of the availability of such information in the Federal Register; and

“(3) by any other methods that the Board determines to be appropriate.”.

SEC. 207. RESTRICTION ON THE USE OF ASSISTANCE UNDER SECTION 616.

Section 616(d) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7715(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) FUNDING.—

“(1) LIMITATION.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this Act for a fiscal year may be made available to carry out this section.

“(2) RESTRICTION RELATING TO ASSISTANCE.—None of the funds authorized to carry out the purposes of this Act shall be available for assistance under this section to a country that does not qualify as a candidate country under section 606 for the fiscal year during which such assistance is provided.”.

SEC. 208. STUDY ON SUBNATIONAL COMPACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, acting through the Chief Executive Officer, shall submit a study to the appropriate congressional committees that assesses the feasibility and desirability of developing partnerships at the subnational level within candidate countries that would be complementary to, and, as applicable, concurrent with, any Millennium Challenge Corporation national-level or regional investments.

(b) CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall examine—

(1) the extent to which targeting investments at the subnational level might provide new opportunities for reducing poverty through economic growth;

(2) the extent to which traditional approaches to defining poverty may not adequately capture the nature of poverty within a country;

(3) the types of subnational entities that might be appropriate partners for subnational Millennium Challenge Corporation compacts;

(4) how candidates for subnational partners might best be identified; and

(5) what role each national government should play in creating or implementing a subnational partnership.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1400

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

Mr. Speaker, I have been honored to serve as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for the past 5 years. Over this period, there has been no shortage of threats to our national security. But I must share with you, there have also been great opportunities—opportunities to make America safer, to make this country more prosperous through strategic investments in diplomacy, and also investments in development.

This bill before us today is one example. The African Growth and Opportunity Act and Millennium Challenge Act Modernization Act seeks to facilitate trade and private sector growth in poor but relatively well-governed countries. This is particularly true in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I would share with my colleagues the goal here is so that they can grow their own way out of poverty. What this legislation does is it seeks to help countries graduate from the need for foreign aid, while simultaneously opening doors for American businesses to break into the most promising emerging markets. For those of you who have followed this, you have watched trade double and then triple with sub-Saharan Africa.

Through AGOA—as we call this African Growth and Opportunity Act—goods produced in eligible African countries enter the United States on a duty-free basis. But to be eligible, countries must be committed to the rule of law, to eliminating barriers to U.S. trade and investment, to combating corruption, and to supporting counterterrorism activities.

So AGOA, as you can see, advances U.S. interests on so many different levels. I am proud to be a member of the AGOA coalition from the beginning. I was one of the original authors of the bill and I have witnessed its transformative impact.

So despite its benefits, AGOA does remain underutilized in too many countries. Prior to its reauthorization in 2015, I set out to learn why, and I traveled to many countries in southern and eastern Africa, where I met with U.S. and African trade officials, business leaders, and entrepreneurs. I visited garment factories and power stations. We saw trade hubs.

I heard a lot about poor infrastructure. I heard a lot about competition with China and burdensome U.S. regulations that are difficult to understand.

Then I walked into an artisan shop in Addis Ababa, and it was run by a remarkable woman. Her name was Sara Abera. I learned that she, in fact, had benefited from technical assistance through the U.S.-East Africa Trade and Investment Hub. She was now exporting to the United States through AGOA. I learned that she was, though, an exception to the rule. She is not the rule.

Other than Sara, there were very few businesses and very few business leaders and entrepreneurs that seemed to have the knowledge of how to access AGOA. To fix this, the bill before us today would make information about AGOA available to an easily accessible public website. This bill also urges U.S. Embassies in eligible countries to more consistently promote AGOA and trade hubs, and it seeks to bring greater transparency to commitments made at annual AGOA forums to followup on these commitments.

So this bill strengthens the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which is already one of our most effective tools for incentivizing policy reform and unlocking market-based growth in developing countries. It increases the MCC's flexibility to promote regional trade, collaboration, economic integration. It does this by allowing up to two simultaneous compacts with an eligible country. It also improves transparency and accountability. It does that by streamlining and strengthening congressional oversight.

Trade and free-market principles, frankly, if we think about it, have helped lift more than 1 billion people out of poverty over the last decade. But it is not just this humanitarian goal that leads us to invest in communities abroad. It is clear that investments targeted towards greater health, towards growing a healthier society, and towards growing a more sustainable society also helps advance U.S. security and economic interests.

It is, therefore, vital that we ensure that two of our most impactful development and trade facilitation tools—that is the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and our Millennium Challenge Corporation—are efficient, effective, and fully utilized. This bill will do exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this important measure, and I reserve this balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 8, 2017.

HON. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request on H.R. 3445, the AGOA and MCA Modernization Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3445 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,
EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 14, 2017.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I am writing regarding H.R. 3445, the African Growth and Opportunity Act and Millennium Challenge Act Modernization Act, which the Committee on Foreign Affairs marked up on September 28, 2017.

As the author of H.R. 3445, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and a legislator committed to the protection of life, I have confirmed that nothing in H.R. 3445, including the amendments made by this bill, alters existing statutory or policy prohibitions against the performance or promotion of abortion under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b) or any other provision of law, which categorically prohibits the Millennium Challenge Corporation from utilizing U.S. foreign assistance dollars—including funds reserved for administrative expenses—to support the performance or promotion of abortion overseas. This includes longstanding prohibitions on the use of funds “to lobby for or against abortion,” most recently enacted in Title III of Division J of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (P.L. 115-31), which preclude U.S. foreign assistance agencies, including MCC, from using their activities to promote changes in the abortion laws of foreign countries.

I will place this letter into the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 3445, and thank you for your cosponsorship and support for this important legislation.

Sincerely,
EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 3, 2018.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 3445, the “AGOA and MCA Modernization Act.” As a result of your having consulted with us on this legislation, I agree not to request a sequential referral on this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that by forgoing formal consideration of H.R. 3445, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the

Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure.

I would like to begin by thanking the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ED ROYCE; and the ranking member of the Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations Subcommittee, KAREN BASS, for their hard work on this legislation.

The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, AGOA, first passed by Congress in the year 2000, has helped to foster a more robust trade relationship between the United States and the nations of sub-Saharan Africa. AGOA has helped to create economic opportunities for thousands of people in Africa, while also benefiting U.S. farmers, manufacturers, and small businesses by providing new markets for their goods.

The bill before us today will make AGOA even more effective. It requires the creation of a website to make information about AGOA benefits more readily available to both sub-Saharan partners and the American people, and it provides much-needed technical assistance to help eligible partners fully utilize the available trade benefits.

The legislation also provides new authorities for the Millennium Challenge Corporation, an independent agency that is charged with promoting economic growth, reducing poverty, and strengthening institutions in eligible countries. Specifically, it will give MCC the ability to enter into regional compacts by simultaneously engaging several countries to fund investments that could benefit all of them.

We know economies fail if they are isolated. Coordinated investments across the region will have an enormous beneficial impact on trade, development, regional stability, and international investment.

There are several good opportunities for regional compacts. In west Africa, MCC currently partners with 10 countries. In southern Africa, MCC partners with three countries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure. The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act is a critical piece of legislation that increases ties and helps foster deeper relationships with partners throughout Africa.

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

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), the lead cosponsor of this legislation and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3445, AGOA and MCA Modernization Act.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation have proven track records of spurring economic development. Expanding these programs advances our position as international leaders, strengthens our domestic job market and economy, while protecting our national security interests.

Trade and development go hand in hand. U.S. investments around the world increases trade opportunities and opens new markets for U.S. goods and services. Africa's consumer spending is expected to reach \$1 trillion.

We must act now in order to solidify this important trade relationship. If we fail to act, rest assured that other nations are ready, willing, and able to fill our void. We have the opportunity through AGOA and MCA to advance stability, security, and business growth on the continent and here at home.

This is in our best interest. That is why I joined my colleagues, Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and Representative SMITH, to introduce H.R. 3445, the AGOA and MCA Modernization Act earlier this year.

Moving developing countries away from foreign aid and towards trade also helps U.S. manufacturers, farmers, and small businesses. We are building long-term trading partners for our goods and services. By using trade, we can also address the root causes of violent extremism and terrorism. This legislation strengthens the AGOA and the MCA—key laws in the effort to promote U.S.-Africa trade.

For example, AGOA and MCA gives MCC greater flexibility to promote trade, collaboration, and economic integration by allowing up to two simultaneous compacts with an eligible country. This is important because, as most of us know, African countries are still grappling with the legacy of colonialism.

For example, only a few hundred miles separate Lagos, Nigeria, from Accra, Ghana. In the United States, traveling this distance would take a few hours. For traders on the continent, the same trip can take up to a full day. They have to contend with inadequate roads, arduous border checks, or high tariffs.

MCC recently signed a compact with Cote d'Ivoire, an economic and cultural hub in west Africa and a longtime strategic and economic partner of the U.S. This compact will diversify the nation's economy by targeting two constraints to growth: access to a skilled workforce and the mobility of goods and people in the nation's capital, Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire's commercial capital.

The Transport Project will focus on rehabilitating key roads in the capital to enable people and goods to move freely throughout the busy city and its strategic port. With 20 percent of the nation's population living in the cap-

ital, unlocking congestion will create opportunities to buy and sell products, expand businesses, improve access to key services, and open up greater trade. This compact is expected to benefit more than 11 million people. In a country where more than half of the population is under the age of 24, it will help to shape a strong, stable future for Cote d'Ivoire.

This compact is all about creating opportunities and stabilities for citizens and businesses in Cote d'Ivoire, west Africa, and in the U.S. By making coordinated investments across countries, MCC could help these nations work together to grow regional markets and facilitate trade. Passage of this bill in the House is an important step toward increasing regional integration across Africa, advancing stability and security and opening new markets for trade.

I believe strongly that it is in our economic and political interest to expand our economic relationships with the nations of Africa. I have said this before and I will continue to reiterate this point. I also believe that the African Growth and Opportunity Act is the key to development of stronger, mutually beneficial economic relations between this country and African nations.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close if the gentleman has no other speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership, and I thank Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH, and Ms. BASS for establishing a real, viable African policy, a policy that I have had the privilege of being part of for all of the years that I have served in the United States Congress.

I remember making the first inaugural trip to do the research and to meet with heads of state in Africa on the question of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Over the years, we worked with the Bush administration on the Millennium Challenge Corporation. So I am delighted that we have a bill that improves the benefits.

It is even more important, in this time, to make sure that the policies of the United States toward Africa and the African countries are clear and precise. They are strong allies and a very viable trade partner.

This, of course, Mr. Speaker, is crucial in the backdrop of very vulgar statements that, unfortunately, have come from the Commander in Chief. Therefore, this is the policy that is real, an ongoing partnership, the fact that Africa represents a growing population of 1 billion people. When we last traveled with a President of the United States—which then was President

Barack Obama—and visited a number of African countries, in particular Kenya, we were there to look at the rising population of small- and medium-sized entrepreneurs, young millennials, and others who were eager to engage in business.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act will be a pathway for sub-Saharan African countries in that area that will create the pathway for trade for the goods of those produced on the continent.

Peace and the economy go together. If we have an economic engine partnership with the United States, looking at good quality investment, and if we have the work of the Millennium Challenge to challenge countries to become more democratic, to open the doors of opportunity, to have a better fiscal system, and to be a real partner in these improvements, that is a real African policy.

So I rise to support the underlying bill, H.R. 3445. I rise to support it because it is an advancement to the work that has been done over the years by the United States Congress and the many partners that we have had.

I am a student of Africa, having gone to school in Accra and Kumasi in Ghana and, of course, in Lagos and Ibadan in Nigeria. I have traveled often, and I understand the ingenuity, the eagerness, and the commitment to democratic principles and, of course, the opportunities for their young generation.

So I rise today to support the bill. I thank the sponsors for this very excellent legislation. It is good work.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if it is appropriate, but I ask unanimous consent to cosponsor the legislation at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request to be added as a cosponsor cannot be entertained at this point on this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will sum up here. What this bill does is unlock a greater potential for AGOA, for the African Growth and Opportunity Act, so communities in Africa can strengthen their own economies and become U.S. trade partners rather than aid recipients. It also enhances the impact of MCC by accelerating regional economic integration.

It is good for American taxpayers. It is certainly good for job creators in the United States. It is good for our national security. It is good for Africa—for the people of Africa.

I think this legislation is the product of more than 2 years of negotiations. It enjoys very broad support. As I say, it doesn't cost the taxpayers anything.

I really want to thank some of the Members who worked hard on this. I thank Representative KAREN BASS for her good work, Congresswoman SHEILA

JACKSON LEE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and Representative CHRIS SMITH; Senators CORKER, CARDIN, ISAKSON, and COONS. I thank them for their help on my measure here today and for their continued commitment to reducing poverty through market-based economic growth.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3445, the African Growth and Opportunity Act and Millennium Challenge Act Modernization Act.

I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 3445, and as Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Africa subcommittee, I want to applaud Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ELLIOT ENGEL, and the Ranking Member of my subcommittee, KAREN BASS, for their commitment to Africa and to enhancing trade, and all the benefits in terms of closer relationships that flow from trade, between the people of the United States and the people of Africa.

The original AGOA Act of 2000 has been called a "cornerstone" of our trade policy toward the continent, and it has served us well. Over the years, however, our subcommittee has had numerous hearings—not to mention meetings with African heads of state and ambassadors—on AGOA, increasing exports to Africa, and on cultivating the-rule-of-law reforms necessary to attract business and investment to Africa. In past Congresses I introduced the Increasing American Jobs Through Greater Exports to Africa Act. It has become apparent that, as well as AGOA has served us, there is room for improvement and innovation.

H.R. 3445 marks a step toward that, by emphasizing capacity building and training and encouraging entrepreneurship in Africa. Importantly, it acknowledges that the world has changed since 2000, and that Africa has been targeted by radical extremists such as Boko Haram and al-Shabaab. Recognizing that we now live in a post-2001 world, H.R. 3445 fosters compliance with our counterterrorism initiatives by African businesses and institutions.

Africa, and much of the developing world, has also benefitted from the Millennium Challenge Corporation since passage of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003. MCC is a critical partner, for example, in our Global Food Security strategy, which fosters agriculture-led economic development.

Though MCC has played a key role, there are also room for improvements. Sometimes during the country selection process, narratives about a country become set, and there is not a fresh appraisal of evidence regarding improvements, or backsliding, in the conditions of that country.

I'd like to thank Chairman ROYCE for working to ensure that MCC remains a vehicle focused on assisting countries with development, and does not become diverted from its original mission.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3445, the African Growth and Opportunity Act and Millennium Challenge Act Modernization Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3445, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CYBER DIPLOMACY ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3776) to support United States international cyber diplomacy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3776

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) *The stated goal of the United States International Strategy for Cyberspace, launched on May 16, 2011, is to "work internationally to promote an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable information and communications infrastructure that supports international trade and commerce, strengthens international security, and fosters free expression and innovation . . . in which norms of responsible behavior guide States' actions, sustain partnerships, and support the rule of law in cyberspace."*

(2) *The Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, established by the United Nations General Assembly, concluded in its June 24, 2013, report "that State sovereignty and the international norms and principles that flow from it apply to States' conduct of [information and communications technology or ICT] related activities and to their jurisdiction over ICT infrastructure with their territory."*

(3) *On January 13, 2015, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan proposed a troubling international code of conduct for information security which defines responsible State behavior in cyberspace to include "curbing the dissemination of information" and the "right to independent control of information and communications technology" when a country's political security is threatened.*

(4) *The July 22, 2015, GGE consensus report found that, "norms of responsible State behavior can reduce risks to international peace, security and stability."*

(5) *On September 25, 2015, the United States and China announced a commitment "that neither country's government will conduct or knowingly support cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to companies or commercial sectors."*

(6) *At the Antalya Summit from November 15-16, 2015, the Group of 20 (G20) Leaders' Communiqué affirmed the applicability of international law to State behavior in cyberspace, called on States to refrain from cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property for commercial gain, and endorsed the view that all States should abide by norms of responsible behavior.*

(7) *The March 2016 Department of State International Cyberspace Policy Strategy noted that, "the Department of State anticipates a continued increase and expansion of our cyber-focused diplomatic efforts for the foreseeable future."*

(8) *On December 1, 2016, the Commission on Enhancing National Cybersecurity established*

within the Department of Commerce recommended “the President should appoint an Ambassador for Cybersecurity to lead U.S. engagement with the international community on cybersecurity strategies, standards, and practices.”

(9) The 2017 Group of 7 (G7) Declaration on Responsible States Behavior in Cyberspace recognized on April 11, 2017, “the urgent necessity of increased international cooperation to promote security and stability in cyberspace . . . consisting of the applicability of existing international law to State behavior in cyberspace, the promotion of voluntary, non-binding norms of responsible State behavior during peacetime” and reaffirmed “that the same rights that people have offline must also be protected online.”

(10) In testimony before the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate on May 11, 2017, the Director of National Intelligence identified six cyber threat actors, including Russia for “efforts to influence the 2016 US election”; China, for “actively targeting the US Government, its allies, and US companies for cyber espionage”; Iran for “leverage[ing] cyber espionage, propaganda, and attacks to support its security priorities, influence events and foreign perceptions, and counter threats”; North Korea for “previously conduct[ing] cyber-attacks against US commercial entities—specifically, Sony Pictures Entertainment in 2014”; terrorists, who “use the Internet to organize, recruit, spread propaganda, raise funds, collect intelligence, inspire action by followers, and coordinate operations”; and criminals who “are also developing and using sophisticated cyber tools for a variety of purposes including theft, extortion, and facilitation of other criminal activities”.

(11) On May 11, 2017, President Trump issued Presidential Executive Order 13800 on Strengthening the Cybersecurity of Federal Networks and Infrastructure which designated the Secretary of State to lead an interagency effort to develop strategic options for the President to deter adversaries from cyber threats and an engagement strategy for international cooperation in cybersecurity, noting that “the United States is especially dependent on a globally secure and resilient internet and must work with allies and other partners” toward maintaining “the policy of the executive branch to promote an open, interoperable, reliable, and secure internet that fosters efficiency, innovation, communication, and economic prosperity, while respecting privacy and guarding against deception, fraud, and theft.”

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to work internationally with allies and other partners to promote an open, interoperable, reliable, unfettered, and secure internet governed by the multistakeholder model which promotes human rights, democracy, and rule of law, including freedom of expression, innovation, communication, and economic prosperity, while respecting privacy and guarding against deception, fraud, and theft.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—In implementing the policy described in subsection (a), the President, in consultation with outside actors, including technology companies, nongovernmental organizations, security researchers, and other relevant stakeholders, shall pursue the following objectives in the conduct of bilateral and multilateral relations:

(1) Clarifying the applicability of international laws and norms, including the law of armed conflict, to the use of ICT.

(2) Clarifying that countries that fall victim to malicious cyber activities have the right to take proportionate countermeasures under international law, provided such measures do not violate a fundamental human right or peremptory norm.

(3) Reducing and limiting the risk of escalation and retaliation in cyberspace, such as

massive denial-of-service attacks, damage to critical infrastructure, or other malicious cyber activity that impairs the use and operation of critical infrastructure that provides services to the public.

(4) Cooperating with like-minded democratic countries that share common values and cybersecurity policies with the United States, including respect for human rights, democracy, and rule of law, to advance such values and policies internationally.

(5) Securing and implementing commitments on responsible country behavior in cyberspace based upon accepted norms, including the following:

(A) Countries should not conduct or knowingly support cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to companies or commercial sectors.

(B) Countries should cooperate in developing and applying measures to increase stability and security in the use of ICTs and to prevent ICT practices that are acknowledged to be harmful or that may pose threats to international peace and security.

(C) Countries should take all appropriate and reasonable efforts to keep their territories clear of intentionally wrongful acts using ICTs in violation of international commitments.

(D) Countries should not conduct or knowingly support ICT activity that, contrary to international law, intentionally damages or otherwise impairs the use and operation of critical infrastructure, and should take appropriate measures to protect their critical infrastructure from ICT threats.

(E) Countries should not conduct or knowingly support malicious international activity that, contrary to international law, harms the information systems of authorized emergency response teams (sometimes known as “computer emergency response teams” or “cybersecurity incident response teams”) or related private sector companies of another country.

(F) Countries should identify economic drivers and incentives to promote securely-designed ICT products and to develop policy and legal frameworks to promote the development of secure internet architecture.

(G) Countries should respond to appropriate requests for assistance to mitigate malicious ICT activity aimed at the critical infrastructure of another country emanating from their territory.

(H) Countries should not restrict cross-border data flows or require local storage or processing of data.

(I) Countries should protect the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms on the Internet and commit to the principle that the human rights that people have offline enjoy the same protections online.

SEC. 4. DEPARTMENT OF STATE RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) OFFICE OF CYBER ISSUES.—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) OFFICE OF CYBER ISSUES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established an Office of Cyber Issues (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Office’). The head of the Office shall have the rank and status of ambassador and be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(2) DUTIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of the Office shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of State shall prescribe, including implementing the policy of the United States described in section 3 of the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2017.

“(B) DUTIES DESCRIBED.—The principal duties of the head of the Office shall be to—

“(i) serve as the principal cyber-policy official within the senior management of the Department of State and advisor to the Secretary of State for cyber issues;

“(ii) lead the Department of State’s diplomatic cyberspace efforts generally, including relating to international cybersecurity, internet access, internet freedom, digital economy, cybercrime, deterrence and international responses to cyber threats;

“(iii) promote an open, interoperable, reliable, unfettered, and secure information and communications technology infrastructure globally;

“(iv) represent the Secretary of State in interagency efforts to develop and advance the United States international cyberspace policy;

“(v) coordinate within the Department of State and with other components of the United States Government cyberspace efforts and other relevant functions, including countering terrorists’ use of cyberspace; and

“(vi) act as liaison to public and private sector entities on relevant cyberspace issues.

“(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—The head of the Office should be an individual of demonstrated competency in the field of—

“(A) cybersecurity and other relevant cyber issues; and

“(B) international diplomacy.

“(4) ORGANIZATIONAL PLACEMENT.—The head of the Office shall report to the Under Secretary for Political Affairs or official holding a higher position in the Department of State.

“(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed as precluding—

“(A) the Office from being elevated to a Bureau of the Department of State; and

“(B) the head of the Office from being elevated to an Assistant Secretary, if such an Assistant Secretary position does not increase the number of Assistant Secretary positions at the Department above the number authorized under subsection (c)(1).”

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Office of Cyber Issues established under section 1(g) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (as amended by subsection (a) of this section) should be a Bureau of the Department of State headed by an Assistant Secretary, subject to the rule of construction specified in paragraph (5)(B) of such section 1(g).

(c) UNITED NATIONS.—The Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations shall use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any measure that is inconsistent with the United States international cyberspace policy described in section 3.

SEC. 5. INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is encouraged to enter into executive arrangements with foreign governments that support the United States international cyberspace policy described in section 3.

(b) TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The text of any executive arrangement (including the text of any oral arrangement, which shall be reduced to writing) entered into by the United States under subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate not later than five days after such arrangement is signed or otherwise agreed to, together with an explanation of such arrangement, its purpose, how such arrangement is consistent with the United States international cyberspace policy described in section 3, and how such arrangement will be implemented.

(c) STATUS REPORT.—Not later than one year after the text of an executive arrangement is transmitted to Congress pursuant to subsection (b) and annually thereafter for seven years, or

until such an arrangement has been discontinued, the President shall report to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the status of such arrangement, including an evidence-based assessment of whether all parties to such arrangement have fulfilled their commitments under such arrangement and if not, what steps the United States has taken or plans to take to ensure all such commitments are fulfilled, whether the stated purpose of such arrangement is being achieved, and whether such arrangement positively impacts building of cyber norms internationally. Each such report shall include metrics to support its findings.

(d) **EXISTING EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall satisfy the requirements of subsection (c) for the following executive arrangements already in effect:

(1) The arrangement announced between the United States and Japan on April 25, 2014.

(2) The arrangement announced between the United States and the United Kingdom on January 16, 2015.

(3) The arrangement announced between the United States and China on September 25, 2015.

(4) The arrangement announced between the United States and Korea on October 16, 2015.

(5) The arrangement announced between the United States and Australia on January 19, 2016.

(6) The arrangement announced between the United States and India on June 7, 2016.

(7) The arrangement announced between the United States and Argentina on April 27, 2017.

(8) The arrangement announced between the United States and Kenya on June 22, 2017.

(9) The arrangement announced between the United States and Israel on June 26, 2017.

(10) Any other similar bilateral or multilateral arrangement announced before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY FOR CYBERSPACE.

(a) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall produce a strategy relating to United States international policy with regard to cyberspace.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A review of actions and activities undertaken to support the United States international cyberspace policy described in section 3.

(2) A plan of action to guide the diplomacy of the Department of State with regard to foreign countries, including conducting bilateral and multilateral activities to develop the norms of responsible international behavior in cyberspace, and status review of existing efforts in multilateral fora to obtain agreements on international norms in cyberspace.

(3) A review of alternative concepts with regard to international norms in cyberspace offered by foreign countries.

(4) A detailed description of new and evolving threats to United States national security in cyberspace from foreign countries, State-sponsored actors, and private actors to Federal and private sector infrastructure of the United States, intellectual property in the United States, and the privacy of citizens of the United States.

(5) A review of policy tools available to the President to deter and de-escalate tensions with foreign countries, State-sponsored actors, and private actors regarding threats in cyberspace, and to what degree such tools have been used and whether or not such tools have been effective.

(6) A review of resources required to conduct activities to build responsible norms of international cyber behavior.

(7) A clarification of the applicability of international laws and norms, including the law of armed conflict, to the use of ICT.

(8) A clarification that countries that fall victim to malicious cyber activities have the right to take proportionate countermeasures under international law, including exercising the right to collective and individual self-defense.

(9) A plan of action to guide the diplomacy of the Department of State with regard to existing mutual defense agreements, including the inclusion in such agreements of information relating to the applicability of malicious cyber activities in triggering mutual defense obligations.

(c) FORM OF STRATEGY.—

(1) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be available to the public in unclassified form, including through publication in the Federal Register.

(2) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary of State determines that such is appropriate, the strategy required under subsection (a) may include a classified annex consistent with United States national security interests.

(B) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed as authorizing the public disclosure of an unclassified annex under subparagraph (A).

(d) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 30 days after the production of the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall brief the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on such strategy, including any material contained in a classified annex.

(e) **UPDATES.**—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be updated—

(1) not later than 90 days after there has been any material change to United States policy as described in such strategy; and

(2) not later than one year after each inauguration of a new President.

(f) **PREEXISTING REQUIREMENT.**—Upon the production and publication of the report required under section 3(c) of the Presidential Executive Order 13800 on Strengthening the Cybersecurity of Federal Networks and Critical Infrastructure on May 11, 2017, such report shall be considered as satisfying the requirement under subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 7. ANNUAL COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

(a) **REPORT RELATING TO ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE.**—Section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h)(1) The report required by subsection (d) shall include an assessment of freedom of expression with respect to electronic information in each foreign country. Such assessment shall consist of the following:

“(A) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in each country inappropriately attempt to filter, censor, or otherwise block or remove nonviolent expression of political or religious opinion or belief via the internet, including electronic mail, as well as a description of the means by which such authorities attempt to block or remove such expression.

“(B) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in each country have persecuted or otherwise punished an individual or group for the nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief via the internet, including electronic mail.

“(C) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in each country have sought to inappropriately collect, request, obtain, or disclose personally identifiable information of a person in connection with such person’s nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief, including expression that would be protected by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

“(D) An assessment of the extent to which wire communications and electronic communications are monitored without regard to the principles of privacy, human rights, democracy, and rule of law.

“(2) In compiling data and making assessments for the purposes of paragraph (1), United States diplomatic personnel shall consult with human rights organizations, technology and internet companies, and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations.

“(3) In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘electronic communication’ has the meaning given such term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code;

“(B) the term ‘internet’ has the meaning given such term in section 231(e)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 231(e)(3));

“(C) the term ‘personally identifiable information’ means data in a form that identifies a particular person; and

“(D) the term ‘wire communication’ has the meaning given such term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.”.

(b) **REPORT RELATING TO SECURITY ASSISTANCE.**—Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (i) (relating to child marriage status) as subsection (j); and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k)(1) The report required by subsection (b) shall include an assessment of freedom of expression with respect to electronic information in each foreign country. Such assessment shall consist of the following:

“(A) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in each country inappropriately attempt to filter, censor, or otherwise block or remove nonviolent expression of political or religious opinion or belief via the internet, including electronic mail, as well as a description of the means by which such authorities attempt to block or remove such expression.

“(B) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in each country have persecuted or otherwise punished an individual or group for the nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief via the internet, including electronic mail.

“(C) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in each country have sought to inappropriately collect, request, obtain, or disclose personally identifiable information of a person in connection with such person’s nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief, including expression that would be protected by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

“(D) An assessment of the extent to which wire communications and electronic communications are monitored without regard to the principles of privacy, human rights, democracy, and rule of law.

“(2) In compiling data and making assessments for the purposes of paragraph (1), United States diplomatic personnel shall consult with human rights organizations, technology and internet companies, and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations.

“(3) In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘electronic communication’ has the meaning given such term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code;

“(B) the term ‘internet’ has the meaning given such term in section 231(e)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 231(e)(3));

“(C) the term ‘personally identifiable information’ means data in a form that identifies a particular person; and

“(D) the term ‘wire communication’ has the meaning given such term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying the United States is increasingly under attack by foreign actors online. Nobody knows this better than our members on the Foreign Affairs Committee, but especially MIKE MCCAUL, who assisted me on this bill. As you know, MIKE MCCAUL also chairs the Homeland Security Committee.

So this legislation is focused on correcting a serious threat.

Malicious cyber activities by state and non-state actors threaten our U.S. foreign policy, our security, and our economic interests right now around the globe.

Last year, the intelligence community's Worldwide Threat Assessment summed this up well. As they looked at the problem, they said: "Our adversaries are becoming more adept at using cyberspace to threaten our interests and advance their own, and despite improving our cyber defenses, nearly all information, communication networks, and systems will be at risk for years."

But it is not just the security of our networks that the United States needs to protect. It is the very fabric of the internet itself that is increasingly under assault by governments that want to erect digital borders, that want to impose more control, and that want censorship online.

The State Department has a critical role to play in promoting an open and secure cyberspace by developing international norms of responsible state behavior and deterring malicious actors from carrying out destructive cyber operations.

Last year, the President signed an executive order charging the Secretary of State with creating an interagency strategy to protect the American people from cyber threats along with a plan to improve international cooperation in cybersecurity.

Despite the prominent role assigned to the Department by the President's executive order and support from this body for such work, the office tasked with leading this effort for the State Department was merged into the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs. The concern is that this limits the Department's ability to confront the full range of issues in cyberspace—such as security, internet access, online human rights, and cybercrime—beyond the clear economic challenges.

So I believe this sends the wrong signal to Moscow, to Beijing, and to other

governments around the world. The United States should make it clear that we place a high priority on the whole range of cyber issues, including cybersecurity, internet access, online rights, deterrence, and cybercrime.

In testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee—and here is the good news—I was relieved to hear our Deputy Secretary Sullivan say that this was just an interim step and that he expects cyber issues will ultimately be elevated to a Senate-confirmed role. This is exactly what this bill requires.

So now, more than ever, we need a high-ranking cyber diplomat at the State Department to prioritize these efforts to ensure that we keep the internet open, keep it reliable, and keep it secure. The bipartisan Cyber Diplomacy Act is going to help counter foreign threats on the internet, it is going to promote human rights abroad, and it is going to also, by the way, create new jobs and economic growth here at home.

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

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

I rise today in support of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, let me first thank our chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ED ROYCE, and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, malicious cyber activity has become a grave threat to the United States and our allies.

In 2014, North Korea hacked Sony Pictures. In 2015, the Chinese stole the personal data of millions of people from the Office of Personnel Management.

In 2016, Russia illegally interfered in our Presidential election, stealing election data and doing real damage to American democracy.

Now, in 2018, our midterm elections are at risk. Putin and his cronies were not finished after the last election. They have hacked our allies, and they will hack our elections again and again unless we do something about it.

We cannot allow foreign governments to meddle in democracy and steal data from our networks. To stand up against these threats, this bill establishes a high-level ambassador to lead the State Department's cyber diplomacy efforts. It also requires the Secretary of State to create an international cyber policy that will improve international cyber norms on security and democratic principles, including a commitment to keep the internet free, open, and interoperable.

America cannot cede cyberspace to China or Russia. Now, more than ever, we need to use all the tools we have to help shape international norms, ramp up coordination with our partners, and stiffen our defenses.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), who is the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Cyber Diplomacy Act, and I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and ELIOT ENGEL for their strong work on this very important issue.

As chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I have passed numerous bills to strengthen our cyber operations to defend the American people and the homeland. Now, I am pleased to see that we are doing the same at the State Department.

As we have seen, rapid technological advancements have increased our dependence on computer networks. With this growing dependence comes exposure to the myriad vulnerabilities and threats from cybercriminals and hackers but also nation states who continue to launch malicious attacks against us.

Currently, as the chairman stated, there are no real international norms or standards to follow when it comes to cybersecurity. As the threat landscape continues to evolve, I believe that Congress must put forth responsible policies to keep pace—protecting our systems, our critical infrastructure, and American citizens' information and privacy.

This legislation helps ensure the open, reliable, and secure use of the internet by establishing the Office of Cyber Issues within the Department of State, headed by an ambassador responsible for advancing U.S. national security and foreign policy interests on cybersecurity and issues of internet freedom around the globe.

This legislation also requires the Secretary of State to produce a strategy on cyberspace to guide U.S. policy.

Lastly, it requires the State Department to add a section to its annual report on human rights detailing governments—such as Iran, Russia, and China—silence of their opposition through internet censorship.

Mr. Speaker, I stand proud to be with my colleagues in the House in a bipartisan fashion to propose solutions to these very grave challenges that face the United States and the world.

□ 1430

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), co-chair of the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Cyber Diplomacy Act and efforts to increase international cooperation and promote global stability in cyberspace.

As the cofounder and co-chair of the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus, I firmly believe that cybersecurity is the national and economic security challenge of the 21st century, and we must integrate cyberspace into our foreign

policy if we are to successfully mitigate the many threats that we face in this new domain.

Then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton recognized this when she created the Office of the Cyber Coordinator within the State Department in 2011, and her successor, Secretary John Kerry, continued American leadership in cyber diplomacy.

I had the privilege of working with the inaugural cyber coordinator, Chris Painter, and we are deeply indebted for his 6 years of service in that role. I cannot remember a meeting I had with a cybersecurity expert from a foreign government where his name did not come up as someone who is actively promoting American interest in a free, open, and secure internet.

I am deeply grateful for the leadership of Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL in recognizing the importance of this role and bringing this bill forward to codify and expand it.

This effort is particularly timely as, since Mr. Painter left, there has been some confusion about whether the position would even be filled or if the office would be reorganized under the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs. It is my goal to see that that does not happen and that this bill prevails. That position deeply needs to be in the State Department, where we can show American leadership on a diplomatic front in cyber.

As a Member who serves on two national security committees, I must emphasize that cybersecurity is not just an economic issue, and this bill appropriately recognizes the broad scope of cyber diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, every armed conflict going forward in the world today has—and all future conflicts will have—a cyber component. We have seen our cyber adversaries like Russia use cyber tools as instruments of statecraft, including efforts to undermine faith in the bedrock of our democracy, our elections.

We must engage bilaterally and multilaterally with our international partners and even our adversaries in order to protect our interests and allow us to continue to reap the benefits of a connected society.

The lack of policies, norms, and precedents in this new sphere of state interaction continues to increase the potential for a cyber incident to lead to escalating conflict. It is up to the hardworking and, sadly, underappreciated members of our foreign service to change this paradigm and encourage generally stabilizing rules of the road in cyberspace, and this bill will ensure they have the leadership structure to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, let me again thank the chairman and ranking member for their extraordinary work on this important bill.

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

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

In closing, keeping the internet open, interoperable, and secure is of critical importance to America's national security, economy, and domestic values. We must use all the diplomatic tools to develop strong international norms, bolster our cyber defenses, and promote internet freedom. H.R. 3776 is a necessary step to ensure the United States stays engaged on these critical issues.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank Mr. SIREs. I appreciate his efforts in supporting this legislation. I thank Mr. ENGEL and Mr. MCCAUL, as well.

As the birthplace of the internet, it is the United States that has been most impacted. We have a foreign policy and economic interests and have been working internationally to ensure that the internet remains open. Part of our idea is that this would be capable of carrying the free flow of ideas. We thought it should remain reliable and secure.

But increasingly authoritarian regimes are very aggressively promoting a different vision from the one that Americans brought to the table, their vision of cyber sovereignty, which they sometimes call it. What cyber sovereignty means for these governments is state control over cyberspace. That does run counter to the values of a free people and the values of individual and economic liberty.

Working with our allies and partners, I think the United States has got to be prepared to advance our own vision of cyberspace when it is under this kind of attack and censorship. The Cyber Diplomacy Act will give us the tools to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their help with this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3776, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLOBAL HEALTH INNOVATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1660) to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1660

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Global Health Innovation Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for a period of 4 years, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of—
(A) the extent to which global health innovations described in subsection (a) include drugs, diagnostics, devices, vaccines, electronic and mobile health technologies, and related behavior change and service delivery innovations;

(B) how innovation has advanced the Agency's commitments to achieving an HIV/AIDS-free generation, ending preventable child and maternal deaths, and protecting communities from infectious diseases, as well as furthered by the Global Health Strategic Framework;

(C) how goals are set for health product development in relation to the Agency's health-related goals and how progress and impact are measured towards those goals;

(D) how the Agency's investments in innovation relate to its stated goals; and

(E) progress made towards health product development goals.

(2) How the Agency, both independently and with partners, donors, and public-private partnerships, is—

(A) leveraging United States investments to achieve greater impact in health innovation;

(B) engaging in activities to develop, advance, and introduce affordable, available, and appropriate global health products; and

(C) scaling up appropriate health innovations in the development pipeline.

(3) A description of collaboration and coordination with other Federal departments and agencies, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in support of global health product development, including a description of how the Agency is working to ensure critical gaps in product development for global health are being filled.

(4) A description of how the Agency is coordinating and aligning global health innovation activities between the Global Development Lab, the Center for Accelerating Innovation and Impact, and the Bureau for Global Health.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1660, the Global Health Innovation Act. I thank Mr. SIREs of New Jersey, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, for bringing this forward in a timely manner.

Over the past two decades, we have made unprecedented progress in addressing some of the most difficult global health challenges of our time. When you think about it, global rates of child mortality have dropped by 53 percent. The prevalence of tuberculosis has been cut, in fact, by half. Malaria deaths are now down 47 percent.

Five countries in sub-Saharan Africa once ravaged by HIV/AIDS are on the verge of controlling their epidemics. The eradication of polio is within reach. The only place it still exists is on the Pakistani-Afghan border, which the Taliban controls. As you know, the Taliban resists vaccinations. They, in fact, assassinate health workers who vaccinate. That is the only reason we have not been able to eradicate this last spot where polio continues to create damage to young lives.

Yet, despite these successes, we still do have a long way to go. Part of that is reflected in the 2014 Ebola outbreak in West Africa that resulted in 11,000 deaths in 10 countries. It serves as a very stark reminder of the global threat of infectious diseases.

Though global child and maternal death rates have been cut in half, there is still an estimated 830 mothers around the world who continue to die from preventable causes every day. That is why we talk about maternal health.

USAID is working to address these global health challenges by harnessing the power of science, technology, and innovation to develop low-cost, high-impact health technologies. They are devoting considerable time and resources to developing these innovations.

This bill makes sure that we ensure that they are being effectively deployed. It supports USAID's efforts, while also enhancing congressional oversight. It directs the Administrator of USAID to report on the development and use of global health innovations in its programs, particularly those related to HIV/AIDS, maternal and child health, and combating infectious diseases to ensure that our investments in global health are deployed and are delivering results.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. I want to start by thanking Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their work on global health and their efforts to bring this bill to the floor. Chairman ROYCE has put in

the time and effort to make sure the Foreign Affairs Committee is frequently thought of as the most bipartisan committee in Congress, and I thank him for his public service.

I also thank the Members who have cosponsored this bill, especially Congressman MARIO DIAZ-BALART, who has graciously acted as the Republican lead. Additionally, I thank the staffers who worked hard to bring H.R. 1660 to the floor for consideration.

Infectious diseases and other health conditions still claim the lives of nearly 9 million people each year. Emerging health threats, such as drug resistance, pose a serious threat to human health across the globe. New vaccines, drugs, tests, and other health tools are desperately needed, but progress cannot be made without a sustained investment in research and development.

U.S. investments in global health research are central components of U.S. foreign policy to increase national security, strengthen U.S. relations around the world, and reduce infectious diseases. The U.S. has a legacy of leadership in global health research through agencies like USAID.

This is why I was proud to introduce H.R. 1660, the Global Health Innovation Act. This will provide the oversight needed to gain a clearer picture of USAID's global health research and development.

Over the years, research and development projects have greatly expanded at USAID, searching for advancements towards an HIV/AIDS-free generation, preventable maternal and childhood deaths, and preventable infectious diseases.

This legislation is an effort to keep up with USAID's efforts and ensure their research and development activities reflect our goals and priorities. This report asks them to provide clarity on their goals and metrics to better understand their work.

H.R. 1660 directs the USAID Administrator to report annually to Congress on the development and use of global health innovations in USAID programs, projects, and activities. The report must also include how the Agency measures progress towards their health-related goals.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 1660 to allow Congress to exercise its oversight powers and ensure USAID's research and development efforts reflect their priorities.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Mr. SIREs of New Jersey, ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere. I thank him for bringing forward this timely measure.

The Global Health Innovation Act seeks to accelerate USAID's work to identify, develop, and expand access to low-cost, high-impact health technologies that will enhance the U.S.

global health security agenda. Frankly, that will save a lot of lives.

□ 1445

What it does is ensure that the time and the resources that are being directed toward developing these technologies are put to good use, and are put to good use quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill and I urge its adoption.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1660.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

WORLD BANK ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 693 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3326.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1449

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3326) to increase accountability, combat corruption, and strengthen management effectiveness at the World Bank, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3326, the World Bank Accountability Act. Frankly, I don't quite understand why every Member is not rising in support of H.R. 3326.

This is important legislation, which is sponsored by my friend from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the chairman of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee. It was cosponsored by a senior Democrat on our committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). Mr. Chairman, it passed our committee by a unanimous vote 60-0. Again, Mr. Chairman, this measure passed our committee by a unanimous vote of 60-0.

H.R. 3326 makes a share of future World Bank appropriations contingent upon vitally needed reforms, with focus on the World Bank's International Development Association, known as IDA, which is the World Bank's concessional lending window, dedicated to 75 of the world's poorest countries.

Mr. Chairman, the reforms in this bill have emerged from five different oversight hearings held in our committee over the past 2 years and they all enjoy bipartisan support.

The bill also supports the administration's goal of ensuring that the World Bank's work is consistent with U.S. priorities that are, obviously, financed by the U.S. taxpayer. In the President's FY 2018 budget, the administration called for a holding to account international organizations whose missions don't advance U.S. foreign policy's interest or which haven't been well managed. H.R. 3326 would enact the administration's request for a 15 percent reduction on authorized funds for IDA.

In addition, Mr. BARR's legislation contains crucial national security provisions, including a prohibition on World Bank assistance to countries that knowingly violate U.N. Security Council sanctions on North Korea.

Also, safeguarding our national security is a provision that helps ensure World Bank assistance won't be used for state sponsors of terrorism.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense requirement that benefited from the input of our democratic colleague on the committee: again, Mr. SHERMAN from California.

So, again, Mr. Chairman, it does kind of beg the questions: Why are we here today? Why are we debating a bill that received support from every single Republican and Democrat on the committee?

As some who may be viewing our proceedings know, there is such a thing known as a suspension calendar for relatively noncontroversial items. This bill should have been dispensed with on what is known as a suspension calendar since it passed our committee 60-0.

But now, apparently, the ranking member has had a change of heart on opposing a bill that she voted for on committee. So some may be confused, and indeed we are confused. It is interesting that we now see opposition to linking these IDA payments to reforms, but that is exactly what Democrats on the Financial Services Committee did in 2005. It is exactly what they did when they voted to withhold

25 percent of IDA funds in a foreign operation's appropriations bill. Last July, the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), consistent with her earlier vote, voted in support of H.R. 3326 as well. So, again, some of us are confused as to why it is being opposed now if she has voted for the policy of withholding twice, including voting for the very bill we are debating today.

It is also important to note, Mr. Chairman, that the reforms included in this bill are those that the World Bank itself deems are important. As far back as 1992, a bank management review highlighted its perverse staff incentives that made pushing money out the door more important than making a dent in global poverty. And as recently as 2014, a bank evaluation report confirmed that these very same perverse incentives are still in place.

Then there is the notorious case of mismanagement in the Uganda Transport Sector Development Project: a scandalous bank initiative, where basic lack of project oversight led to sexual exploitation of underage girls, repeated harassment of female staff, and deficient safety measures that very well may have resulted in five fatalities—lest we forget.

In 2015, the World Bank's president had this to say:

The multiple failures we have seen in this project on the part of the World Bank, the government of Uganda, and a government contractor are unacceptable. It is our obligation to properly supervise all investment projects to ensure that the poor and vulnerable are protected in our work. In this case, we did not.

I am committed to making sure that we do everything in our power, working with other stakeholders first, to fully review the circumstance of this project, and then to quickly learn from our, and other's, failures so they do not happen again.

Mr. Chairman, if the World Bank thinks these reforms are necessary, shouldn't we all think these reforms are necessary?

And how about the testimony of Sasha Chavkin, a reporter for the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists, who testified before our committee?

Sasha said:

We found that, over a decade, spanning from 2004 to 2013, projects financed by the World Bank physically or economically displaced an estimated 3.4 million people around the world.

Mr. Chairman, these are some of the world's most vulnerable displaced by the World Bank that screams out for more reforms.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. BARR for saying with his legislation that enough is enough. He has produced a serious, long overdue reform bill, one that was supported in our committee unanimously 60-0. We typically could not get a 60-0 vote on a Mother's Day resolution, yet we have it for this bill. Again, it just begs credibility and credulity as to why are we here today debating a bill that was passed unanimously in

committee. I urge the House to adopt it unanimously.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3326, the World Bank Accountability Act of 2017.

Last year, Democrats on the Financial Services Committee joined our Republican colleagues in favorably reporting H.R. 3326 out of committee to support the bill's authorization of a U.S. contribution of \$3.29 billion to multilateral development efforts and to enforce the importance of U.S. leadership at the international financial institutions, but the favorable report in committee came with clear conditions for the future of the bill.

Democrats made it clear during consideration of this bill in committee that our ongoing support for the measure would depend upon changes to provisions in the bill moving forward that put critical U.S. funding at risk. But here we are today and Republicans have not made any effort at all to address our very specific concerns.

Namely, the bill would cut up to 30 percent of the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association—IDA—in any year in which the Treasury Secretary does not certify to Congress that the World Bank has adopted or is taking steps to implement two sets of reforms mandated in the bill.

IDA is the arm of the World Bank that provides grants and other assistance to the world's 77 poorest countries, which are home to more than 450 million people living in extreme poverty. Cuts to U.S. funds to IDA would punish millions of children and other vulnerable people in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, who are living in extreme poverty, who are suffering from famine, or who are emerging from conflict.

Democrats do not believe that cutting U.S. funds for, and diminishing U.S. influence at, the international financial institutions is an effective approach to reform.

□ 1500

To remedy this problem with the bill, Representative MOORE, who is the ranking member on our committee's Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade, had sought to offer an amendment on the floor to strike the provisions in the bill that would give the administration cover to cut U.S. funding from multilateral efforts aimed at alleviating global poverty. The amendment would have maintained both sets of reforms currently in the bill and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to actively promote these policy goals through advocacy and direct engagement with World Bank management as well as the World Bank's other major shareholders.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee refused to make this amendment in

order, thus depriving the House of the opportunity to decide for itself which approach it prefers to take: reforming the World Bank by fiat with a threat to cut funding or reforming the World Bank through the exercise of U.S. influence and power at the World Bank based on the merits of the reforms themselves.

Mr. Chairman, the process by which this bill has come to the floor stands in stark contrast to our committee's long history of working together on issues relating to global economic governance.

For many years, the Financial Services Committee has worked in a bipartisan fashion to achieve a number of important reforms at the World Bank, including increased transparency, the creation of the inspection panel, more disclosure of information, and closer consultation with local communities most affected by World Bank projects.

We were able to successfully advance these policy goals through serious and direct negotiations and sustained engagement with both the Department of the Treasury and the World Bank itself, not by threatening to walk away from our commitments, but the Trump administration has consistently demonstrated troubling attitudes toward the role of the U.S. in the world.

In November of last year, in testimony before the Financial Services Committee, David Malpass, Treasury's Under Secretary for International Affairs, expressed the administration's view that globalism and multilateralism have gone substantially too far.

In December, the Trump administration refused to pledge any funds for the next replenishment of the International Fund for Agricultural Development, a small multilateral development bank that helps the poor in remote, rural areas where few donors operate. Of course, just last week, this President made ignorant, racist, and deplorable comments about Africa, where, as it happens, IDA focuses a great deal of its resources and energy.

Mr. Chairman, the more committed we are to our goals and to our ideals, the more morally obligated we are to do everything we can to advance those goals.

The legislation before us today, in its current form, fails to meet that test, so I will be opposing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. We can, and we should, do better.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the sponsor of the legislation that passed unanimously 60-0 in our committee and the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank him for his support and leadership in bringing my legislation to the floor.

As Chairman HENSARLING has already noted, H.R. 3326 passed the House Financial Services Committee by a unanimous vote of 60-0. No amendments were offered by any of our Democratic colleagues during that markup. So it is disappointing to me that the ranking member is standing in opposition today, despite voting for this bill in committee and then waiting half a year before proposing any changes.

Nonetheless, I want to address the gentlewoman's criticism of the withholding mechanism in this legislation, because she seems to share a philosophy endemic at the World Bank, which basically says this: money equals impact. But this runs counter to the evidence we have heard again and again during multiple oversight hearings.

It also runs counter to how the World Bank itself operates with its borrowers. The World Bank lends to poor countries by attaching conditions. People can disagree if that conditionality is too much or too little, but the World Bank affects behavior by telling governments that there are no blank checks. The ranking member knows this, and it goes without saying that there are many elements to World Bank conditionality that the ranking member and her Democratic colleagues passionately support, but if the gentlewoman from California would never tolerate the World Bank writing blank checks to governments, it is odd that she wants Congress to write a blank check to the World Bank.

Here is how a former, longtime senior staff member of the World Bank put it in testimony before our subcommittee last Congress: ". . . the reality is that bank staff are assessed by the volume of their lending, dollars of money lent. And that is just a poor indicator of impact on poverty. You have impact on poverty sometimes when you don't lend at all."

This perverse lending culture at the World Bank has been documented for at least a quarter century and documented by the World Bank itself.

Mr. Chairman, I want to draw your attention to a 1992 bank management review entitled, "Effective Implementation: Key to Development Impact", commonly known as the Wapenhans Report, which details a pressure to lend that distorts staff incentives at the expense of management and project implementation. Again, this is from 1992.

Well, fast forward to 2014, and a report by the bank's own evaluation office entitled, "Learning and Results in World Bank Operations: How the Bank Learns," concludes that the pressure to lend is alive and well.

In addition to focusing on better incentives and management at the World Bank, H.R. 3326 requires the World Bank to more effectively support secure property rights, due process, and economic freedom. As distinguished academics such as Nobel economics laureate Angus Deaton, New York Uni-

versity's William Easterly, and the University of Chicago's James Robinson have found, foreign aid makes little positive difference if we are indifferent to the poor's right to exert control over their livelihoods, own land and other assets, and be free from arbitrary government interference.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the World Bank supports a corrupt government, that doesn't mean that it is going to help the condition of the impoverished in that country that is denied economic freedom.

Why doesn't the ranking member support these commonsense principles? If the bank doesn't lend with the rights of the poor in mind, then the ranking member's concerns about withholding money aren't serious. If money is being squandered and it isn't helping the poor to begin with, why would you not want to withhold it?

Again, our Democratic friends love conditionality at the World Bank; they just had a change of heart when a Republican-sponsored bill is holding the World Bank to high standards. So let no one watching this debate be fooled by crocodile tears.

Let me close by touching on the national security elements of this bill, which the ranking member also plans to vote against.

H.R. 3326 incentivizes the World Bank to strengthen its work to fight violent extremism and keep state sponsors of terrorism away from World Bank resources. This latter provision was a direct result of bipartisan discussions that we had in our subcommittee, so it is shocking to see anyone on the other side of the aisle oppose the legislation.

Finally, this bill would also ensure that the U.S. oppose World Bank financial assistance to countries that knowingly fail to enforce U.N. Security Council sanctions against North Korea. Our committee passed nearly identical language as part of the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act, which I am proud to have sponsored, and the provision benefitted directly from input from my subcommittee ranking member, Ms. MOORE. The committee vote, yet again, was unanimous on that bill, and the House went on to pass it by a vote of 415-2.

It boggles the mind that any Member of this body would vote against that language as part of H.R. 3326.

In closing, if the ranking member is upset that we take the interests of the poor more seriously than the interests of the World Bank, then so be it, but I believe the World Bank's interests and the poor's interests should be aligned, not just in theory, but in practice, and if they are not, it is the World Bank that should look at itself in the mirror.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3326.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas really has presented rather hollow arguments that have no place in this debate. This is about our humanitarianism and about our strategic position in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3326, the World Bank Accountability Act of 2017.

Let me be clear, from the outset, that I support the World Bank and its mission. The World Bank is a vital source of financial and technical assistance to developing countries. It works to reduce poverty and support development around the globe.

Let me also be clear that I support this bill's authorization of \$3.29 billion to the World Bank's International Development Association, which provides grants and very low-interest loans to the poorest 77 countries on the planet. These countries use this funding for a wide array of investments in areas like education, health, public administration, infrastructure, and resource development, but when I voted for this bill in committee, I joined the ranking member and the rest of my Democratic colleagues in making clear that my support was dependent on working together on making changes to the bill as we moved to the floor.

This is about the right of the minority to provide meaningful input into legislation, and that was an agreement that we struck before we voted on the bill.

Despite Democrats' best efforts, that did not happen, and there continue to be provisions in this bill that need to be addressed.

For example, the bill calls for withholding 30 percent of the U.S. contribution to IDA in any year over a 6-year period in which the Treasury Secretary cannot certify to Congress that the World Bank has adopted or is taking steps to implement two sets of reforms mandated in the bill.

In addition, if the Treasury Department cannot report that the World Bank has met either or both of these reforms in any given year, the bill forces U.S. funding to the World Bank to be withheld and makes it more difficult for the World Bank to implement these reforms going forward.

As currently drafted, this bill reflects a total misunderstanding of how the international system works. Multilateral institutions, like the World Bank, which we set up, require sustained U.S. involvement and leadership.

It is unrealistic to think that the U.S. can impose its will on the World Bank. Withholding funds is not an effective approach to reform. The only way to achieve the reforms we are seeking at the World Bank is through our participation and commitment.

At times like this, we must not retreat from our involvement or responsibility on the world stage.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CURTIS). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Placing restrictions on our involvement or undermining international efforts that promote growth and reduce poverty is not something that we should support.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage every Member in the House to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds just to say when my colleague on the other side of the aisle talks about meaningful participation, not one single amendment was offered by my Democratic friends. It was a perfect bill. It passed 60-0.

I would also point out the only leverage we have as the United States is our contribution, and that is what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

□ 1515

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the World Bank Accountability Act, sponsored by my friend from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Having had the opportunity last Congress to chair the subcommittee that Mr. BARR now leads, I can tell my colleagues that the reforms in this bill are real and they're urgent.

Let me highlight one case of management failure at the World Bank that I focused on last Congress, alongside with my ranking member, the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). I think the scandal will illuminate not only the reasoning behind the reforms demanded by H.R. 3326 but, also, the mechanism for achieving those reforms, as the chairman was pointing out. It is the power of our purse that will effect change.

In 2015, the World Bank canceled an IDA—International Development Association, as has been referred to—road project in Uganda. This initiative saw appalling lapses in basic management by the Bank which, literally, enabled sexual exploitation of children to happen. When local Ugandans complained to the Bank staff, they were ignored. Only after the Bank's ombudsman became involved directly did the Bank really investigate the abuses.

My colleagues on the Financial Services Committee and I were so outraged by the scandal that I, along with Ms. MOORE, my ranking member, wrote a letter on July 14 of 2016 to the World Bank demanding corrective action.

Here is the thing: To underscore the gravity of the Bank's management failures, we originally proposed a letter at the highest levels of the committee, including the chairman and the ranking member. In fact, the letter as it went out—and I will include it in the RECORD—was on the letterhead of Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS. And, unfortunately, the ranking member then refused to sign the letter, then just leaving it as a subcommittee letter that

went out by myself and Ranking Member MOORE.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2016.

DR. JIM YONG KIM,
President, World Bank Group,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. KIM: We are writing to express our alarm over the World Bank's cancelled Uganda Transport Sector Development Project. As you know, the Bank is facing serious allegations related to misconduct by a Chinese contractor, including sexual exploitation of minors, repeated harassment of female staff, and deficient safety measures that may have resulted in five fatalities. The Bank has admitted that its supervision of the project was inadequate, particularly with respect to protecting Ugandan girls.

In addition to negligent supervision, the Bank's slow response to local communities' accusations is troubling. According to the Bank's own timeline, Ugandans had to wait six months from the time they first voiced their complaints until the Bank's Country Director wrote to public authorities requesting follow-up by law enforcement. Ten months elapsed before the Bank suspended the project, and delays in the Management Response meant that the Bank's Inspection Panel did not visit Uganda until one year following the initial allegations. As the Panel continues to investigate this case, we urge you and Bank management to cooperate fully while respecting the Panel's independence. We also ask that any findings of negligence and wrongdoing lead to appropriate disciplinary action.

The failure of this project to protect, let alone benefit, Ugandans should inform supervision in all sectors and regions going forward. We believe that the Bank must strengthen its role in supervising and monitoring its projects to ensure that the poor are protected in the Bank's work. Any actions by the Bank that would weaken its oversight could undermine support for the institution.

Additionally, the Bank has long faced criticism, including from its own staff, for a culture that too often places the volume of lending above concerns for the effectiveness of that lending. Last October, the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing on the multilateral development banks that explored this very problem, and a report by the Bank's Independent Evaluation Group notes how the "pressure to lend" has characterized the Bank's culture for decades, often at the expense of development outcomes. It is clear that such a culture can distract from the proper preparation and administration of projects, including monitoring and supervision, thus putting development at risk.

In the case of Uganda, the Bank clearly should have made supervision a higher priority. We hope that future beneficiaries, be they in Africa or elsewhere, will encounter more capable and responsive partners at the Bank.

Sincerely,

BILL HUIZENGA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

GWEN MOORE,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I think what America just heard from the last two speakers on the other side of the aisle was that, literally, the Democrats

wanted the money to the World Bank but not the reforms. That is why they voted for the \$3 million-plus to go into that account, that IDA account.

How cynical. I mean, funding of IDA is about as good as putting a Band-Aid on a car accident victim; right? It is not doing anything, ultimately, if there is such woeful inadequacy in trying to provide the true issues that need to be addressed.

So, the sexual abuse of underage Ugandans, not really interested in talking to you about that; harassment of female project staff, not really interested in talking about that on the other side of the aisle; deficient project safety that may have resulted in five fatalities, not interested in talking about that. So, when they rise, talking about how much they care about the poor and those who are underserved—forgive me if I am cynical, Mr. Chairman—it rings a bit hollow.

For the Bank, it got even worse. After sending this letter with Ms. MOORE, we received a response that the Bank was undertaking cosmetic steps to improve their projects and their actions, such as creating a task force.

Again, forgive me for being a little cynical about the task force, but not only was the country manager associated with the Ugandan project not held accountable, he was promoted to country director for the Congo.

It still gets worse. Last November, we learned that the Bank was suspending yet another road project in the Congo due to allegations of sexual violence against women. The investigation is still underway today, Mr. Chairman. And the Bank has already admitted that it ignored repeated requests to the beneficiaries in the Congo to look at the other complaints, but we are beginning to see a theme: let's just keep the money flowing anyway.

Here is the thing: it was the same projects, the same people in place. I am just wondering why they—whether it is the ranking member or others who voted for this in subcommittee—refused to keep the Bank's feet to the fire.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I am just confused as to why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to hold the Bank's feet to the fire because we have known about these issues for several years. Task forces haven't been sufficient; rhetoric hasn't been sufficient. We need real accountability in the Bank, and we need it now. It needs to be initiated immediately, and then it needs to be maintained and institutionalized.

So I thank my friend from Kentucky for taking this commonsense approach and for demanding that the World Bank live up to its commitments to the poor, whether they are in Africa or in other places in the world.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3326.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

Today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3326, the World Bank Accountability Act of 2017.

Let me start by stating how important our Nation's contributions are to the World Bank's International Development Association, IDA. Those funds support the largest source of development finance for the world's poorest nations, including those in Africa, Latin America, and Asia. That is why, at the committee level, I voted in favor.

Both Democrats and Republicans agreed that funding the World Bank's development finance for poor nations represented America's highest ideals and interests. And, naturally, I would support a bill like this, but we had agreed that it wasn't the last word, that we would work and there would be additions thereto and/or subtractions in reviewing the bill.

In my estimation, looking at the bill, it also cedes too much authority to the executive, and those concerns have not been addressed in the final bill. For me, particularly in light of this administration's statements just a few days ago, it is troubling that it could be misused by this administration.

As written, the President, who has indicated a complete disdain for poor nations and people of color, could withhold foreign assistance if the World Bank does not conform to his administration's policies. It would be a mistake to allow the President to coerce the World Bank to fit his flawed world view, especially this President whose world view is inconsistent with America's past leadership around the globe, and that is whether it was a Democrat or Republican President.

Furthermore, the procedures in this bill do little to rebuild the world's faith in our Nation because we are having a problem with all of our allies, particularly the poor nations of the world, as to where we stand.

So, clearly, our vision, this Nation, has deteriorated under the current administration. Under this bill, our Nation could lose further credibility around the world during a time when countries, especially our allies, are uncertain about where our country stands on fundamental democratic values.

Ultimately, the procedures in this bill could punish millions of children and the vulnerable families in Africa, Latin America, and Asia who could go without food and basic resources.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from New York an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, since we know of the President and his will to withdraw from multilateral organiza-

tions and not work with others and just work by himself, we know what his position is. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 3326.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Williams), the vice chairman of Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3326, the World Bank Accountability Act. I would like to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade, Mr. ANDY BARR, for his hard work on this piece of legislation and for his leadership on this important issue.

H.R. 3326 passed through the Financial Services Committee unanimously, with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 60-0.

Mr. Chair, right now, the World Bank's International Development Association, IDA, is an irresponsible benefactor for the world's neediest nations. At the core of my concerns within the World Bank, I take great issue with the Bank's offering employee incentives for approving new loans. The Bank, itself, has even documented that they harvest a culture that encourages loan volume rather than approval based on merit and approval based on need.

H.R. 3326 will help eliminate these illogical incentives at the World Bank that prioritize pushing money out the door rather than delivering authentic and helpful solutions.

In addition to mass lending from the Bank, careless lending is equally disconcerting and has made it easier for corrupt regimes to abuse their citizens and exploit the money for terrorism-related efforts. To address this issue, H.R. 3326 ensures that the World Bank cannot approve funds for a country that has been classified by the United States as a state sponsor of terrorism, and it demands that the U.S. decline Bank loans to countries that knowingly fail to impose U.N. Security Council sanctions against the North Korean regime.

Additionally, this bill will encourage improvements within the World Bank by withholding up to 30 percent of future appropriations for the World Bank's IDA until the Treasury reports that the Bank has undertaken meaningful reforms in order to combat corruption, strengthen management accountability, and undermine violent extremism. By passing this legislation, we require the World Bank to put more faith in free enterprise as opposed to corrupt regimes that abuse the poor.

If the World Bank is serious about helping those who need it most, it should make certain that borrowing governments are committed to the welfare of their citizens. The World Bank has been slipping through the cracks far too long, and it is time to implement meaningful and lasting reforms.

Once again, I commend Representative BARR for introducing this necessary legislation. I encourage the House to follow the Financial Services Committee's lead by passing H.R. 3326.

In God we trust.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), the senior member of the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3326 as it currently stands.

This is a disappointment to me. I, like many of my colleagues, originally voted to support this legislation in committee, with the understanding that both sides of the aisle would continue to work to allay the concerns that elements of this bill would give the Trump administration new and disruptive tools that would likely be used to the detriment of the World Bank's mission and our relationships with other countries.

There was an understanding to negotiate changes, but this legislation we will be voting on today does not reflect that promise. In light of that failure, my colleague, GWEN MOORE, offered an amendment that would have set aside our concerns, but this amendment was not made in order, so we will not be voting on that either.

This bill does have elements that are important to our country's obligation to some of the poorest countries in the world. The World Bank provides grants and highly concessional loans through the International Development Association, the IDA, to the world's 77 poorest countries. This money goes a long way towards raising the standard of living, public health, and economic growth for the 450 million people who live there.

Since World War II, the United States has stood as a strong partner and a leader in the multilateral work to improve the quality of life around the world. Our success has relied on the diligent support of American lawmakers, diplomats, and groups around the world that work closely with allies and partner organizations throughout the world to provide assistance in times of great crisis.

But our confidence that this administration's broad discretion to defund the IDA—provided in the bill we will be voting on—would not be abused, frankly, was not improved by the President's recent racist remarks last week.

We are constantly reminded of the continuing importance of this mission and the need to pledge our support to the poorest countries in the world, to offer aid for the neediest individuals. Time after time, however, the Trump administration has shown itself incapable of using the resources that Congress gives it to work in constructive ways within multilateral organizations, instead, alienating our allies and undermining our country's reputation and mission. While I support this legis-

lation's authorization of \$3.29 billion for multilateral development efforts for these countries, the poorly conceived and defined conditions in this legislation make it impossible to support.

Any withholding of U.S. contributions to IDA is a serious action that would have devastating consequences. It would punish millions of children and other vulnerable groups in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, many of whom live in absolute poverty. It would also limit our ability to help individuals in famine-ridden parts of the world and refugees in fragile areas. They rely on humanitarian assistance for food and water.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, they rely on humanitarian assistance for food, water, and basic medical care and could face death without this assistance.

Many of the provisions in this bill, as written, would place conditions on U.S. contributions to IDA that, in the hands of the Trump administration, would not be an effective approach to reform and could very well undermine efforts to reduce poverty and promote growth. This would damage our country's historic and noble mission to lead the world in assisting the poorest countries with food, clean water, and medical help.

So, with reluctance, I have to encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill and hope that it comes back to the floor with the bipartisan input that we were promised.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1530

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), another hard-working member of the Financial Services Committee who knows this bill passed 60-0 with no Democratic amendments offered.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of our committee and the chairman of our subcommittee for making great points and for pushing forward this great legislation.

The Members opposed to this legislation were for it before they were against it, as has been pointed out. But the other thing is the premise of the argument that is being made in opposition to this bill: that the United States should somehow give money, just spend the money, regardless of how poorly the World Bank will deploy this capital, regardless of whether they are effective or not in accomplishing the important mission of helping address poverty in some of the poorest nations in the world.

The specific purpose of this fund is to address poverty, and it has not done a

very good job of doing that. Frankly, they have abused the funds they have had. So the premise would be that somehow we can just spend the money and trust that somehow they are going to get better.

Well, thankfully, when we were talking about it in committee and when we have talked about it on this side of the argument here—and I hope there is truly broad bipartisanship support for this bill to show to the American people we do expect a return on our dollars. We expect results for the money that comes to this body to spend on behalf of the United States of America.

I think the other premise is that somehow, unless we just send the money with no strings attached and no expectation of results, then we are not engaged in the world, that somehow we have withdrawn from the world and we don't care.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Because we do care, we are putting terms and conditions on the money. Because we do care about poverty and the results, we care that the World Bank operates, frankly, to accomplish its mission.

So while some would look for bigger, bolder reforms and maybe better use of U.S. tax dollars, we certainly expect some accountability for those results. This is a very measured objective in this bill, and I commend our committee for coming to this consensus 60-0 in committee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope for a similar outcome when we call the vote on the floor of the House.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the vice ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to express my concerns with the way this bill has moved to the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill's authorization of a U.S. contribution to the International Development Association, IDA, the part of the World Bank that helps the world's poorest countries through loans and grants to boost economic growth, to reduce inequality, and to improve the standard of living across the world.

The IDA provides assistance for basic healthcare, primary education, clean water and sanitation, and infrastructure.

I also support the idea that the bill would reestablish the U.S.' engagement on global economic cooperation. When this bill came up in the Financial Services Committee markup, as has been pointed out, I, along with many of my colleagues, expressed concerns over the bill making a U.S. contribution contingent on President Trump's determination that the World Bank is implementing these important reforms.

Our support for the bill was based on the understanding that those concerns would be addressed. So we supported

the bill in good faith, hoping that, in fact, those issues would be addressed.

It has been pointed out that no Democratic amendments were offered in committee. We took on faith that those issues would be addressed.

Ms. MOORE, a member of the committee on the Democratic side and a leader on this issue, offered an amendment, which the majority rejected in the Rules Committee and did not allow this House to vote on in order to—what we would say would be—improve the legislation. The amendment was not even made in order.

We support good governance and accountability, but those goals ought to be advanced on their own merits. Allowing President Trump to make the determination to withhold money from these countries based on his interpretation as to whether they have met his standard was a bridge too far for many of us.

The nature of the reforms outlined in the bill give some pause when we consider the recent actions and the recent words. It is impossible for any of us to, first of all, erase the hateful comments made by the President of the United States in reference to countries such as those that benefit from the work of the IDA.

So setting aside for a moment the concerns that members of the committee addressed—and this happens from time to time in committee, let's not pretend that it doesn't, where there are concerns that we decide we will address as the bill goes forward. Very often those are worked out. When they are not, we are not going to be put in the position as members of the committee of having to say: Well, that never happened.

It did happen.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CULBERSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I understand we may come to different conclusions ultimately on how the bill comes to the floor, and Members ought to feel free to vote their conscience, but it is not the case that we did not express those concerns with the hope that they would be addressed before the legislation moved to the floor.

Nobody saw it as a perfect bill, unless, of course, those individuals were not listening to the issues being raised by Democratic Members during the debate in committee.

Mr. Chairman, I will end with this: when the President of the United States, just in recent days, uses vulgar and hateful terms to depict entire populations, many of whom live in countries that are the principal beneficiaries and people who themselves are the principal beneficiaries of this work, I have a very difficult time granting authority to that same administration to make a determination as to whether those countries are worthy of the help that the United States would offer.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds again to say it is an interesting narrative being told by the minority, but they offered no amendments, voted for the bill 60-0. We have heard nothing for 6 months until last Friday, the first time they decided to articulate a specific concern about a bill they had already supported.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), the majority whip of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank our chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BARR from Kentucky, for bringing this bill, H.R. 3326, to the floor today because this is precisely what the American people want out of their government in Washington, D.C.: accountability.

Mr. Chairman, our constituents ask us all the time: Do you monitor the money that you send and spend around the world to further America's interests?

There are always a lot of people just kind of looking around. And how do we verify that?

Well, Mr. Chairman, here is an opportunity to verify that. This important piece of legislation would require the World Bank to implement real incentives, particularly through staff evaluation standards, that prioritize anti-poverty results and capable project management over just the volume of loans they produce. It is that classic management expertise, quality over quantity.

Of course we want poverty eradicated. The taxpayers of this country wouldn't vote for us to approve spending like this if it wasn't done right to further America's interests around the world and to alleviate poverty around the world.

If the World Bank is serious about that, then it would defend the poorest's freedoms more vigorously. In other words, Mr. Chairman, no reforms like we propose, then poverty is not eradicated; the poor are not helped.

So H.R. 3326 insists on greater efforts by the World Bank to fight corruption in its projects. Just because the World Bank may have to work in corrupt environments does not mean it needs to add to the graft by pouring money in it for the taking. No one is for that. That is why the vote was 60-0.

That is why the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) was so supportive of this in our subcommittee. It withholds appropriations until the World Bank raises the quality of its work, raises the quality of its forensic audits, which are designed to unmask the systemic corruption we find in the Third World, inadvertently or advertently supported by the efforts of the World Bank.

We are tired of it. That is why, on a bipartisanship basis, we support the foreign policy goals contained in H.R. 3326.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, Mr. BARR, for his thoughtful work to im-

plement this. These are needed changes. These are bipartisanship changes. These improve transparency, end corruption, better spend our taxpayer resources, and demand accountability of the World Bank, which is notoriously unaccountable. I thank Mr. BARR and I thank Mr. HENSARLING for their efforts.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to briefly speak about H.R. 3326, the World Bank Accountability Act, which the House is voting on this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, last summer, I joined my Democratic and Republican colleagues in supporting H.R. 3326 in the Financial Services Committee to authorize the United States to participate in replenishing the International Development Association, the IDA.

However, Democrats made it clear during consideration of this bill in committee that our support depended on changes to certain provisions. Specifically, we believe that prohibitions in the bill put the U.S. funding at risk and make it too easy for the administration to cut off funding for vulnerable nations.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that my Republican colleagues have chosen not to uphold our agreement and address these concerns. Given the recent events and remarks by President Trump degrading developing nations and the people who live in them, we should be concerned about giving the administration this power.

It is critical that Congress provide moral leadership and demonstrate to the world that the United States will not ignore or punish countries that are struggling with poverty or conflict. We must send a strong signal that the United States Congress respects people of all backgrounds and nationalities.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, let me say that Democrats did view this legislation as an important marker of international engagement from our committee, which has not in recent times demonstrated a great deal of interest in global economic leadership. We viewed this measure as an opportunity to reinforce the importance of global economic cooperation. Given that, it seemed to us a mistake to then reject the possibility of cooperation with our own Republican colleagues. So we supported the bill for that reason as well, and I regret we couldn't come to an accommodation.

□ 1545

On another matter, let me also say that I won't question the sincerity of my Republican colleagues' commitment to reforming the World Bank, but

I do wonder why, if these reforms are as pressing and as urgent and as critical as they say, why did they take so long?

Chairman HENSARLING has been at the helm of our committee for over 5 years, and, during that time, the Obama administration requested legislation to authorize U.S. participation in three other replenishments, including the previous IDA-17. But the committee refused to act on any of these requests, not only shirking its oversight responsibility, but also missing a number of opportunities to press for reforms which presumably were as urgent then as they are now.

In fact, in November of 2014, near the end of the 113th Congress, I wrote to Chairman HENSARLING urging him to turn his attention to the three pending authorization requests before Congress adjourned. I made a number of arguments in support of the multilateral development banks, the MDBs, which apparently did not persuade the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I include that letter in the RECORD.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, November 19, 2014.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: I write to urge you to turn your attention before Congress adjourns to the Administration's requests for authorizations for U.S. participation in the replenishments of three concessional windows at the multilateral development banks (MDBs)—namely, the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA-17), the Asian Development Fund (AsDF-11), and the African Development Fund (AfDF-13).

As you know, these concessional facilities provide grants and low-cost development financing to the world's poorest countries. They support projects that combat hunger and poverty while promoting private-sector growth and global stability. Well-designed multilateral aid programs help create more equitable societies and more stable democracies. It is also crucial to U.S. interests that developing nations continue to grow. Exports have been the most rapidly growing share of our economy, and exports to developing countries have been an important part of that.

America is also fighting a war on terrorism, and while the forces that give rise to terrorism are complex, poverty and despair provide a fertile feeding ground. Moreover, U.S. contributions to the development banks also provide tremendous value for the money. Every dollar we commit is leveraged many times over by contributions from other donor nations, as well as from the internal resources of the institutions themselves.

Today, we have another very important, and potentially far-reaching, reason why the U.S. should promptly meet its commitments to the MDBs. The last few years have unfortunately seen a weakening of the commitment to multilateralism by the United States, which has led to widespread doubt about U.S. leadership on global economic governance.

In response, a number of developing countries, led by China, have begun to act independently, with initiatives viewed as the first serious, coordinated effort to reshape

the global financial architecture and challenge western dominance in the world economy.

Last month, China announced an agreement with 21 other developing countries to create a multilateral development bank called the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), which will focus on financing infrastructure development projects in the Asia-Pacific region. A clear rival to the Asian Development Bank, the AIIB will be led by China, its largest shareholder, and headquartered in Beijing.

Separately, in July, the so-called BRICS nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) announced plans to launch an international development bank of their own, which they hope will rival the strength and influence of the World Bank. The "New Development Bank," as it is called, will be headquartered in Shanghai and focus on infrastructure investment throughout the developing world.

Development experts agree that global infrastructure needs in developing countries is tremendous, and there are many who welcome the contribution that the new development banks can make in helping to build sustainable economic infrastructure both in Asia and elsewhere. But these new institutions also reflect frustration by the world's major emerging economies with the slow pace of governance reforms at the Bretton Woods institutions, especially the IMF. In fact, the now-stalled agreement to realign the quota shares at the IMF, negotiated by the Bush Administration, was a critical effort to preserve its legitimacy and keep emerging economies firmly anchored in the multilateral system that the U.S. helped design.

U.S. inaction in meeting its commitments to the MDBs, as well as its refusal to ratify IMF governance reforms, is what led, in large part, to the creation of these new institutions that will increasingly pose a challenge to the global financial order created by western powers after World War II. We should be mindful that a world in which countries such as China and Russia are acting outside of the established international financial institutions, or other global bodies, is one that could drift beyond our control. Moreover, it remains to be seen what values these new rising powers will articulate and promote in their vision of a new global economy.

I believe this makes U.S. leadership at the multilateral development institutions today more important than ever. They are directed at some of the most central challenges faced by the U.S.—strategic, economic, political and moral—and, in many ways, they are often our most effective means for responding to those challenges.

I strongly urge you to take prompt action to affirm U.S. support for, and U.S. leadership at, these institutions, which have served both U.S. interests and the global public good for so many years.

Sincerely,

MAXINE WATERS,
Ranking Member.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Nevertheless, here we are, at a historic moment when U.S. credibility on the global stage is in serious question.

We have the option of choosing to lead and show the community of nations that the hateful words of the President will not be followed by misguided and enabling actions by Congress.

Today, I speak on behalf of the world's poorest countries and their people. Today, I stand with Africa, and

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and its misguided, cynical approach to multilateralism.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation as a signal to the world that Trump doctrine is not the American doctrine or a broader sign of American unreliability and indifference.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to tell you what is being said about us from some of these countries and around the world.

From Haiti, Trump comments saying that they were "based on stereotypes."

"In the spirit of the people of Haiti, we feel in the statements, if they were made, the President was either misinformed or miseducated about Haiti and its people."

From Laurent Lamothe, the former Haitian Prime Minister: "It shows a lack of respect," he says, "and ignorance never seen before in the recent history of the U.S. by any President."

Let's see what Jessie Duarte, Deputy Secretary General of the African National Congress, has to say. He said, "Ours is not a s—hole country, neither is Haiti or any other country in distress."

From the Government of El Salvador: "We have addressed a note of protest to the Government of the United States highlighting in this document also the high value of Salvadorans."

From Salvador Sanchez, President of El Salvador:

The statement by the President of the United States hits the dignity of the Salvadoran people. El Salvador demands within the framework of the principles governing relations among states respect for the dignity of their noble and courageous people.

Hugo Martinez, El Salvador's Foreign Minister, said:

"It's always been a foreign policy priority of our government to fight for the respect and dignity of our countrymen independent of the immigration status.

"Our countrymen are hardworking people who are always contributing to the countries where they are living and, of course, also to our country."

And according to the State Department, Senegal also summoned the U.S. Ambassador for an explanation. And so Macky Sall, President of Senegal, said: "I am shocked by the words of President Trump on Haiti and Africa. I reject them and condemn them vigorously. Africa and the Black race deserves the respect and consideration of all."

And then there is John Mahama, former President of Ghana. He said: "Africans and Haitians come from s—hole countries? Isn't Trump demonstrating that he is nothing but a racist and pursuing a policy of 'Make America White Again'? I congratulate Botswana for showing the way. Our AU Presidents must respond strongly to this insult."

I could go on and on about comments that are coming from our friends and

our allies. Some of them may be poor countries but who have had respect for us in the past and who have stood with us in times of adversity.

I absolutely know that this country has demonstrated, time and time again, that we are humanitarians, that we understand the importance of giving support to the poorest countries in this world, and they appreciate us so much. They honor us, they have respected us, and they have done everything to show that they will stand with us when they need us to do that.

And here we are at a time when we are willing to put them at risk with a piece of legislation where we have some Members on the opposite side of the aisle who think they know better than the World Bank, who think they know better than all of the Members, Democrats and Republicans, who have worked together for years in our support of the World Bank; in our support of giving support to the 77 poorest countries in the world; and giving our support to the 450 million people, many of them who are living in abject poverty, many of them who don't know where the next meal is going to come from, and many of them whose lives are at risk every day.

How can we, the richest country in the world, turn our nose up at them, talk about somehow they are not credible, talk about somehow they are all corrupt? I reject it, and I ask the Members of this Congress to vote "no" on this misplaced, misguided piece of legislation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward the President, including by repeating remarks carried elsewhere that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3/4 minutes remaining.

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

First, Mr. Chairman, let me get the whole process debate out of the way. Anybody who is watching this debate has got to be scratching their head at the proposition that every single one of my Democratic colleagues who come to the floor to denounce H.R. 3326 have already voted for it. They voted for it 60-0 in committee.

Mr. Chairman, do you know how many amendments they offered in that markup, their opportunity to refine the legislation, their opportunity to improve the legislation, their opportunity to put their imprimatur on the legislation? Do you know how many amendments they offered? Zero. Zero amendments were offered by the minority who now claim that somehow they were cut out of the process.

For 6 months, we have been waiting, waiting to bring this bill, waiting to

hear about these improvements, and only three legislative days ago did, finally, the Democrats deign to offer any new improvement to this bill.

So I think, Mr. Chairman, she doth protest too much. And now what I don't understand, Mr. Chairman, is how my Democratic colleagues can defend some of these rogue regimes and some of the activities of the World Bank.

Dr. Jean Ensminger, Edie and Lew Wasserman professor of social science at Caltech, testified that there is corruption throughout World Bank projects in remote areas of Kenya near the Somali border.

She said: "As I dug more deeply, it became apparent that corruption had been entrenched in the project since 2000." And we are talking about the poorest of the poor.

She goes on to say:

As the board was about to renew the project for 5 years, finally, the internal investigation showed that 62 percent of the transactions were fraudulent.

Except my friends on the other side of the aisle: It doesn't matter. Don't worry about the fraud. Just send them U.S. taxpayer money. It doesn't matter that the poor aren't actually helped. Just send them money because it makes us feel good.

Sasha Chavkin from the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists testified—and I alluded to this earlier about the forced displacement of the poorest of the poor caused by projects financed by the World Bank.

He went on to testify: "We found, instead, that the bank repeatedly funded governments that not only failed to adequately resettle communities, but, in some cases, were accused of human rights abuses such as rape, murder, and violent evictions associated with bank projects. We found in several cases that the World Bank continued to bankroll these borrowers even after evidence of these abuses came to light."

We have a bill to reform that, to make sure the poor are actually helped, to ensure that instead of taxpayer money going to rape, murder, and violent evictions, that it actually goes to help the poor. And why my Democratic colleagues who were once for it are now against it is beyond me.

We certainly know about the infamous World Bank project, road project, in western Uganda where it was associated with an increase in sexual exploitation of young girls. Teenage girls were being sexually harassed on the way to school. Many were sexually exploited or wagged by project workers, and once this became known, the World Bank denied it.

So we have the simple bill to say that the U.S. taxpayer will demand accountability. We will demand reforms. People should be aghast at how this money has been spent at the World Bank. It is not how much money you spend. It is how you spend the money. And if we want reforms, we are going

to have some accountability, something that my friends on the other side of the aisle used to support, and they should be ashamed that they are not supporting it today.

We must all support H.R. 3326. I very much commend the gentleman from Kentucky for bringing this valuable piece of legislation to the floor.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3326

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "World Bank Accountability Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS UNTIL CERTAIN CONDITIONS ARE MET.

(a) INSTITUTIONAL REFORMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, in addition to any amounts withheld from disbursement under subsection (b), 15 percent of the amounts provided in appropriations Acts for the International Development Association for the fiscal year—

(A) shall be withheld from disbursement until the conditions of paragraph (2) or (3) are satisfied; and

(B)(i) shall be disbursed after the conditions of paragraph (2) are satisfied; and

(ii) may be disbursed after the conditions of paragraph (3) are satisfied

(2) INITIAL CONDITIONS.—The conditions of this paragraph are satisfied with respect to the amounts provided in appropriations Acts for a fiscal year if, in the fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—

(A) is implementing institutional incentives, including through formal staff evaluation criteria, that prioritize poverty reduction, development outcomes, and capable project management over the volume of the Bank's lending and grantmaking;

(B) is taking steps to address the management failures described in Inspection Panel Investigation Report 106710UG, and to prevent their recurrence in countries that are eligible for World Bank support; and

(C) is taking measures to strengthen its management of trust funds, with the goal of increasing the accountability of the trust funds for poverty reduction and development outcomes.

(3) SUBSEQUENT CONDITIONS.—The conditions of this paragraph are satisfied if the Secretary of the Treasury reports to the appropriate congressional committees, in each of the 3 fiscal years most recently preceding the fiscal year in which the report is made, that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has instituted the measures described in paragraph (2) of this subsection and the measures described in subsection (b)(2).

(b) GOVERNANCE AND ANTICORRUPTION REFORMS.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—With respect to each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, in addition to any amounts withheld from disbursement under subsection (a), 15 percent of the amounts provided in appropriations Acts for the International Development Association for the fiscal year—

(A) shall be withheld from disbursement until the conditions of paragraph (2) or (3) are satisfied; and

(B)(i) shall be disbursed after the conditions of paragraph (2) are satisfied; and

(ii) may be disbursed after the conditions of paragraph (3) are satisfied

(2) *INITIAL CONDITIONS.*—The conditions of this paragraph are satisfied with respect to the amounts provided in appropriations Acts for a fiscal year if, in the fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—

(A) is emphasizing in appropriate operational policies, directives, and country strategies its support for secure property rights, due process of law, and economic freedom as essential conditions for sustained poverty reduction in World Bank borrowing countries;

(B)(i) in the preceding fiscal year, has not approved any loans or grants assistance by the Bank to a country designated by the United States as a state sponsor of terrorism; and

(ii) is strengthening the ability of Bank-funded projects to undermine violent extremism;

(C) is taking steps to conduct forensic audits of projects receiving assistance from the Bank, increase the number of the forensic audits, and strengthen the capacity of the Bank's Integrity Vice Presidency, and that not less than 50 percent of the forensic audits initiated by the Bank in each fiscal year are of projects randomly selected from among International Development Association borrowing countries; and

(D) is taking measures to detect and minimize corruption in all World Bank projects involving development policy lending.

(3) *SUBSEQUENT CONDITIONS.*—The conditions of this paragraph are satisfied if the Secretary of the Treasury reports to the appropriate congressional committees, in each of the 3 fiscal years most recently preceding the fiscal year in which the report is made that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has instituted the measures described in paragraph (2) of this subsection and the measures described in subsection (a)(2).

(c) *APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.*—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committees on Financial Services and on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Foreign Relations and on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 3. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

The Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies shall include in the report required by section 1701 of the International Financial Institutions Act for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023 a detailed description of the actions undertaken by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in the fiscal year covered by the report to institute the measures described in subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) of section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 4. OPPOSITION TO WORLD BANK ASSISTANCE FOR GOVERNMENT THAT FAILS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE MEASURES REQUIRED UNDER AN APPLICABLE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION.

The Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 73. OPPOSITION TO ASSISTANCE FOR GOVERNMENT THAT FAILS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE MEASURES REQUIRED UNDER AN APPLICABLE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION.

“The Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States Executive Director at the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose the provision of assistance to the government of a borrowing country of the International Development Association if the President of the United States determines that the government has knowingly failed to implement or enforce sanctions required under an applicable United Nations Security Council resolution (as defined in section 3 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114122; 22 U.S.C. 9202)) that is in effect.”.

SEC. 5. EIGHTEENTH REPLENISHMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION; REDUCTION FROM IDA-17 AUTHORIZED LEVEL.

The International Development Association Act (22 U.S.C. 284 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 30. EIGHTEENTH REPLENISHMENT.

“(a) *CONTRIBUTION AUTHORITY.*—The United States Governor of the International Development Association may contribute on behalf of the United States \$3,291,030,000 to the eighteenth replenishment of the resources of the Association, subject to obtaining the necessary appropriations.

“(b) *LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—In order to pay for the contribution provided for in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, \$3,291,030,000 for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury.”.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 115-518. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 115-518.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 2, after “economic freedom” insert “, including reduction of government barriers to entrepreneurship.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 693, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support my amendment to H.R. 3326, the World Bank Accountability Act. I also want to thank the chairman of the full committee and ANDY BARR, who is the subcommittee

chairman, for introducing this legislation and working with me on this amendment.

The purpose of the underlying bill is simple: to ensure that the World Bank is effective in supporting projects abroad that work and actually reduce poverty. One aspect of the bill requires that the U.S. may withhold part of its funding from the World Bank unless the Treasury Department reports that the World Bank is emphasizing proven antipoverty solutions such as secure property rights, due process under the law, and economic freedom.

My amendment would make a small and positive change to the bill which clarifies that the World Bank should also focus on reducing government barriers to entrepreneurship in addition to the other requirements.

□ 1600

This simple modification is important for a couple of reasons:

First, multiple studies have found that entrepreneurship is an essential part of reducing poverty abroad because it gives people the ability to use their skills and God-given talents to foster innovation and create jobs in their individual communities. Foreign governments often create barriers to entrepreneurship through excessive fees, burdensome licensing requirements, and lengthy permitting processes.

Second, this modification is consistent with United States foreign policy, which, in part, is to promote market solutions to international poverty. This will ensure that individuals will have the capability to pull themselves out of poverty without excessive barriers put up by their government, ultimately improve the efficiency of United States development assistance and improve the economic situation in impoverished nations.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. I appreciate the committee's willingness to work with me on this issue.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PALMER). Is the gentlewoman opposed to the amendment?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Yes, I am opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

While the amendment speaks to reducing government barriers to entrepreneurship, the real-world impact of adopting this amendment would be to enlist the World Bank in the business

of really what they are going for, diminishing labor standards.

The World Bank's prior "doing business" report is a prime example of why we must reject this amendment. The World Bank should be encouraging sustainable and inclusive growth, not policies that diminish workers' rights. So I would urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his very thoughtful amendment. His amendment addresses an issue dear to our heart, and that is economic freedom. By making the bill even more explicit in its support for entrepreneurship, his contribution makes a good piece of legislation better. Still, it is important to remember that the poor, wherever they may be in the world, can succeed if their government lets them, and that is a principle we should all wholeheartedly support. I hope the World Bank will subscribe to it as well.

I would just say one other thing about the debate that has transpired here today. This is hardworking American taxpayers' generosity. It is their charity. It is the American taxpayers trying to help people who live in impoverished countries.

It is unfair to hardworking taxpayers and it dishonors the generosity of the American people to not hold the World Bank accountable.

I applaud the gentleman, Mr. NORMAN, for his amendment, which will unleash entrepreneurship in these lesser developed countries.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 115-518.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 22, insert " , to institute the measures described in section 203 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1375c), and to ensure that persons to whom a G-5 visa (as defined in such section 203) has been issued and who are employed by a diplomat or staff of the Bank are informed of their rights and protections under such section 203" before the period.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 693, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an anti-human trafficking amendment to the World Bank Accountability Act.

The chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies is already required by law to submit to the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and the President of the United States an annual report on the effectiveness and operations of international financial institutions as well as other goals for development assistance and financing already specified by Congress.

The base text of the World Bank Accountability Act already includes several additions to the chairman's annual report. This amendment would make one addition to that report. The amendment would require the chairman to report on the detailed actions undertaken by the World Bank to institute certain protections for G-5 non-immigrant visa holders and inform these individuals of the rights afforded to them by the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008. That legislation was sponsored by my good friend and former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Howard Ber- man.

G-5 nonimmigrant visas are reserved for foreign domestic employees of diplomats and international organizations, such as the World Bank.

Prior to the enactment of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act, these foreign domestic employees had very few protections.

However, the bill enacted several important reforms on how we prevent abuse and trafficking of foreign domestic employees in the United States on G-5 nonimmigrant visas.

The law mandated that all such visa holders have an employer-employee contract that includes, inter alia:

One, an agreement by the employer to abide by all Federal, State, and local laws;

Two, information on the frequency and form of payment, work duties, weekly work hours, holidays, sick days, and vacation days; and

Three, have an agreement by the employer not to withhold the passport, employment contract, or other personal property and documents of the employee.

Among other things, the law also permits these foreign domestic employees to remain legally and work in the United States while seeking legal redress against their employers, as required.

As a Representative for Northern Virginia, I count among the residents of my district many of the hardworking and dedicated employees of the World Bank who work in offices throughout the D.C. metropolitan area. As a result, I also represent the foreign

domestic employees of those who work in the World Bank and such institutions. Unfortunately, sometimes, some of these individuals have been subject to abuse by their employers.

Since 2010, there have been at least five Federal civil trafficking cases in the United States involving the World Bank, and a majority of those cases were filed in the Eastern District of Virginia. All of these cases resulted in either a settlement, a default judgment for the plaintiff, or a guilty plea—all of them.

According to the GAO report on household workers for foreign diplomats, "The people who come to the United States on G-5 visas are among the most vulnerable who enter our borders legally. They are often poor, uneducated, and unfamiliar with their rights under United States law. If they find themselves in an abusive situation, their ability to hold their employers accountable can be limited, particularly if their employers hold full diplomatic immunity and inviolability."

According to a 2017 survey, 85 percent of domestic worker trafficking survivors report having pay withheld or being paid well below minimum wage, in violation of our own domestic laws. Seventy-eight percent have had employers threaten to report them for deportation if they complained. Sixty-two percent report having their passports or other identification documents taken away or withheld illegally by their employers.

We must empower all individuals who find themselves victims of abuse or human trafficking and provide them with a way out. Too often their plight is obscured by their vulnerability and their susceptibility to these kinds of threats.

I hope this amendment helps shed more light on one corner of this problem and offers victims currently suffering under an abusive employer a way out of the shadows. This is a matter of human decency, human freedom, and a reaffirmation of human autonomy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge its adoption. I thank the chairman and his staff and the ranking member and her staff for their cooperation fashioning this amendment.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his efforts, and I am willing to accept his amendment.

The language he proposes would ensure that the Treasury keeps Congress updated on the World Bank's efforts to ensure that certain visa holders at the World Bank are aware of the provisions of current law.

This addition to the bill is unobjectionable. I am pleased to support it.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BARR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115-518.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 13, insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "The Secretary".

Page 8, line 13, strike "should" and insert "shall".

Page 8, line 16, insert "financial" before "assist".

Page 8, line 17, after "ance" insert ", other than assistance to support basic human needs,".

Page 8, line 24, strike the close quotation marks and the period that follows.

Page 8, after line 24, insert the following:

"(b) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (a) for not more than 180 days at a time with respect to a foreign government if the President reports to the Congress that—

"(1) the failure described in subsection (a) by the foreign government is due exclusively to a lack of capacity of the foreign government;

"(2) the foreign government is taking effective steps to prevent the failure from recurring; or

"(3) the waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 693, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a straightforward amendment that would simply make this bill's language more consistent with legislation the House has already passed with an overwhelming bipartisan majority.

As reported, H.R. 3326 calls on the Treasury Department to oppose World Bank assistance to IDA countries that knowingly fail to enforce U.N. Security Council sanctions against North Korea.

As the U.N. Panel of Experts has concluded, lax enforcement, including in developing countries eligible for IDA support, has significantly undermined the effectiveness of U.N. sanctions against the Kim regime.

All my amendment does is change the word "should" to "shall," making

U.S. opposition to World Bank assistance for those countries mandatory. At the same time, the amendment adds Presidential waiver authority so that the administration can exempt countries that may be facing limits to their government capacity or which are making an effort to correct their enforcement failures. There is also a national interest waiver included in this provision.

The Financial Services Committee has already passed this stronger mandatory provision in the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act, which I am proud to have sponsored along with my subcommittee ranking member, Ms. MOORE from Wisconsin. Ms. MOORE's input was important to making this provision both tough and flexible enough to incentivize foreign countries to work harder on sanctions enforcement.

Our committee passed the Otto Warmbier sanctions bill unanimously, and it passed the full House in October by a vote of 415-2. Again, this is a minor change to align this bill's language with a policy that the House has already endorsed on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues' support.

Before I conclude, I do want to just make a general comment about the wisdom of this legislation and the approach to enforce accountability on the World Bank. We heard some of the arguments from our friends on the other side of the aisle—our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I would just say, on a bipartisan basis, we are the guardians and the custodians of the American taxpayers' charity. We are the guardians of their hard-earned income that they pay in the form of taxes to their government, and they ask us to be wise stewards of those tax dollars.

These taxpayers work hard to pay their taxes. So when that money comes to Washington, they expect when we are fighting poverty in Third World countries with their tax dollars that we make it work because the American people—and we all agree here—want to fight poverty in these Third World countries.

We want to make sure that these Third World countries are not either knowingly or unknowingly supporting circumventing these sanctions against North Korea.

We want to make sure that they are promoting economic freedom and actually helping people rise out of poverty and achieve their God-given potential in these countries that need our humanitarian assistance.

So for goodness' sake, let's support accountability at the World Bank so that we don't have rape, murder, and violent evictions associated with World Bank projects, which is what everybody knows the testimony has been in our oversight.

This is not about turning our backs on the poor. It is about standing up for the poor. It is about making sure that the money that our taxpayers are giv-

ing to the World Bank is actually helping alleviate poverty and not exacerbating the problems in these poor countries.

□ 1615

If the Bank can't undertake the reforms in this bill—again, reforms that the minority supported—then, by definition, the Bank's money is not benefiting the poor. If it is not benefiting the poor, how could withholding a portion of it be punishing the poor?

For goodness' sake, let's honor the charity of the American taxpayers. Let's not dishonor it. Let's honor it by actually making reforms to the World Bank so that it can fulfill its important mission and not undermine its important antipoverty mission.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, not only do I want to thank him for his leadership in providing accountability to the World Bank to ensure that the poorest of the poor are truly helped and that the hardworking, beleaguered taxpayer has his funds respected, but I also want to thank him for this amendment and his previous work to ensure that sanctions on one of the most dangerous regimes on the face of the planet, North Korea, are actually effective. We know the threat that North Korea presents to all of our constituents and our country.

So I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership, and I urge the adoption of his amendment.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, though I do not intend to oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, offered by the gentleman from Kentucky, Representative BARR, would make changes to section 4 of the underlying bill dealing with opposing World Bank assistance for governments that fail to enforce U.N. Security Council sanctions against North Korea.

These changes are welcome and would bring this section of the bill in line with a provision that was adopted on a bipartisan basis in the Financial Services Committee as part of our commitment in the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act.

Just as the bipartisan measure that was passed through our committee included a clearly defined waiver authority, the amendment offered by Representative BARR would add, in this same waiver, provisions to the underlying bill. In doing so, the amendment not only makes section 4 of the bill consistent with the approach used in

other contexts, but, more importantly, it ensures that we allow the President to waive the withholding of assistance for countries that fall short in applying sanctions on North Korea when such failure is due exclusively to a lack of capacity of the foreign government and the foreign government is taking effective steps to prevent the failure from recurring.

While I do not believe the underlying bill should become law in its current form, I do believe we should take a consistent and thoughtful approach to cutting off World Bank assistance to the poorest countries that are unable to fulfill their U.N. Security Council obligations. This amendment would address this concern.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for giving credit to Ms. MOORE for her work and her assistance with the work that was being done to deny North Korea any kind of assistance from any of our allies, as I understand it. This is not something that is done by the Republicans or the Democrats. This is truly bipartisan. We all feel the same way about North Korea, and we all feel that the sanctions should be honored. We all feel that no country, in particular those countries that we are supporting, in any way should do anything to give support to North Korea.

In saying that, let me also point out that we don't come to this floor with any kind of empty rhetoric, talking about all of those countries are corrupt and somehow all of these countries in Africa and other places that are very poor are somehow disregarding the fact that the United States is being of assistance to them. Most of them know that their lives oftentimes depend on our generosity. They love us and support us. They want to emulate us.

They get a little bit confused when we have people who charge them with being corrupt and irresponsible and noncaring and not having an appreciation for what the citizens of the United States are doing for them. That is not the kind of rhetoric that we need in order to enhance our posture or our image with our constituents and have them believe that we are saving them from these poor countries who are getting taxpayer money and don't care about them. That is not true.

I cringe when I hear that kind of rhetoric on the floor of Congress. I cringe when I hear us using our position, our influence, to send a message that somehow we don't trust, we don't believe, we don't honor, and we don't respect many of those very, very poor countries. We are talking about 77 of the poorest countries in the world.

You will see ads on television, from time to time, of nonprofit organizations that are trying to save the lives of little children who are dying from malnutrition. You see them every night, and they tell you: Send \$21; send some money to this organization so we can save these children who are dying because they don't have clean drinking water, who are dying because they are

victims of malaria, who are dying because they don't have any healthcare whatsoever, living practically outdoors. When we see these ads, many people are responding, joining in with their government to show our humanitarianism and helping the least of these.

I want us to take credit, but I want us to be respectful. I want us not to join in calling names. I want us to say to the President of the United States: "Don't keep doing this." I want to say to the Members on the opposite side of the aisle: "You are better than this, and you don't need this for your reelection. You don't need this to send a message to your citizens that you are saving them from poor, corrupt countries."

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) having assumed the chair, Mr. PALMER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3326) to increase accountability, combat corruption, and strengthen management effectiveness at the World Bank, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1702

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

WORLD BANK ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 693 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3326.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1702

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R.

3326) to increase accountability, combat corruption, and strengthen management effectiveness at the World Bank, with Mr. CARTER of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115-518 by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 115-518 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

AYES—420

Abraham	Carson (IN)	Deutch
Adams	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Dingell
Aguilar	Cartwright	Doggett
Allen	Castor (FL)	Donovan
Amash	Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael
Amodei	Chabot	F.
Arrington	Cheney	Duffy
Babin	Chu, Judy	Duncan (SC)
Bacon	Cicilline	Duncan (TN)
Banks (IN)	Clark (MA)	Dunn
Barletta	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Barr	Clay	Emmer
Barragán	Cleaver	Engel
Barton	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bass	Coffman	Espallat
Beatty	Cohen	Estes (KS)
Bera	Cole	Esty (CT)
Bergman	Collins (GA)	Evans
Beyer	Collins (NY)	Farenthold
Biggs	Comer	Faso
Bilirakis	Comstock	Ferguson
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (MI)	Connolly	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Flores
Black	Cooper	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Correa	Foster
Blum	Costa	Fox
Blumenauer	Costello (PA)	Frankel (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Frelinghuysen
Bonamici	Cramer	Fudge
Bost	Crawford	Gabbard
Boyle, Brendan	Crist	Gaetz
F.	Crowley	Gallagher
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Gallego
Brat	Culberson	Garamendi
Bridenstine	Curbelo (FL)	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Curtis	Gianforte
Brooks (IN)	Davidson	Gibbs
Brown (MD)	Davis (CA)	Gohmert
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Gomez
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Gonzalez (TX)
Buck	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Bucshon	DeGette	Gosar
Budd	Delaney	Gottheimer
Burgess	DeLauro	Gowdy
Bustos	DelBene	Granger
Butterfield	Demings	Graves (GA)
Byrne	Denham	Graves (LA)
Calvert	Dent	Graves (MO)
Capuano	DeSantis	Green, Al
Carbajal	DeSaulnier	Green, Gene
Cárdenas	DesJarlais	Griffith

Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.

Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

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

□ 1726

Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. TSONGAS, Messrs. FARENTHOLD and MCCAUL changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.
The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3326) to increase accountability, combat corruption, and strengthen management effectiveness at the World Bank, and, pursuant to House Resolution 693, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4279; and

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 184, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]
AYES—237

Abraham	Barr	Bost
Aderholt	Barton	Brat
Allen	Bergman	Bridenstine
Amodei	Billirakis	Brooks (IN)
Arrington	Bishop (MI)	Buchanan
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Buck
Bacon	Black	Bucshon
Banks (IN)	Blackburn	Budd
Barietta	Blum	Burgess

Byrne
Calvert
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill

NOES—184

Adams	Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael F.
Aguilar	Chu, Judy	Duncan (TN)
Amash	Cielline	Ellison
Barragan	Clark (MA)	Engel
Bass	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Beatty	Clay	Español
Bera	Cleaver	Esty (CT)
Beyer	Clyburn	Evans
Biggs	Cohen	Poster
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Blumenauer	Cooper	Fudge
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Gabbard
Bonamici	Crist	Gaetz
Boyle, Brendan F.	Crowley	Galleo
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Gohmert
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Danny	Gomez
Brown (MD)	DeFazio	Green, Al
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Green, Gene
Bustos	Delaney	Grijalva
Butterfield	DeLauro	Gutiérrez
Capuano	DelBene	Hanabusa
Carbajal	Demings	Harris
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Hastings
Cartwright	Dingell	Heck
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Higgins (NY)

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

NOT VOTING—10

Brady (TX)	Long	Scalise
Cummings	Loudermilk	Vela
Kind	Noem	
Lewis (GA)	Poe (TX)	

Himes	Marchant	Sanford	Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Loeb sack	Royce (CA)	Smith (NE)	Visclosky
Hoyer	Massie	Sarbanes	Brooks (AL)	Fudge	Lofgren	Ruiz	Smith (NJ)	Wagner
Huffman	Matsui	Schakowsky	Brooks (IN)	Gabbard	Loudermilk	Ruppersberger	Smith (TX)	Walberg
Jackson Lee	McClintock	Schiff	Brown (MD)	Gaetz	Love	Rush	Smith (WA)	Walden
Jayapal	McCollum	Scott (VA)	Brownley (CA)	Gallagher	Lowenthal	Russell	Smucker	Walker
Jeffries	McEachin	Scott, David	Buchanan	Gallego	Lowey	Rutherford	Soto	Walorski
Johnson (GA)	McGovern	Serrano	Buck	Garamendi	Lucas	Ryan (OH)	Speier	Walters, Mimi
Johnson, E. B.	McNerney	Sewell (AL)	Bucshon	Garrett	Luetkemeyer	Sánchez	Stefanik	Walz
Jones	Meeks	Shea-Porter	Budd	Gianforte	Lujan Grisham,	Sanford	Stewart	Wasserman
Jordan	Meng	Sires	Burgess	Gibbs	M.	Sarbanes	Stivers	Schultz
Kaptur	Moore	Slaughter	Bustos	Gohmert	Luján, Ben Ray	Schakowsky	Suozzi	Waters, Maxine
Keating	Moulton	Butterfield	Butterfield	Gomez	MacArthur	Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman
Kelly (IL)	Nadler	Byrne	Byrne	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney,	Schneider	Takano	Weber (TX)
Kennedy	Napolitano	Calvert	Calvert	Goodlatte	Carolyn B.	Schrader	Taylor	Webster (FL)
Khanna	Neal	Capuano	Capuano	Gosar	Maloney, Sean	Schweikert	Tenney	Welch
Kihuen	Nolan	Carbajal	Carbajal	Marchant	Marchant	Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Westrup
Kildee	Takano	Cárdenas	Cárdenas	Marino	Marino	Scott, Austin	Thompson (MS)	Westerman
Kilmer	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)	Carson (IN)	Gowdy	Marshall	Scott, David	Thompson (PA)	Williams
Krishnamoorthi	Pallone	Thompson (MS)	Carter (GA)	Granger	Marshall	Sensenbrenner	Thornberry	Wilson (FL)
Kuster (NH)	Panetta	Titus	Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Massie	Serrano	Tipton	Wilson (SC)
Labrador	Pascrell	Tonko	Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Mast	Sessions	Titus	Wittman
Langevin	Payne	Torres	Cartwright	Graves (MO)	Matsui	Sessions	Tonko	Womack
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Tsongas	Castor (FL)	Green, Al	McCarthy	Shea-Porter	Torres	Woodall
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Vargas	Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	McCaul	Sherman	Trott	Yarmuth
Lawrence	Perry	Veasey	Chabot	Griffith	McClintock	Shimkus	Tsongas	Yoder
Lee	Pingree	Velázquez	Cheney	Grijalva	McCollum	Shuster	Turner	Yoho
Levin	Pocan	Visclosky	Chu, Judy	Grothman	McEachin	Simpson	Upton	Young (AK)
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Walz	Cicilline	Guthrie	McGovern	Sinema	Valadao	Young (IA)
Loeb sack	Quigley	Wasserman	Clark (MA)	Gutiérrez	McHenry	Sires	Vargas	Zeldin
Lofgren	Raskin	Wasserman	Clarke (NY)	Hanabusa	McKinley	Slaughter	Veasey	
Lowenthal	Rice (NY)	Schultz	Clay	Handel	McMorris	Smith (MO)	Velázquez	
Lowey	Richmond	Waters, Maxine	Cleaver	Harper	Rodgers			
Luján Grisham,	Roybal-Allard	Watson Coleman	Clyburn	Harris	McNerney			
M.	Ruiz	Welch	Coffman	Hartzler	McSally			
Luján, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)	Cohen	Hastings	Meadows			
Lynch	Rush	Yarmuth	Cole	Heck	Meehan	Jones	Lynch	
Maloney,	Ryan (OH)	Yoho	Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Meeks			
Carolyn B.	Sánchez		Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Meng			
			Comer	Hice, Jody B.	Messer	Brady (TX)	Long	Rooney, Thomas
			Comstock	Higgins (LA)	Mitchell	Cummings	Noem	J.
			Conaway	Higgins (NY)	Moolenaar	Kind	Poe (TX)	Scalise
			Connolly	Hill	Mooney (WV)	Lewis (GA)		Vela
			Cook	Himes	Moore			
			Cooper	Holding	Moulton			
			Correa	Hollingsworth	Mullin			
			Costa	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)			
			Costello (PA)	Hudson	Nadler			
			Courtney	Huffman	Napolitano			
			Cramer	Huizenga	Neal			
			Crawford	Hultgren	Newhouse			
			Crist	Hunter	Nolan			
			Crowley	Hurd	Norcross			
			Cuellar	Issa	Norman			
			Culberson	Jackson Lee	Nunes			
			Curbelo (FL)	Jayapal	O'Halleran			
			Curtis	Jeffries	O'Rourke			
			Davidson	Jenkins (KS)	Olson			
			Davis (CA)	Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo			
			Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Pallone			
			Davis, Rodney	Johnson (LA)	Palmer			
			DeFazio	Johnson (OH)	Panetta			
			DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell			
			Delaney	Johnson, Sam	Paulsen			
			DeLauro	Jordan	Payne			
			DeBene	Joyce (OH)	Pearce			
			Demings	Kaptur	Pelosi			
			Denham	Katko	Perlmutter			
			Dent	Keating	Perry			
			DeSantis	Kelly (IL)	Peters			
			DeSaulnier	Kelly (MS)	Peterson			
			DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Pingree			
			Deutsch	Kennedy	Pittenger			
			Diaz-Balart	Khanna	Pocan			
			Dingell	Kihuen	Poliquin			
			Doggett	Kildee	Polis			
			Donovan	Kilmer	Posey			
			Doyle, Michael	King (IA)	Price (NC)			
			F.	King (NY)	Quigley			
			Duffy	Kinzinger	Raskin			
			Duncan (SC)	Knight	Ratcliffe			
			Duncan (TN)	Krishnamoorthi	Reed			
			Dunn	Kuster (NH)	Reichert			
			Ellison	Kustoff (TN)	Renacci			
			Emmer	Labrador	Rice (NY)			
			Engel	LaHood	Rice (SC)			
			Eshoo	LaMalfa	Richmond			
			Española	Lamborn	Roby			
			Estes (KS)	Lance	Roe (TN)			
			Esty (CT)	Langevin	Rogers (AL)			
			Evans	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)			
			Farenthold	Larson (CT)	Rohrabacher			
			Faso	Latta	Rokita	Abraham	Barton	Brooks (IN)
			Ferguson	Lawrence	Rooney, Francis	Aderholt	Beatty	Brown (MD)
			Fitzpatrick	Lawson (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Aguiar	Bilirakis	Buchanan
			Fleischmann	Lee	Rosen	Allen	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
			Flores	Levin	Roskam	Amodel	Black	Budd
			Fortenberry	Lewis (MN)	Ross	Arrington	Blumenauer	Bustos
			Foster	Lieu, Ted	Rothfus	Bacon	Blunt Rochester	Butterfield
			Fox	Lipinski	Rouzer	Banks (IN)	Bonamici	Byrne
			Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard	Barletta	Brat	Calvert
						Barr	Bridenstine	Carson (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Poe (TX)
Cummings	Long	Scalise
Kind	Noem	Vela

□ 1737

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4279) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise any rules necessary to enable closed-end companies to use the securities offering and proxy rules that are available to other issuers of securities, 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 Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 2, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—418

Abraham	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Adams	Barragán	Black
Aderholt	Barton	Blackburn
Aguiar	Bass	Blum
Allen	Beatty	Blumenauer
Amash	Bera	Blunt Rochester
Amodel	Bergman	Bonamici
Arrington	Beyer	Bost
Babin	Biggs	Boyle, Brendan
Bacon	Bilirakis	F.
Banks (IN)	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Barletta	Bishop (MI)	Brat

NAYS—2

	Lynch	
Brady (TX)	Long	Rooney, Thomas
Cummings	Noem	J.
Kind	Poe (TX)	Scalise
Lewis (GA)		Vela

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1744

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.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 185, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—225

Abraham	Barton	Brooks (IN)
Aderholt	Beatty	Brown (MD)
Aguiar	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Amodel	Black	Budd
Arrington	Blumenauer	Bustos
Bacon	Blunt Rochester	Butterfield
Banks (IN)	Bonamici	Byrne
Barletta	Brat	Calvert
Barr	Bridenstine	Carson (IN)

Carter (TX) Himes
 Cartwright Hollingsworth
 Chabot Huffman
 Chu, Judy Huizenga
 Ciциlline Hultgren
 Clay Hunter
 Cole Issa
 Collins (GA) Jeffries
 Collins (NY) Johnson (GA)
 Comer Johnson (LA)
 Comstock Johnson, Sam
 Cook Joyce (OH)
 Cooper Kaptur
 Courtney Kelly (IL)
 Cramer Kelly (MS)
 Cuellar Kelly (PA)
 Davidson Kennedy
 Davis (CA) Kildee
 Davis, Rodney King (IA)
 DeGette King (NY)
 DeLauro Knight
 DelBene Kuster (NH)
 Demings Kustoff (TN)
 Dent Labrador
 DeSaulnier LaMalfa
 DesJarlais Lamborn
 Deutch Larsen (WA)
 Diaz-Balart Lewis (MN)
 Dingell Lipinski
 Doggett Loudermilk
 Donovan Love
 Duffy Lucas
 Duncan (SC) Luetkemeyer
 Duncan (TN) Lujan Grisham,
 Ellison M.
 Engel Lujan, Ben Ray
 Eshoo Marino
 Estes (KS) Massie
 Evans McCarthy
 Farenthold McCaul
 Ferguson McClintock
 Fleischmann McEachin
 Fortenberry McHenry
 Foster McMorris
 Frankel (FL) Rodgers
 Frelinghuysen Mc Nerney
 Gabbard Meadows
 Garamendi Meng
 Garrett Messer
 Gianforte Mitchell
 Gibbs Moolenaar
 Gonzalez (TX) Mooney (WV)
 Goodlatte Moore
 Gosar Moulton
 Gowdy Mullin
 Granger Murphy (FL)
 Griffith Nadler
 Grothman Napolitano
 Guthrie Newhouse
 Handel Norman
 Harper Nunes
 Harris O'Rourke
 Hartzler Olson
 Heck Palmer
 Hensarling Panetta
 Higgins (LA) Pelosi

NAYS—185

Adams Coffman
 Amash Cohen
 Babin Conaway
 Barragan Connolly
 Bass Correa
 Bera Costa
 Bergman Costello (PA)
 Beyer Crawford
 Biggs Crist
 Bishop (GA) Crowley
 Bishop (MI) Culberson
 Blackburn Curbelo (FL)
 Blum Curtis
 Bost Davis, Danny
 Boyle, Brendan DeFazio
 F. Delaney
 Brady (PA) Denham
 Brooks (AL) DeSantis
 Brownley (CA) Doyle, Michael
 Buck F.
 Burgess Emmer
 Capuano Espaillat
 Carbajal Esty (CT)
 Cárdenas Faso
 Carter (GA) Fitzpatrick
 Castor (FL) Flores
 Cheney Foxx
 Clark (MA) Fudge
 Clarke (NY) Gaetz
 Cleaver Gallagher
 Clyburn Gallego

Perlmutter
 Peters
 Puffman
 Polis
 Posey
 Quigley
 Rice (SC)
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney, Francis
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Royce (CA)
 Ruppersberger
 Russell
 Rutherford
 Sanford
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Speier
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Taylor
 Thornberry
 Titus
 Torres
 Trott
 Wagner
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Womack
 Yarmuth
 Yoho
 Young (IA)

Kilmer
 Kinzinger
 Krishnamoorthi
 LaHood
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lieu, Ted
 LoBiondo
 Loebsock
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Mast
 Matsui
 McGovern
 Shear-Porter
 McKinley
 McSally
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Perry
 Peterson
 Pittenger
 Poliquin
 Price (NC)
 Raskin
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Renacci
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rogers (AL)
 Rokita
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Rosen
 Roskam
 Rouzer
 Ruiz
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes

Schakowsky
 Schrader
 Sewell (AL)
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Soto
 Stivers
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Tenney
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Watson Coleman
 Wenstrup
 Wittman
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Zeldin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tonko
 NOT VOTING—19

Brady (TX) Long
 Castro (TX) McCollum
 Cummings Noem
 Dunn Pingree
 Hoyer Poe (TX)
 Kind Reichert
 Lewis (GA)

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

□ 1752

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to inclement weather, I am unavoidably prevented from voting on today's legislation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 23, "yea" on rollcall No. 24, "yea" on rollcall No. 25, and "yea" on rollcall No. 26.

CONGRATULATING MAYOR BRUNO CARNOVALE ON MORE THAN 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

(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 Emporium Borough Mayor Bruno Carnovale on his upcoming retirement after more than 50 years of service to the community.

Mayor Carnovale first served as a council person for 18 years, then as civil service chairperson for the Emporium Borough Police Department for 4 years, and, most recently, as mayor beginning in 1988.

It was 1966 when Bruno Carnovale ran for office with the goal of finding a solution to continual flooding problems near Oak Street. He stuck around long after that goal was achieved.

Mayor Carnovale grew up in Johnsonburg, but he has had connec-

tions to Emporium since spending childhood summers working on his grandfather's farm. After high school graduation, he moved to Emporium and briefly went to work for Sylvania before joining the Navy during World War II. After the war, he returned to Sylvania and became a senior electrical designer, certified electrical inspector, and master electrician.

Mayor Carnovale has been active with The American Legion, Lions Club, Cameron County Republican Committee, the American Cancer Society, and he is an active member of St. Mark's Church.

Mr. Speaker, I wish him the best in his well-deserved retirement, and I thank him for his service.

DIVERSITY VISAS

(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, 8 years ago, a devastating earthquake in Haiti killed hundreds of thousands of people. Still today, our neighbor is suffering from the remnants of that disaster.

But instead of extending American hospitality to Haitians, the President cursed them out, laying bare his racist intention to destroy the fundamental ideals of our immigration policy.

Mr. Speaker, the American Dream must remain open to anyone from anywhere who wants to come here for any reason, especially if they are seeking refuge from disease, famine, or oppression, just as generations have come here in our history.

The diversity visa program does just that. It helps people—particularly the African diaspora—achieve the American Dream.

We must protect the diversity visa program and not sacrifice ourselves to the false promise of America-first nationalism.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of inclusion. We are a nation of open-armed freedom for all people, not just Norwegians. The President may speak for the alt-right, but he does not speak for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIANFORTE). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1800

TAX REFORM

(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 talk about the benefits that many Americans across the country are already seeing from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

After hearing leaders of the Democratic Party call \$1,000 "crumbs," I wanted to make sure my colleagues on

the other side of the aisle understood that our tax reform and relief plan is more than just crumbs to over 2 million Americans.

Immediately following the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we saw an outpouring of businesses announce they would offer bonuses to their employees, and some even increased their wages. This money was instantly invested back into American workers.

I would like to see one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle come to Mississippi and see the response they get after they tell the Levins and the Ladners in Saucier, Mississippi, that \$1,000 is only crumbs. I promise you they would only say it once.

As we go into 2018, I will continue highlighting real stories of Mississippi businesses that are benefiting from our new Tax Code.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, the Federal Government runs out of money. We owe the American people a long-term solution to keep the government open.

Democrats insist that this solution address the urgent issues facing the American people, those we represent. That means long-term funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program; funding for communities fighting the deadly opioid epidemic; funding for the VA Choice Program so that our heroic veterans get the care they need and deserve; passing the Dream Act; and providing additional disaster recovery funds for Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Texas, Florida, and Colorado.

I urge my Republican colleagues to be sure that these issues are addressed in the continuing resolution. Work with the Democrats. Let's get this done for the American people.

NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, January is National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

With as many as 25 million people enslaved worldwide, human trafficking is an abhorrent practice that has become one of the most important human rights issues of our time.

Here in the United States, there are an estimated 100,000 minors at risk of being trafficked. We have taken positive, bipartisan action on a number of bills—18 this past year, Mr. Speaker—to combat trafficking, fight child abuse and exploitation, support and protect victims, and strengthen law enforcement's ability to go after the traffickers.

While we can be proud of the progress we have made, clearly there is more that needs to be done, including cracking down on the demand side of the equation and holding websites accountable for advertising sex with juveniles.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to make this effort a priority and work with law enforcement, victims service groups, and other stakeholders to end human trafficking.

FINDING LEGISLATIVE SOLUTIONS FOR DREAMERS

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Congress to move quickly on finding a legislative solution for DREAMers before January 19.

With every passing day that Congress delays action from now until March 5, approximately 122 people will lose their DACA protection. We cannot forget about the consequences that DACA termination will have on women and their families.

Mr. Speaker, 53 percent of active DACA recipients are women. As the vice chair of the Democratic Women's Working Group, I am here to say that we need to represent all women and their families. All women just want a better future for themselves and their children. Without safety from deportation, families will be torn apart. Many DREAMers now have children of their own.

It is time for Congress to act. I am standing here today speaking for women in this country.

AMERICAN HOCKEY LEAGUE ALL-STAR GAME

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Utica Comets of the American Hockey League, the team that has been selected to host the AHL All-Star game on Sunday, January 28, through Monday, January 29, at the Adirondack Bank Center in our own home city at the Utica Memorial Auditorium.

Central New York has a strong hockey tradition, from the AHL's Comets and Binghamton Devils to the classic powerhouse teams of the past, the legendary Clinton Comets.

Many other collegiate hockey teams hail from our region: the Hamilton College Continentals; my own home alma mater, the Colgate Raiders; and the Utica College Pioneers.

Fans are passionate for hockey in the Mohawk Valley and Southern Tier, which the AHL recognized by awarding the Utica Comets with the 2015 All-Star game. The success of this event was, in large part, due to the Comets organization, including former National Hockey League goalie Rob

Esche; the amazing Comets fans; and the greater Utica community, whose hospitality showcased the enthusiasm and warmth of our region.

Our entire community is thrilled that AHL has again awarded the 2018 All-Star game to the Utica Comets, and it is my hope that fans across the United States and Canada will come to Utica to see great hockey and to enjoy the great spirit of our community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STANLEY JOHN KACZOROWSKI

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. Stanley John Kaczorowski, who passed away on December 23 at the age of 78.

Mr. Kaczorowski dedicated much of his life to public service in our Nation's judicial system. Originally from New Jersey, Mr. Kaczorowski graduated from Seton Hall University Law School before being hired as the assistant prosecutor for Union County, New Jersey. As assistant prosecutor, he tried his first murder trial at the age of 25.

After a number of years with the prosecutor's office in New Jersey, he moved with his family to Georgia's First Congressional District, specifically Skidaway Island. Here, he continued his dedication to public service by serving on the Chatham County Board of Elections.

He is survived by his wife, Carole, of 30 years, along with a number of children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren. Mr. Kaczorowski will be missed.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF LOUISBURG, KANSAS

(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 celebrate the 150th anniversary of the founding of Louisburg, Kansas.

Today, Louisburg kicks off its celebration at Louisburg City Hall, and although I cannot be there, I am honored to join in the celebration of this community I have the privilege of representing in Congress. Congratulations to Mayor Marty Southard, City Manager Nathan Law, and all the community leaders who have come together to recognize the 150th anniversary.

Founded in 1868, Louisburg is a town of wonderful history, great people, outstanding public schools, booming businesses, and beautiful parks and lakes. Louisburg is home to a number of small businesses that have contributed to its success and growth.

One of my favorite stops each fall is the Louisburg Cider Mill. Brooke and I

always have a great time watching the girls choose pumpkins, enjoy cider donuts, and take in all the fun fall activities.

I am proud to represent Louisburg resident Joe Steffy of Poppin' Joe's Gourmet Kettle Korn, started in 2005. As a young man with Down syndrome and autism, Joe has testified before Congress as a small-business leader, and I had the pleasure of meeting him on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Speaker, these small businesses are just two examples of what makes Louisburg great. Congratulations to Louisburg, and I look forward to another great 150 years.

TAX PLAN GOOD FOR OUR ECONOMY

(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, we heard last week about \$1,000 being crumbs and how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act doesn't really mean anything for normal people.

Where I come from, this means a lot to people. \$100 bills and \$50 bills adding up to \$1,000 is real money to real people, maybe not in San Francisco, but in my district and a lot of places in this country.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is working. These dollars are coming home. I just read today that Apple is going to repatriate billions of dollars and pay \$38 billion of new taxes because they see a fair tax rate, and they want to come back and reinvest in America once again. That is \$38 billion for the good of the economy that may not have come back home, but now will, because now we have a tax rate that is friendly to the people who provide jobs and make the economy happen in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know anybody who would step over a dollar instead of stopping to pick it up. These aren't crumbs on the ground. These are the things that make America strong again and our economy good again. They are not just merely crumbs that elitists in San Francisco or coastal counties in California think don't mean anything. We are on the right track with this. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will mean more for Americans and their pocketbooks, lower taxes, and a better economy.

DACA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to re-

vising and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I speak tonight on the issue of the DACA program.

In 2012, President Obama issued an executive action to allow 800,000 young people, known as DACA kids, to remain in the United States. These are young immigrants who were brought here at an early age by their parents, people who had no choice in whether to come to the United States, but, for many, this is the only home and only Nation they have ever known.

These young people now face the threat of deportation if Congress does not act as soon as possible. And certainly, by March 5, 800,000 young people will become subject to deportation. Already, there has been a cost to Congress' inaction. Every day, 122 of these folks become subject to deportation.

We all understand in this body the long history of immigration to the United States and the incredible contributions that immigrants from around the world have made to our Nation. These are people from Germany, Ireland, Latin America, Africa, and Asia. From literally every corner of the globe, people have come here lending their talents, their energy, their creativity, and their passion to making sure that the United States remains the greatest Nation on Earth. That is the case with the DACA kids.

Today, I am joined by several of my colleagues who are going to share some stories about DACA recipients, their lives, and the contributions they are making in our American communities and in American life.

But before I yield to my first colleague, I want to run through, for a minute, the requirements for somebody to be a DACA recipient. This has sometimes been, obviously, a very passionate, sometimes heated debate about what should happen with the DACA recipients and whether the Congress should even commit itself to coming up with a DACA solution. Whether it is people making comments on television or sometimes comments you read online, it is clear that there is a lot of misinformation out there—sometimes, willful misinformation—about who these people are.

So I want to read real quickly the requirements for somebody to be a DACA recipient.

□ 1815

First, they were under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012.

Second, they came to the United States before reaching their 16th birthday.

Third, they have continuously resided in the United States since June 15, 2007, up to the present time.

Fourth, they were physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012,

and at the time of making the request for consideration of deferred action with USCIS.

Fifth, they had no lawful status on June 15, 2012.

Sixth, they are currently in school, have graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, have obtained a general equivalency development—GED—certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the Coast Guard or Armed Forces of the United States.

And, seventh, they have not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more misdemeanors, and did not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

This addresses two of the common questions or, sometimes, criticisms that you hear about the DACA program, which, first, is the idea that some of these folks are criminals. Well, it makes very clear in these requirements that that cannot be the case.

And then, second, this idea that, hey, these folks, if they wanted to, they could have just become citizens. Again, number five was: had no lawful status on June 15, 2012, when the program commenced.

These are energetic, hardworking folks that we can be very proud of who are making significant contributions to American society.

Congress must act—and we should act this week—to come up with a DACA solution, to make sure that no more of these kids are subject to deportation, that their lives are no longer left in the balance, and that their futures are secure. These are folks who are in college, who have graduated and have gone into different fields, different professions, teachers and many other different professions that are represented by the DACA students now. Congress must act to make sure that they can stay in the country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the DREAMers issue, DACA recipients, is very personal for me. My district is 70 percent Latino, and I have an estimated 8,000 DACA recipients. I also have a cousin who is a recipient of DACA.

It is heartbreaking to hear the stories of recipients who are living in uncertainty, living in fear, and who tell you firsthand of the sense of urgency that they feel. It is a sense of urgency that, frankly, I don't feel is happening here in Congress.

Now, I will talk to my colleagues across the aisle, and they will tell me: "I support a solution. I want to do something to help DACA recipients." But we can't get a vote. The leadership will not give us a vote on the Dream Act. They won't give us a vote on any legislation that involves DACA.

Just today, we had White House Chief of Staff Kelly come in to meet

with members of the Hispanic Caucus to talk about this issue. We continue to hear that the President is committed to finding a fix, yet he is using DACA recipients as a political pawn, a political pawn to get a wall that he said Mexico would pay for.

Frankly, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I know that putting money into a wall is not the best use of our dollars.

This issue is urgent; it is real. These are people's lives. They are doctors, they are nurses, and they are teachers.

In my very district, I have a DACA recipient named Roque Pech. He was my guest for the State of the Union last year, somebody who is now teaching our children, somebody who is giving back to our community.

DACA recipients are good folks. They are our neighbors. They are our friends. They are our family members. There is overwhelming support, on a bipartisan basis, to give them the protections that they need and deserve. Members of our military who are serving are also DACA recipients.

I urge us all to come together to find a solution, so that we can deliver on providing the protections that DACA recipients so urgently need and so urgently want, and stop making this a political football so that we can also move on to other issues.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I bring up my next colleague, Congresswoman BARRAGÁN talked about the incredible DREAMers, DACA recipients that are in her district, and I have many in my district. I represent a very large city in Texas, the city of San Antonio—I have the main San Antonio district—and you can imagine that we have our fair share of DACA recipients in San Antonio.

I want to read, really quickly, the story of just one of them. Her name is Lisa.

Lisa is a first-generation American who immigrated to the United States from Canada in October 1996 at the age of 6. Lisa learned she had, unknowingly, overstayed her visa on December 19, 2010, just a day after the DREAM Act stalled in the Senate, when she received, in the mail, a notice to appear in immigration court, which is the first step in deportation proceedings.

She went to elementary, middle, and high school in San Antonio. During that time, she was a Girl Scout, logged more than 700 hours of community service during her high school years, and spearheaded a fundraiser that raised \$10,000 to help pay for the bone marrow transplant of a young leukemia patient whom she had never met.

In 2008, she graduated from a San Antonio high school with summa cum laude honors, ranking in the top 6 percent of her class. She spent the summer working as a congressional intern for the United States House of Representatives, right here—for my predecessor, Charlie Gonzalez—before heading to Northwestern University to

study journalism and political science. Lisa was sitting at her college graduation ceremony on the day that President Obama announced the DACA program, June 15, 2012.

Her work permit has enabled her to take out a mortgage, buy a car, get a job, pay taxes, renew her driver's license, and repay six figures—about \$114,000—of student loans used to fund her Northwestern University degree.

Today, Lisa is a communications associate at a nonprofit. As a reporter, Lisa's work has been published in The Washington Post, Huffington Post, San Antonio Express-News, Boulder Daily Camera, The Denver Post, and several other places. Her story is just one story of the incredible folks who are part of the DACA program that are contributing to the greatness of our Nation.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, we have waited too long to protect the DREAMers. This is unacceptable to me and to the vast majority of Americans.

My Republican colleagues say that we have until March to fix this issue, but that is simply not true. 16,287 DREAMers have lost their protection since September. For those DREAMers, the deadline has already passed.

This is not a partisan issue. I would like to remind my colleagues that the Dream Act is a bipartisan bill. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership and the White House have not acted in good faith. They have politicized this issue. They have backed themselves to the wall. They are holding the fate of DREAMers hostage.

They say that they want to help DREAMers, but then they say they will only help DREAMers in exchange for border security, demanding that we give up on our commitment to keeping families together, ending the Diversity Visa program, knowing that these are poison pills.

If Republicans truly want to help DREAMers, Democrats stand ready. If Republicans want to compromise on a comprehensive immigration reform bill, we are ready to do that, too.

We can talk about all of the changes to our immigration system that Republicans want at the same time that we talk about how we bring 11 million people, undocumented people, out of the shadows and on a pathway to citizenship. But the issue of DREAMers and comprehensive immigration reform should simply be kept separate.

Show some leadership. President Trump says he wants a "bill of love." So do I and so do my colleagues.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Congresswoman was talking about the support for DACA, and it is true that surveys consistently show that the American people support the DACA kids at about 83 percent or so. That is an incredible, overwhelming majority support for this program.

She mentioned the possible tradeoff. There has been this argument that we should pass a clean Dream Act, for ex-

ample, which is a DACA fix, and whether it should be paired with anything else, like, if we are going to pass a DACA bill, what is the price to pay for that? That is the common debate. What is the President, or what is the majority, going to demand for that?

But as Congresswoman TORRES mentioned, I would just point out that that 83 percent support among the American people is not 83 percent only if you build a wall. The American people don't say: We support the DACA kids, but only if you build a wall across the United States of America. They say: We support the DACA kids, and we want to make sure that those kids can stay and continue to live in the United States of America.

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand with the DREAMers, both those living throughout the great San Joaquin Valley whom I have the honor and the privilege to represent, as well as those across the entire United States. We in the valley—as we like to say—and throughout our Nation are, let us remember, a nation of immigrants, past and present.

So we know the integral role, both historically and today, that immigrants have played throughout the great history of our Nation in terms of the development of our economy and our communities. The contributions that have been made are the story of America. And our DREAMers, these young immigrants, also make immense contributions, and their story is a part of America's story.

It is estimated that roughly 685,000 of our Nation's workers, our DREAMers, with protections through the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program, that if we, in fact, remove them as some are maybe suggesting, it would impact over \$460 billion to our Nation's economy, to our GDP. Think about that.

In my home State of California, it is estimated that there are over 193,000 DREAMers who are currently legal, who are working and contributing with these DACA protections, and that removing them from the workforce in California would cost an estimated \$11.6 billion to the GDP of California.

Does this make any sense? No.

But the DREAMers also serve in our military, protecting our Nation both at home and abroad, in harm's way. They are our friends. They are our neighbors. They are deacons in our local churches, and many of them are students, hoping to contribute to the betterment of America. They, too, want to be a part—and they are, in fact—of the American Dream.

In my district alone, we have over 600 DREAMers at the University of California, Merced, and more than that at my alma mater, Fresno State University.

But these DREAMers are young men and women. They are not just numbers.

These are people. They are people, many of whom we have trusted to be a part of our country, to uphold its word, when they basically enrolled to be a part of the DACA program.

Just today, I spoke to two DREAMers in my office. One of them is a remarkable young person, currently getting her Ph.D. in physics—she is 27 years old—at the University of California, Merced, focusing her research on solar energy.

□ 1830

Just think about this: helping America with the next generation of our energy development.

Her name is Bo. She hopes to work in renewable energy when she gets her Ph.D., but now with the possible removal of DACA, her future is uncertain. She came here when she was 3 years old. Her DACA protections expire in less than 1 year.

Another DREAMer I spoke to today was a student body president while working on his bachelor's degree at Fresno State, my alma mater. His name is Pedro. He has graduated now. He has earned his master's degree in public policy and urban affairs and is contributing to the economy of our valley and to our State. His DACA protections expire within months.

Think about that. Think about the gravity of these two students, Bo and Pedro. In less than a year, they don't know if they are going to be here. This is their country, as far as they are concerned.

Our DREAMers have shared stories time and time again of uncertainty and fear that is gripping their families and our communities as they are forced to wait and see if the only home that they have ever known, this country, will keep its word when they enrolled in the DACA program and create the protections that allow them to stay here and ultimately become citizens.

That is the question. That is what we are trying to achieve.

So I stand here today to say to my colleagues, as Members of the Congress, we all take an oath every 2 years. We swear to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies, foreign and domestic, and to promote, guess what, the general welfare for the good of our country.

Well, that is what this is all about, promoting the most positive things that can be a part of our country. These DREAMers are a part of that. So this has to be a part of our permanent solution.

Eighty-six percent of the people in this country support providing legal designation for these DREAMers, and it is imperative that we do the right thing. This is America. I will continue to work with my colleagues on the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and other Members of Congress in a bipartisan fashion to ensure that we do the right thing. This is the American way.

More than just protecting these young people, America needs a stable,

just, and commonsense immigration policy. Let's face it, our immigration system is broken. I will continue to work on a bipartisan basis for comprehensive immigration reform more broadly so that we don't end up back right where we are here today in bickering and in partisan, piecemeal, and often contradictory fashion that does nothing to fix our broken immigration system.

We must improve the dialogue and the debate. This problem is very solvable. It really is. Let's get past the political posturing, let's fix DACA and provide support for our DREAMers, let's move on in the second phase, which the President has suggested, and let's work on the other elements. We are for border security. It is important. We all support border security. Let's do the other things that are a part of fixing this broken immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for recognizing me.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Congressman COSTA, for his remarks. He made several very important points. One of them was the economic benefits of the DREAMer population, the DACA population, on their communities and how not only for California and his district, but for so many other parts of the country where you do have DACA recipients, it would be a real economic blow to deport these folks, to uproot them from the communities and simply get them out of here. It would be an economic blow to the economies of those cities and towns and States and, of course, to our Nation.

The second thing that I thought was very important is really the human element that right now, as you can imagine, these 800,000 young people are watching the United States Congress. Their parents, their brothers, their sisters, everybody who loves them realizes that their future hangs in the balance. They are living in fear and incredible anxiety wondering whether they are going to be allowed to stay in what is for most of them the only place they have ever known as home.

It would be like deciding that I am going to go live in Egypt or live in Uruguay or anywhere else. I simply have no connection to those places as home.

That is what these young people are facing if this Congress refuses to act. That is what they are facing now.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely correct. That is why this debate is so important and that is why we must come together not just on behalf of Bo and Pedro, as I cited their examples, but for the 800,000-plus DREAMers across this country and their families.

This is just good common sense. It is the right thing to do and it is the thing that we must do to move our Nation on a positive track.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for all his hard work. I am honored to be a part of this Special Order.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for being a champion on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CASTRO for his great leadership on this issue.

I want to take a moment to talk about the story of Mariana Castro. Mariana is going to be interning for us this year, and she is an ambitious young DREAMer from Florida.

In 2005, Mariana left Lima, Peru, at the age of 10 with her mother, leaving her father and brothers behind for a safer life.

She was in the high school IB program. Not until the 10th grade did she realize that regardless of her excellent grades and involvement in hundreds of hours of community service, her undocumented status would be a hurdle to pursuing higher education.

A few months before graduation, DACA—Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals—was a miracle. She would now be able to provide for her family, drive, and no longer live in the shadows.

Mariana enrolled in the University of Florida, but faced severe financial difficulties due to her status. As her only way to higher education, she temporarily paused her education and fought for tuition equity in the State of Florida. I had the honor of having a role in that, having been in the Florida Senate at the time when we passed instate tuition along with a bill that I had that admitted DREAMers into The Florida Bar. This would spark her passion for social justice.

Throughout her time at UF, she utilized her voice to speak for immigrant rights and human rights by taking several leadership positions within Chispas, the only student-led immigrant advocacy organization at UF.

She has helped start programs that provide training for professional staff under student affairs about relevant immigration laws that affect students as well.

She has helped raise thousands of dollars for Out of the Shadows, a scholarship specifically for undocumented students in Florida that she oversaw for 3 years.

She spent a semester working for the Florida Senate and has also worked as a Know Your Rights trainer for the Florida Immigrant Coalition, where she was able to educate the immigrant community about their rights in the United States through mobile consulates.

Due to her status, she is unable to qualify for loans and only qualifies to be eligible for a very limited amount of scholarships. Mariana has been paying for her education out of pocket, working 20 to 30 hours during school and 50-plus hours during school breaks.

Her only close relative in the States, her mother, has been undergoing difficult medical procedures, including treatment for human papillomavirus

and, most recently, severe glaucoma, making her unable to support her daughter.

After graduation, she hopes to attend law school to continue her fight for immigrant families across the Nation. But if the DACA program doesn't exist, if DREAMers aren't given their rights, then she will never be able to practice law under Florida law.

I am proud to announce that Mariana will be completing a congressional internship in my office this semester.

In Florida, we have 92,000 individuals who would be eligible for DACA, 92,000 DREAMers, and I have met so many of them. They are ambitious. They are attending college. They are starting small businesses. They are joining our military. They are the very best of what this Nation has to offer. Their struggles have shaped them. Their obstacles have made them better, sharper, and hungrier for it.

We need to encourage these new American DREAMers, much like so many generations before them, in fact, the generations of ancestors of so many who occupy the seats in this Chamber. The time for action is now.

We want to have a clean Dream Act. That is our priority. But at the very least, rather than talk about shutdowns, let's talk about solutions.

There is a bill in the Senate. It is not perfect. There are things in there that I really don't like at all and that I know a lot of the members on the Congressional Hispanic Caucus don't like—in the Graham bill, along with Senator DURBIN—but it is a compromise and it is a start.

I challenge for them to put it on the floor, have a vote, and send it over to the House. And then I challenge Speaker RYAN to put this bill, whatever comes over from the Senate, on the floor. Let's put together amendments. Let's take the very best of our debate, of our ideas in this august Chamber, and let's put forward a product that deals with DREAMers, that deals with TPS, that deals with border security, and let's put it on the desk of the President. Let's dare the President not to sign something that could be the embodiment of a generational opportunity to resolve so many issues that are so important to both parties.

Mr. Speaker, let us not talk about shutdowns. Let us talk about solutions. I am honored to be here today with Congressman CASTRO to do just that.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SOTO for his wonderful words. He also brought up a few important things that I think we need to remember.

The first is this issue of DREAMers, or undocumented immigrants, is often in the American debate reduced to the idea that all of these folks are Mexican or from Mexico, when, in fact, it is actually a very diverse group of folks who are in the category of DREAMers or who are part of the DACA program.

So I would like to ask Mr. SOTO to describe the community that he rep-

resents around Orlando and some of the different groups that are represented in the DACA program.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me that opportunity.

Florida has every color in the rainbow, every religion, every background. Where you have Mickey Mouse, you tend to have a lot of folks around the world who are familiar with Orlando. So we have Haitians who are DREAMers. We have Peruvians who are DREAMers. We have folks from Vietnam and from Laos who are DREAMers. We have folks from every continent other than Antarctica.

I want to make this point: the law makes all the difference in these statuses.

I am of Puerto Rican descent. My father was born on the island, so, therefore, he is a citizen by a statute. We have a large Puerto Rican population, where most of my constituents who are from the island are only citizens because of an act passed over 100 years ago.

We also have a huge amount of Cuban Americans. Because of wet foot, dry foot policy, and because they were escaping tyranny, they are citizens.

So a law makes all the difference, and we know that for a fact and we live it every day in Florida, and that is what these kids need. The law needs to be on their side because it is the right thing to do. A law makes all the difference in these families' stories and these kids' opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are people of European descent, of Asian descent, certainly of Latin American descent, and of African descent who are part of the DACA program. So I am glad that the gentleman went through the variety, the diversity of the people in his area who are part of this program.

Now, bear in mind, my grandmother was from Mexico. My grandmother came here around 1922 as a 6-year-old orphan. I remember a few years back, this professional genealogist for a publication looked at my family's history because we had never formally looked it up, and she found the documents of when my grandmother came to the country. I remember there was a box in the form that said, "Purpose." In other words, the purpose for why she was coming. And it said, "To live."

I mean, that is how easy it was back then around 1922 to come to the United States, to live in this Nation.

□ 1845

It obviously has become much tougher since then. It just speaks to the wonderful, incredible diversity of people who have come here from different places around the world.

And then Congressman SOTO mentioned one other important thing, which is the historical context by which we find ourselves in this place.

When you think about it, there is this intense debate going on right now and this incredible push to do a DACA fix by the end of the week, hopefully; and a lot of people, I think, who may not have followed the volleying and the back and forth for a while are wondering why this is such a crisis now.

We know the immediate answer, which is, if we get to March 5, there are 800,000 of these young people who will be deportable, subject to deportation, who are part of the DACA program. Already, every day that passes, 122 more become deportable.

There was an opportunity a few years ago to deal not only with this part of the immigration issue, but to achieve what is called comprehensive immigration reform. And by "comprehensive," that just means that you are dealing not just with one part of immigration, but you are dealing with all of the different issues associated with immigration.

So it was DACA, but it was also issues with visas, like tech visas and agricultural workers. It was dealing with the parents of the DREAMers, for example.

And that bill that passed through the Senate with 68 votes, a wide majority in the Senate in 2014, it came over to the House and, based on public reports and what the Members of Congress had stated their support would be for or against that bill, there was a majority, over 218 Members—again, based on public reports; we never took the vote, but based on public reports—who said that they basically would have supported a bill like that.

At the time, Speaker Boehner refused to put that bill on the floor for a vote because of something called a Hastert rule. The Hastert rule is basically an informal rule that says that the Speaker of the House won't put a piece of legislation on the floor for a vote unless that piece of legislation already has the support of a majority of the majority. And at that time, the piece of legislation, even though it probably had 225 or 230 supporters in Congress, a clear majority to pass, didn't have over 50 percent support of the Republican Conference, which represented the majority party.

Now, my last point on this, and I know you know this, but when a Speaker governs with the Hastert rule, oftentimes the will of the majority is ignored in this House of Representatives, but it also does something very insidious. It allows about 25 percent of this body to control 100 percent of the legislation that comes through here.

So I thank the gentleman for bringing up the history and the context because this Congress and this country missed an incredible opportunity in 2014 to deal not only with the DACA issue, but also with the many other issues associated with immigration. So I thank Congressman SOTO.

Now I yield to Congressman CORREA, a wonderful new Member from California, and welcome him.

Mr. CORREA. I thank my colleague from Texas.

I represent Orange County, California. I would like to say that California is now the sixth largest economy in the world. My home county of Orange County, if it were a country today, would be the 32nd largest economy in the world.

My district is exploding with jobs, unemployment at a record low. We have biotech, high-tech, tourism, home to Disney land, the Angels. We also have recycling, manufacturing. You name it, it is there.

It is about Americans working hard; former immigrants, now Americans, also working hard; and new immigrants, like DACA students, DACA members of my community, also holding hands with all of us, working hard to enrich our communities, our neighborhoods, our county, our State, and our Nation.

Today, DACA recipients, model immigrants. Nobody in this body would ever debate the fact that we want immigrants who come to work hard, follow the laws, pay taxes, learn English, and study hard. Those are model citizens that any nation in the world would want, and we have them here in this country.

Just a few weeks ago, my daughter came home, 17 years old, from high school. Two of her best friends came with her, and they said: We want help, Mr. Congressman. You are a Congressman. We want some help.

And I said: What is the issue?

They said: We are both DACA students, and we are afraid. We are concerned. We want to go to college. We don't know what is going to happen.

I didn't have any answers for those two young ladies, but, really, the answer I gave them was the same answer I give all the DACA individuals, students I meet in my district, which is: Let me fight the fight for you in Washington, D.C. What you have got to do is continue to study hard, continue to follow the law, and don't give up praying.

I am convinced that, in this body, there are enough people to vote for DACA students, to vote to change the laws. Why? Because it is the right thing to do.

This is a country of immigrants, and nobody, again, can debate the fact that these are good immigrants. These are good, hardworking folks who want a shot. They don't want a gift, but they want the opportunity to earn American citizenship.

These folks have taken an oath, the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag and our country to defend it against foreign and local enemies. These folks are Americans in the true sense of the word. Let's give them a shot, a true shot, at being Americans.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I thank Congressman CORREA. He is right. The DACA kids are going to school with our kids, are going to college with our kids, are in our workplaces. They are people who are contributing and whose

futures hang in the balance, depending on what this Congress does or does not do.

Mr. CORREA. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. CORREA. I would like to say, they serve in our military. They are police officers, teachers, doctors, nurses. They are part of our fabric.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. He is right. And they are part of a long legacy of immigrants to this country.

The United States has this paradoxical history when it comes to immigration. We are, of course, very proudly a nation of immigrants, but each wave of immigrants has also faced its own bouts with discrimination.

When the Germans came here in the 1800s, they were said by some to be too dirty to be considered Americans. The Irish were greeted in cities like Boston and New York with signs that read "NINA," no Irish need apply, for the jobs that were available. The Chinese were excluded from our country for decades.

During World War II and the frenzy that ensued, Japanese Americans, but also Italian Americans and German Americans, were interned, including in my home State of Texas.

In every generation Americans have also stood up and changed course and become more welcoming for each of those groups, and I believe that, in this generation, in this time, this is part of that shift, for Congress to finally address this issue head-on and fully welcome these DACA kids as Americans and pass legislation to do that.

I thank Congressman CORREA for his words.

I yield to Congressman SUOZZI, from the other side of the country, the wonderful State of New York, a freshman Congressman.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for having us here tonight. Based upon what he was just talking about, I am going to talk about my father first. I am a first-generation American.

My father was brought to the United States by his mother when he was 4 years old. His father was already here. He came from Italy. His father was already here working. He had joined the U.S. Army during World War I and got his citizenship because of that, and my father was naturalized as a citizen because of that. He was the first one in the neighborhood to go to college, and he then fought in World War II and got the Distinguished Flying Cross with three oak leaf clusters as a navigator on a B-24.

He came back after the war, and he went to Harvard Law School on the GI Bill. Imagine that, an Italian immigrant going to Harvard Law School on the GI Bill in the 1940s.

He was discriminated against as an Italian American at the time—the gentleman was just talking about that—and he couldn't get a job at a big law firm. So he went back to our hometown

of Glen Cove, Long Island. He teamed up with another Italian guy. He started a law practice. He ended up running for city court judge, and he became the youngest judge in the history of New York State, at 28 years old.

My father really lived a great American success story. He was a man who would proudly say "what a country" all the time.

My father died 2 weeks before my election in 2016. As I went through his papers, I saw his yearbook from St. Dominic High School, when he was 18 years old. They asked all the students: What's your goal in life? Most people would talk about I want to become a lawyer or a doctor or an engineer, or I want to do some sort of exotic travel. My father wrote: "My goal is to be a real American."

Now, I had seen that when I was a kid, and I thought: Boy, I can't believe how patriotic my father was as an 18-year-old.

But he died in 2016, in the middle of the Presidential campaign. A lot of the rhetoric that we are hearing now was really hot then as well. I realize that my father was 18 years old in 1939 and Mussolini had teamed up with Hitler, and Italian Americans here in the United States of America were viewed as fascists or mafioso, and that discrimination was rife.

But the good people of this country and people in this body and people like my father held on to the basic, fundamental concepts of what makes America work. What makes America great are these basic, fundamental ideas.

So, in dealing with the question of DACA and with immigration, we have to look at some basic, fundamental American concepts. Let's first remember that all immigrants, whether they are documented or undocumented, are human beings and are entitled to be treated with human respect and dignity.

The most fundamental concept in America is that all men and women are created equal—not all men and women with a green card are created equal, not all men and women who are citizens are created equal, not all men and women from a particular country are created equal. All human beings are equal and should be treated with human respect and dignity.

I am concerned that the rhetoric that we are facing right now, that the negativity that we are facing right now, that the uncertainty that we are facing right now, that the outright assaults that we are facing in some cases right now are causing so much anxiety in our country, and it is diminishing our status as a beacon of hope to the world.

That is the great thing about America. That is what makes America great is that we are a beacon of hope to the world. That beacon is being diminished by the rhetoric and by our failure to address this immigration crisis.

This is not a new phenomenon. This started in the 1980s when death squads and civil wars and abject poverty

forced people to flee from El Salvador over the border into the United States by the tens of thousands. Starting with President Reagan, through President Bush and President Clinton and on, we haven't enforced our borders for that entire time, and now 11 million people in this country are suffering with this uncertainty because we failed to enforce our borders.

I am all for securing our borders, but let's return to being a beacon of hope to the rest of the world, and let's stop the suffering and the anxiety as we push people underground and we treat them as nonhuman beings, entitled to human respect and human dignity.

I believe that this is the greatest country on Earth, and I believe that my dad knew that. He also knew that a central part of our being the greatest country on Earth is being that beacon of hope to so many people, that said to the tired and the poor yearning to breathe free: Come to our shores.

If we really want to make America great again, we have to reclaim that mantle of being that beacon of hope.

I agree with all the wise comments that have been made by my colleagues here today that the votes do exist in this House to resolve this issue if we could get a bill put on the floor. There are so many groups, so many Democrats, so many Republicans meeting throughout this town on a regular basis to try to find a compromise to solve this problem—Democrats and Republicans—but because there is nothing on the floor, we can't get the votes presented in a public way. If it was put on the floor, it would pass. We would have DACA. We would have the Dream Act. We would have solutions to border security.

We need to recognize that we are all in this together, and we need to rise up to the challenge to be the beacon of hope that we once were and still should be to the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CASTRO for giving me the opportunity to speak.

□ 1900

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressman for sharing his dad's life story and what this country meant to him and the importance of coming up with a solution, a fix, as soon as possible.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I want bring up one thing I forgot to mention.

I was the young mayor of the city of Glen Cove in 1994, and we had day workers from Central and South America gathering on the street corners seeking work. The community was divided. This was 1994. Just think how long ago this is now, 23 years ago.

One group saying: Get those people out of here. And other people saying: These poor guys are trying to live the American Dream the same as your family did.

I ended up setting up the first day-worker gathering spot anywhere on the East Coast of the United States of America in 1994. It was one of the first

things I did as mayor. We ended up bringing them indoors. If you didn't get hired for the day, you could learn a skill, you could learn to speak English, you could learn about the cultural norms of our community. We said: If you play by the rules, we are going to help you. If you break the rules, you are going to get in trouble.

The same guys that were on the street corners now have their own businesses, they own their own homes, and their children go to school with my children. That is the American Dream.

We have so much potential in this country if we could unleash it for people who want to work 6 days a week and go to church on Sunday, if only we could remove this anxiety and this threat that we are pushing people underground and forcing them into an underground economy and underground communities. If only we could lift this back up again, we could accomplish so much.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for reminding us of something that is often lost in this conversation and debate, which is the fundamental humanity of the people that we are talking about. Whether they have a green card, whether they are documented or undocumented, the fact that we are talking about the lives of human beings, too often that is lost in what is sometimes a contentious debate.

Mr. SUOZZI. Think about it. You are a kid going to school, you are worried about taking tests. You are working every day, you are worried about your job. You are worried somebody is sick in your family. You are worried you don't have enough money to pay your bills. The normal concerns of life. Heap on top of that a national debate that is treating you as a pariah and creating such anxiety to rip families apart. Think about how challenging that must be for those individuals, those families that are facing that type of threat.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. There is no question that for a lot of them, as you talk to them, you can see what a soul-crushing experience it is, and, as your dad wrote in his yearbook, I think many of these kids have the same feeling. They want to be fully accepted as real Americans, which they obviously feel part of this country, feel like it is home, but are not sure whether America accepts them.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just to make some closing remarks before I yield back the balance of my time, Congress has to take action now. We can't wait any longer for another 122 DREAMers every day, DACA recipients, to become subject to deportation, and certainly can't get to March where 800,000 of the DACA kids will lose their futures in America and become subject to deportation.

The issue of immigration and border security, all of these things are among

the thorniest issues in American life no matter where you go in the country.

But we are a nation of immigrants, and this is one way that we will gauge the soul of this Congress and of this Nation and determine whether we are going to continue to live up to the Nation that we strive to be, which is a nation of immigrants, of people from different countries who have made such a beautiful, incredible, strong and powerful nation, have crafted that Nation together.

And I would just remind those who are against the DACA kids, who would argue for inaction, who argue that they should get the hell out of here, that this country has been blessed throughout the generations that people from every corner on Earth have wanted to come to the United States of America. Fifty years ago, if you asked somebody who was living in Europe or Asia or Latin America or anywhere else around the world where on Earth they would want to go if they were going to leave their home country, the answer 50 years ago was very clearly the United States of America.

There is a scarier day in this country than the day when everybody wants to come here. That is the day when nobody wants to come here. The challenge for all of us as legislators and basically as Americans is to make sure that when you ask that same question of somebody 50 years from now who is living abroad where on Earth they would want to go if they were going to leave their home country, that they still feel comfortable believing it is the United States of America.

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

THE MARCH FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor, as we approach the March for Life on Friday, to remember the infamous Supreme Court decision that has resulted in the loss of some 60 million unborn babies and tens of millions of women who have been harmed. Sixty million have been killed, a number that equates with the entire population of England, as a result of that very misguided and sad and tragic decision.

It is my honor, as we open up this Special Order, to yield to Congresswoman JACKIE WALORSKI from Indiana, a distinguished Member of this body who serves on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate life, to stand for the idea that every human life is a gift from God, and to join my colleagues in renewing our commitment to defend the inherent dignity of every person born or unborn.

This week, we will vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which says that a baby born after a failed abortion attempt should be given the same medical care as a baby born any other way.

The same day, hundreds of thousands of our fellow Americans will march on the Nation's capital to celebrate the sanctity of life. Those who march for life come from every corner of the Nation to be voices for the voiceless and to defend the most vulnerable among us. Such compassion, their dedication to this worthy cause, gives us hope that, through service and action, we can foster a culture of life.

Mr. Speaker, each and every life is precious. That is why we must continue to be tireless in our work to defend the sanctity of life and to protect the unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her very strong and powerful statement.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to ROBERT PITTENGER from North Carolina, who is the author of the No Abortion Bonds Act, a bill that would close loopholes in the Tax Code that allow abortion providers to finance new clinics and facilities with local bonds that are exempt from Federal taxes. Congressman PITTENGER serves on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of our Nation's greatest tragedy. I would like to thank Chairman SMITH so much for his leadership over the past 35 years. He has been unrelenting in his commitment and support of life, and I have the deepest respect for him.

Today marks Roe v. Wade's 45th anniversary. Since that ignoble decision, over 60 million precious, innocent unborn babies have been intentionally killed by abortions in the United States.

In light of the anniversary and the March for Life event, I would like to share the words of the late Mother Teresa:

"But I feel that the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion, because it is a war against the child, a direct killing of the innocent child, murder by the mother herself.

"And if we accept that a mother can kill even her own child, how can we tell other people not to kill one another?"

"How do we persuade a woman not to have an abortion? As always, we must persuade her with love, and we remind ourselves that love means to be willing to give until it hurts. Jesus gave even His life to love us.

"So the mother who is thinking of abortion should be helped to love, that is, to give until it hurts her plans or her free time, to respect the life of her child. The father of that child, whoever he is, must also give until it hurts."

Mother Theresa goes on to say:

"By abortion, the mother does not learn to love but kills even her own child to solve her problems.

"And, by abortion, that father is told that he does not have to take any responsibility at all for the child he has brought into the world. That father is likely to put other women into the same trouble. So abortion just leads to more abortion.

"Any country that accepts abortion"—Mother Theresa says—"is not teaching its people to love, but to use any violence to get what they want. This is why the great destroyer of love and peace is abortion."

The work of this body, Mr. Speaker, must be to correct this tragedy to protect the lives of those who cannot speak for themselves.

We hope and pray for those who stand in darkness on this grievous loss of life and who have been advocates of abortion. Who would know the mind of God regarding these 60 million precious souls, that He may have given to some of them the cure for cancer or Alzheimer's or Parkinson's or many other diseases? God is merciful, but we must recognize our own responsibilities and affect for our own actions.

This week, we have the opportunity to outlaw the diabolical practice of killing babies who survive an abortion, something incredibly barbaric, by passing the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

I also urge my colleagues to join me in support of the No Abortion Bonds Act, legislation I introduced to block Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers from using tax-exempt, taxpayer-backed bonds to finance their abortion clinics.

Ours is a great cause, greater than us, greater than this generation. It is a battle for the very soul of what we stand for as a nation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we do have several physicians who serve in this Congress who are very, very pro-life and very eloquent in their defense of life.

I yield to Congressman ANDY HARRIS, who is associated, obviously, with Johns Hopkins, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to serve as the co-chair of the Pro-Life Caucus and to speak briefly today on the anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision.

Mr. Speaker, for the last hour, those of you who listened, and there are a lot of people watching who listened, was a discussion about the humanity of individuals, the humanity of people here in America, and how we need to deal with it, how we need to respect it, how we need to take that humanity into consideration. And we will. That had to do with the DREAMers. It was about DACA.

But for this hour, we are going to talk about 1 million human beings a year who lose their life through abortion in the United States—one million human beings per year.

Now, why do I emphasize human beings? Because the science on this is

very clear. These are human beings. From the moment of conception, their genetic makeup is unique from every other human being in the world and uniquely human.

So how can we not consider those 1 million human beings a year who lose their life to abortion not the greatest human rights challenge that faces us here in the United States?

When we have the March for Life in 2 days, we are going to see many people from the millennial generation, many young people, who I think realize, because they have grown up and they learn in their science class, that these, in fact, are 1 million human beings every year who lose their life in the United States. They realize the science is clear. They are human beings. They deserve the protection of this Congress.

We are going to deal with the issues that they talked about last hour, and then the Congress should turn its attention to ending that human rights abuse for those 1 million human beings every year who lose their life to elective abortion right here in the United States.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership over the decades on this issue. The struggle is not over. This human rights issue is not over, but hopefully, thank God, one day it will be.

□ 1915

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. HARRIS for his very eloquent remarks and for reminding us that this is the greatest human rights struggle on Earth.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee. Ms. FOXX has been a lifelong leader on the issue of life and, of course, in leadership, and now as a full committee chairman. I thank the gentlewoman for all she does on behalf of the unborn and their mothers each and every day.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to join my colleagues who all thank the gentleman tonight for the fantastic leadership that he has given to this issue for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to affirm the dignity of the estimated 59 million children whose lives have been terminated by abortion in the United States since 1973. This Friday, tens of thousands of Americans will bear witness to the value of the unborn at the 45th annual March for Life, united in opposition to the life-degrading Supreme Court decision, Roe v. Wade.

The right to life is first among the inalienable rights of the Nation's Declaration of Independence. It is imperative to safeguard life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; those necessary conditions for people to flourish. Unfortunately, as evidenced by Roe v. Wade, our society too often values happiness at the expense of human life.

However, amid this culture of death, the pro-life movement fights for life

with love. And this year's March for Life theme, "Love Saves Lives," truly embodies the spirit of the pro-life movement. Look no further than the 2,200 pregnancy centers across the country dedicated to serving pregnant women and new mothers. There are many in my district and I am very proud of them.

These pregnancy centers empower women with life-affirming options and offer medical testing, prenatal care, and ultrasounds. They also provide parenting classes, baby supplies, and financial assistance to help meet the emotional and material needs of pregnant women.

Many offer information about the beautiful option of adoption and provide referrals to connect birth mothers with loving families for their babies. The babies cared for in these clinics are loved before they are even born and the women are offered the love and support they need. These clinics recognize life as a precious gift and embrace a life-affirming option despite adverse circumstances.

We live in a society that mistakes choice for liberty. But the beauty of living in a free country is that we can use our liberty for love. On Friday, the march will speak for the unborn, but the pro-life movement is more than just words. It is love in action every day, affirming the value of life at all stages, no matter the difficulties it presents.

Striving to love daily is not easy, yet it is the greatest exercise of our freedom, and there is no life unworthy of that love.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman FOXX again for her very moving words, which are backed up by her actions each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Education and the Workforce Committee.

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

This past Sunday, I stood at the side of a casket of a beloved longtime friend who had just turned 95 years of age 5 days before. Up until almost her dying day, she was vibrant, was committed to life, touching lives of people, changing lives and making an impact in the world.

I am rejoicing today in a different way because of two brand-new lives that have been born: one to a staff member, and another to a former staff member of mine. Brand-new babies with an opportunity to be dreamers in this world.

Who knows what their lives will be, but isn't this what it is all about?

Life that is lived has impact and then goes on, and new lives to follow, ultimately to have impact, have dreams, and make a difference, and truly establish the divine plan that is the sanctity of life.

This week we are observing the 45th anniversary of Roe v. Wade and the

44th March for Life. There are people like us, like Congressman SMITH, who have, for the past 35-plus years, been leading this challenge here. It was 35 years ago that I left my dream job as pastor of a local church to speak for life in the halls of the State legislature and end taxpayer-funded abortion.

In Michigan, we still have a law that says abortion is not lawful, but because of Roe v. Wade, we march again this year speaking for life, speaking for the defenseless, speaking for those who would desire, who would dream to be found in a world that they can change.

How did we get into this situation, especially when we have in that Declaration of Independence the immortal statement that says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," among them, the right to life—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

John Adams, our second President, said: "Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other."

May we redouble our efforts to be that moral people that stand on things that are timeless, that were designed by our Creator, God.

Let me end with this: one of our good friends and former colleagues here in this Chamber, one night, gave me a poem that meant a lot to him. As I read that poem, it changed me as well.

It is entitled, "The Anvil," and it simply says:

Last eve, I passed a blacksmith's door
And heard the anvil ring the vespers chime;
Looking in, I saw upon the floor old hammers,
worn with beating years of time.
"How many anvils have you had," said I, "To wear and batter all of these hammers so?"

"Just one," said he;

And then with twinkling eyes, "The anvil wears the hammers out, you know."
And so, thought I, the anvil, called the Master's word,

For ages, skeptic blows have beat upon;
And though the voice of fallen blows was heard,
The anvil is unharmed and the hammers gone.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the truth of miracle and blessing of life will prevail and the right to life will be protected for all. Even as we find the anvil stand firm, so will the truth of God's creation of human life. It will remain. Let us all who honor life never give up.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS), who is a member of the Navy Reserve and who serves on the House Armed Services Committee; the Veterans' Affairs Committee; and the Space, Science, and Technology Committee. He is championing the Patients First Act to prioritize ethical stem cell research that will help patients and do no harm to the youngest members of the human family.

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his tireless efforts on behalf of the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded on the universal principle that all people have a God-given right to life. "All" includes every single human being, regardless of race, gender, or age. Throughout our Nation's history, we have continually fought to draw closer to this ideal. However, there is still so much more work to do.

Forty-five years ago, the Supreme Court made a tragic decision in Roe v. Wade, and since then, more than 60 million innocent lives have been lost. Every single one of those lives was important and unique. Tonight, as we reflect on those lives lost as a result of Roe v. Wade, we also celebrate that our culture is increasingly recognizing the value of human life.

A recent Marist Poll found that an overwhelming majority of the American people want substantial limits on abortion. Another poll found that 61 percent of Americans opposed using tax dollars to fund abortions within the United States, while 83 percent of respondents opposed subsidizing abortions outside of the United States.

Last year, the House took an important step by passing the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This bill would prohibit any elective abortion attempt on an unborn child who is 20 weeks or older, the age at which research shows us that children are able to feel pain. Sixty-three percent of Americans support a 20-week abortion ban, and I am hopeful that our colleagues in the Senate will pass this bill later this month.

We also must work to ensure that taxpayer dollars do not continue to support the abortion industry, including Planned Parenthood, our Nation's largest abortion provider.

Life is a precious and sacred gift worth fighting for. Tonight, I urge my colleagues to stand for human rights and equal justice by standing for our Nation's most vulnerable, the unborn. Let's make the cause of life the cause of our time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), from the Third District, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think the interesting part of our conversation tonight is what we are talking about. We are talking about the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act; the born-alive abortion survivors. This is such a commonsense bill, it just protects our children.

I wonder what people think about this: in the case of an abortion or an attempted abortion that results in a child being born alive, any healthcare practitioner present must exercise professional care to preserve the life of the child. The child must be immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

This bill is needed to protect our children. Americans have seen the horrifying videos of Planned Parenthood, and the Judiciary Committee has heard testimony from women who have survived and whose children have survived abortion.

But I think what is more chilling than anything, in the United States of America—the biggest defender of life, and liberty, and freedom in the world, that is our history—we have to pass a law that protects children who survive an attempted abortion. These are children that are born alive. It is incredible that we have to even have that discussion in the people's House, especially the United States of America.

Where have we become this deprived of what our moral constitution needs to be?

It is unbelievable that we have to come to this House and on this floor and defend those lives.

Now, it has been said oftentimes that 90 percent of life is showing up, because when you show up, people know you care. On Friday, hundreds of thousands of Americans from all over our country will come to Washington, D.C., in the March for Life. They have done this for 45 years. For 45 years, their passion has never diminished. For 45 years, they have made the trip to Washington, D.C., so that our country's leaders, political leaders, understand the sanctity of life. It is incredible that we have to go through this process.

□ 1930

The United States is only one of seven countries in the world that allows abortion after 5 months. I wish we would quit using the term 20 weeks—5 months. Who is included in that group? North Korea, Vietnam, and China. What a wonderful group to be part of.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman because he has fought this fight for so long. I ask Mr. SMITH to just think of the last 45 years, the number of people who have come here, the number of people who have marched for life, and we talk about what it is that we are trying to get to.

Now, we know there has been 60 million abortions—60 million little boys and little girls who never got to live the full potential of their life. But through the efforts of the pro-life movement, what we can count are the numbers of expectant mothers who were going to have an abortion, but, through the efforts of people like CHRIS SMITH, stopped and thought for a minute about what it was they were actually going to do, and that was end a life. We don't have those numbers, but I have to tell you, they have to be off the charts.

Another thing I think is so important, for those folks who did go through an abortion, it is time for them to know that there is forgiveness and there is mercy. There is always room in our hearts to embrace them and get them through that difficult period.

Mr. Speaker, I can't tell you how important this piece of legislation is. It is just so chilling. I am going to repeat it again: a law that allows children who are born alive in an attempted abortion have got to be protected by the people's House. Where in our hearts, as human beings, do we not understand the basic moral obligations and rights that we have?

It is just so hard to come here year after year to do this. But for 45 years—for 45 years—they have shown up in droves, millions and millions of Americans, talking about life and protecting life. We have another chance this Friday for all of us to show up and for all of us to be there. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of life is showing up because people know you care.

I thank Mr. SMITH of New Jersey so much for showing up for 45 years. We do know the gentleman cares, and we do know his compassion and his dedication to life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I just remind everyone this is a total team effort. One of the beauties of the pro-life movement—and I have been in it for 45 years—is that it is filled with incredibly compassionate, selfless people who would do anything to help the weakest and the most vulnerable. So I thank the gentleman for his leadership for all these years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS), who is the famous gentleman who serves on the Appropriations Committee where so many of these battles are engaged.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KELLY. What inspiring words. I thank Congressman SMITH for his incredible leadership. I am so proud to stand with my colleagues today to support the right to life.

I commend all of those who will be coming to our Nation's Capital this week, including from my home State of West Virginia, to let their leaders—us—know that we are a country that values life and human decency.

Each and every life is a precious gift from God. It is our responsibility to stand up for the unborn who were made in God's own image. They have no voice. We must be their voice. I am proud to join my colleagues in using our voices to protect life and to stand up for the unborn. I am proudly pro-life.

As we near the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we grieve for the lost lives. We pledge to protect the babies yet to be born. No taxpayer should be forced to pay for abortions. That is why I have consistently supported legislation to repeal ObamaCare and to defund Planned Parenthood.

I was also proud to be a cosponsor of the recently passed Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which would stop late-term abortions and the torturous pain that comes as the result of this despicable practice.

I am also a proud cosponsor of the bill that will be taken up later this

week, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This legislation ensures that babies born after a failed abortion attempt are given the appropriate medical care to live and are treated as human beings.

Mr. Speaker, every life—born and unborn—is precious, and I am proud to stand here with my colleagues to reaffirm our values—that life is a gift from God, and every baby deserves life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his eloquent statements and remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN). General JACK BERGMAN is a retired three-star general of the Marine Corps, and he serves on the Veterans' Affairs, Budget, and Natural Resources Committees.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SMITH for yielding. I am proud to be amongst my colleagues this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the constituents of the First District of Michigan who are—I repeat—the voice for those who have no voice.

2018 marks the 45th anniversary of the infamous Roe v. Wade decision. Since that day, as you have heard several of my colleagues say, almost 60 million abortions have occurred in our country, our United States. Today, this timeframe is an appropriate time for us to pause, reflect, and plan a path forward for the pro-life movement.

The most important question we must ask ourselves is: Why? Why do we stand for life? Why is this cause so important to us? Why do we fight for not only all of our citizens, but for the unborn?

For me, my why is simple: every life—every life—has immense value, regardless of wealth, stature, or fame. Whether you were born in rural northern Michigan or in a large city, we all were put here on this Earth for a purpose: to fulfill God's purpose.

As the father of two wonderful daughters and eight beautiful grandchildren, I know firsthand the joy, love, and inspiration that every single life brings.

Life is precious and should never be taken for granted. As a nation, we must offer hope to those who have no hope. We must remind others of the hope offered by an adoptive family and continue together as the voice for those who have no voice. We must and will continue to fight for those who have no voice.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (JODY B. HICE), who is co-chair of the Values Action Team. It is worth noting that he is part of the team back home that has now been ranked number 8 by Americans United for Life in what they call the "Life List" because of the legislation and the policies that have come forward in Georgia to protect life.

He was a pastor before coming to Congress and has been a leader for religious liberty as well in the House.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what an honor it is to be here with Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for leading and managing not only the calls but this Special Order this evening.

It is amazing to me that here we come, yet again, on the anniversary of another *Roe v. Wade*, 45 years, some 60 million children who have gone. Along with that is another anniversary, the March for Life, that has been taking place now itself for over 40 years.

I am thrilled that this weekend there will be students, teachers, nuns, pastors, priests, and families from all across this great country marching in the streets right here in Washington, D.C., from the National Mall to the Supreme Court and all across various streets across this country standing up for life. What a powerful thing that is.

When we talk about life, it is not an issue between Republicans or Democrats. This is an issue protecting 10 fingers and 10 toes. It is about protecting a precious heartbeat. Yes, we have been able, in this Chamber, to support and pass some significant legislation like the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. That is a great thing. There should be no taxpayer funds going toward abortion. We have passed the pain-capable bill, another great bill.

I wear this little lapel pin, a footprint in a heartbeat. I am hopeful that we will be able to vote on and pass the heartbeat bill. We have all heard abortion stops a beating heart. It is time now that a beating heart stops abortion; that if a heartbeat can be detected, a baby will be protected. I am hopeful that we will be able to get that on the floor here for each of us to have an opportunity to vote for that.

I am pleased as well that we made the Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act. It defunded Planned Parenthood—something many of us have been fighting for for years, for decades—and, in particular, ever since the horror of seeing the videos of Planned Parenthood selling baby parts, it is time that we finally accomplish that.

I just am so grateful for my colleagues here tonight taking a stand for life; taking a stand for what is the greatest, first, and most important right of all, the right given by Almighty God, the right that President Reagan said himself, “without which no other right has any meaning.” So I thank my colleagues for being here tonight for taking a stand.

There is obviously more work to be done. The people of America gave us a united government in this past election and sent us here to stand for the platform that we ran on that includes saving lives.

I want to encourage each of us to stay in the fight and each one watching to stay in the fight. We have come a long way. There is more to go, and, with God’s grace, we will see it happen. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for allowing me the opportunity.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), who is from Wisconsin’s Sixth District. He is a member of the House Budget Committee, the Education and the Workforce Committee, and the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work on the Pro-Life Caucus.

Only 52 years ago, abortion was illegal in this country, just as it was largely illegal throughout our country’s history. It was illegal before ultrasounds which made it so clear to everybody what was in the womb. It was illegal when medical care was a fraction of what it is today. It was illegal when families lived without electricity or running water.

Despite these hardships, the public knew abortion should be illegal.

How have we responded to our material blessings? How have we responded to these abortions? By saying that we cannot afford these children.

I would like to thank Donald Trump for reinstating the Mexico City policy. I would like to thank him for allowing States to not fund Planned Parenthood with their title X funds. I would like to thank him for defunding the United Nations Population Fund. I would like to thank the March for Life people for coming up here this year and reminding Americans about this important cause.

I hope that the American citizens stop and think: if abortion could be illegal only 52 years ago in this country before we had ultrasounds, if abortion could be illegal in the 1800s with minimal medical care when people were living six or seven people in a room in a house without air conditioning and without heat, then how did these people keep abortion illegal and how do we respond to our blessings by saying that we have to have one of the most liberal abortion laws in the country?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is the chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. SMITH for his leadership in this effort for so many decades.

Mr. Speaker, we spend millions of dollars every year in this Nation—in fact, in some cases, billions of dollars—providing healthcare for Americans, feeding Americans, providing housing for Americans, and educating Americans. We do that, Mr. Speaker, because we value life. We value these lives, and so we spend billions and billions of dollars ensuring that there are opportunities for these folks, ensuring that we are protecting these lives and we are doing everything we can to provide a pathway to prosperity, to make sure that these people are healed from their ailments, to make sure that they have shelter, and to make sure that they have food.

Mr. Speaker, under current law, if someone causes a fetus to die, that is a crime in this country. That is a crime. They can be charged for the murder of the mother, and they can be charged for the murder of the fetus.

□ 1945

But there is one exception in the law, and that is an abortion. I don’t understand how in this country we can, on the one hand, say that these lives are so valuable and we are going to spend all these resources on healthcare and many other issues in people’s lives because they have so much value to us as Americans. I don’t understand how we can charge someone criminally if a fetus is killed through some type of crime, yet we provide an exemption or an exception for abortion. A life is a life, is a life, is a life, is a life. It either has value or it does not.

This month, as we have the 45th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, it is amazing to think about 45 years. I think it is important that we reflect upon all of those constituents who we have all met; all of those Americans who are the product of a changed mind; the constituents I have met who have told me that their mother, their father changed their mind, and telling me about their lives and the contributions they have made to our community, the contributions they have made to this Nation. All lives have value.

In this Congress, we have passed the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. We passed the Conscience Protection Act. As other Members have noted, this week we are going to be voting on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which ensures that if a child survives an abortion—that awful situation—they would be given appropriate medical care to ensure that they have an opportunity at life, to ensure that they have a chance, because lives have value.

Mr. Speaker, as we move forward, I want to continue working with folks on both sides of the aisle, as I often hear people standing here and saying they are a voice for the voiceless. They are a voice for those that are vulnerable populations. This is a vulnerable population. This is a voiceless life that we need to be representing and we need to be fighting for.

I am going to continue working with folks on both sides of the aisle to protect and promote life, the unborn and the born, because our Nation’s most vital resource isn’t found in our economy, in our environment, in our jobs. It is found in our people.

I think so many other policies that we pursue here in this Congress respect that and represent that. This is the one anomaly that we need to continue to fight to continue to fix, because a life has value. We need to continue fighting for the most vulnerable in our society so they have the opportunity to have the same experiences that other Americans have.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very eloquent remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee. He has long pushed for transparency and led a landmark effort on Federal payments to Federal abortions providers. He recently led an amicus brief supporting his State's right not to be forced to fund Planned Parenthood.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend and unquestioned leading fighter for all life as the chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus, Chairman CHRIS SMITH. My dear friend has saved millions of lives not just in America, but on every continent on God's Earth. It is a true honor to join my friend tonight to fight for life.

One of America's darkest days is rapidly approaching. Forty-five years ago, January 22, 1973, seven activist judges masquerading as being impartial on our Supreme Court came up with a constitutional right to kill the unborn. In *Roe v. Wade*, these activists create a constitutional shadow, a "penumbra" on the 14th Amendment to make abortion legal. Since that decision in 1973, America's moral values have declined and we have attacked our decency. It reached its high point when videos came out of Planned Parenthood personnel drinking a large glass of wine and talking about selling baby parts.

But America is starting to rebuild her moral fiber. We now have a strong pro-life President in Donald Trump. President Trump has appointed a Supreme Court Justice, Justice Gorsuch, who will apply the laws and not make laws and violate our Constitution. He knows that the word "penumbra" has no business being in a Supreme Court decision.

More and more States are choosing to save lives, instead of taking the lives of the innocent. In a few days, millions of pro-life Americans will come to their Capital to show the world we respect all human life at the March for Life this week. I hope that all the activists who want to kill unborn babies leave their offensive foam helmets at home.

I want to close with two quotes from two people very involved in this issue. The first one is from Norma McCorvey. She is the *Roe* in *Roe v. Wade*. She died in Katy, Texas, in my district, last February. She made this strong confession:

"I felt crushed under the truth of this realization. I had to face up to the awful reality. Abortion wasn't about 'products of conception.' It wasn't about 'missed periods.' It was about children being killed in the mothers' wombs. All those years, I was wrong. Signing that affidavit, I was wrong. Working in an abortion clinic, I was wrong. No more of this first trimester, second trimester, third trimester stuff. Abortion—at any point—is wrong. It is so clear. Painfully clear."

Mr. Speaker, my final quote is from Mother Theresa. It is short, but says it all about the fight for life. She said:

"It is a poverty to decide that a child must die that you must live as you wish."

Mr. Speaker, reject poverty and choose life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. OLSON for those very strong comments. I feel the same way about his great leadership for all these years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue. I thank those who are sponsoring H.R. 4712.

I was a young man in high school when the *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court decision came down. It ignited a movement to preserve the life of the unborn. My mother and future mother-in-law began working in the trenches to see this pernicious and barbaric practice eliminated. Seeing their example, my wife, my family, and I have worked to protect these little ones for many years. We have worked for pro-life causes in the community, internationally, and in the State legislature.

During my tenure in the State legislature, we passed dozens of pro-life bills. I am pleased to say that, since 2009, Arizona has passed and had signed into law 39 bills promoting the protection of unborn babies. In fact, Arizona was recently named the top pro-life State in the Union by Americans United for Life. Even so, Arizona is not without problems.

I dedicate my support for H.R. 4712 to Aryana Zeitner, whose mother faked a serious illness so that a doctor would perform an abortion at 22 weeks. Aryana survived the abortion, but she was not given any medical attention. Doctors, nurses, and presumably her mother, let her life slowly ebb away. Aryana's life passed after 1 hour and 18 minutes after the abortion was performed. This bill is for Aryana and others who should be alive today.

In another instance, a baby with no name survived an abortion. 911 in the Phoenix area of Arizona received a call from a worker at the abortion clinic indicating that a post-abortion baby was breathing, but the clinic did no more than provide oxygen. The baby passed, dying before arriving at the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I dedicate this bill to all of the unnamed victims of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, if a baby survives an abortion, it is not an abortion. It is a birth. It is inhumane to allow a baby who survives an abortion to simply die from neglect and inattention.

I urge the passage of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, H.R. 4712. I urge leadership to bring H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act of 2017, sponsored by 170 Members of this body, to the floor for a vote as well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from

Kansas (Mr. ESTES), who serves on the Education and the Workforce Committee and the Homeland Security Committee. His home State of Kansas was just ranked number five as the most pro-life State in the country by AUL's 2018 Life List. I thank him for his leadership all these years as well.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SMITH for hosting this Special Order on the 45th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*. Wade to remember the devastating impact on children and women, and to celebrate the sanctity of all human life.

Each and every life is precious, a unique gift with intrinsic value. Furthermore, science is clear that, at just 16 weeks old, a baby's body is fully formed and has fingerprints, and a baby can even make facial expressions.

Mr. Speaker, I have been blessed with three incredible children, each one of them unique with their own special personalities, talents, and dreams. As a father, I am excited to see what impact they will have on the world. Each of them will contribute to society and bring a unique perspective to the world that only they can.

As we approach the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, I am reminded that in the past 45 years there have been over 60 million fewer individuals in the country today because of abortions. That is 60 million fewer people living the American Dream, starting families, farming in Kansas, or going to medical school to save lives. Their fate was determined before they even had a chance to show the world their talents.

In my home State of Kansas, I am thankful for the countless volunteers who assist with educational programs and outreach to ensure that we are becoming a society that values life, even before a child is born.

For many years, my wife and I have been involved with Kansans for Life and have been blessed to work with so many tireless advocates for life. Hundreds of these volunteers are coming here this week for the March for Life.

With 63 percent of Americans now supporting abortion bans after 20 weeks—that is 5 months—I think we are seeing an incredible pro-life generation. This gives me hope, Mr. Speaker, and I am ready to see what kind of impact these unborn children will have on our world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), a pro-life leader who has been a leader in educating members of our Conference about the dangers of assisted suicide. He serves on the Financial Services Committee. He has been, of course, a great leader in defending the unborn and their moms.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, CHRIS SMITH, for his long work in this endeavor.

This past Monday, our country observed Martin Luther King Day. I had

the privilege of participating back home in some events honoring Dr. King.

While reflecting on Dr. King's legacy at one of the events, I recalled decades ago when I first read the letter from the Birmingham jail.

Dr. King explained there are two types of laws: just and unjust.

Dr. King asked: What is the difference between the two?

He answered that a just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law.

To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas, Dr. King said: an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law.

Defending the natural law principles of the Declaration of Independence is one of the reasons I ran for Congress. The first right listed in the Declaration is the God-given right to life.

□ 2000

This Friday marks the 45th anniversary of one of the most somber days in our country's history: the day that the Supreme Court issued *Roe v. Wade*.

Associate Justice Byron White called this decision an exercise in "raw judicial power," as the court invented a right to abortion that wiped out the laws of all 50 States.

To echo the words from Dr. King's 1963 address at the Lincoln Memorial, the Supreme Court stamped the promissory note of the rights in the Declaration of Independence with "insufficient funds" for the unborn.

As we observe this sad anniversary, let us, once again, restore the promise of our Declaration of Independence's right to life.

I look forward to greeting constituents at the March for Life.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, commend Congressman SMITH for his tireless advocacy in defending the defenseless.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM), a member of Armed Services Committee; the Agriculture Committee; and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today so proud to stand with my colleagues and to stand with those who will be marching in 2 days to remove the scourge, the stain, on American history.

Our Louisiana delegation, as you have heard, has a strong presence here. We have a strong presence from Louisiana that will march on Friday: a very young people that get what abortion is. Our great whip leader, STEVE SCALISE, would be here, too, were he not recovering from a surgery. So we wish him the best.

Mr. Speaker, as a Christian, I know that life is a precious gift, and I believe that life begins at conception. As a physician, my oath is to protect all lives, including that unborn child. And, certainly, as an American, I think

abortion violates our Constitution's unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard, tonight, that over 60 million babies have been aborted. Think what they could have become: mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, nieces, and nephews—vital parts of our community.

As you heard from my great friend, GARRET GRAVES, who listed some of the bills that we have introduced this Congress, we will continue to do this.

Mr. Speaker, we don't have to continue to put up with this stain on American history. We can do better. We know how to do it. We must end this practice as soon as possible and we must prevent this horror from continuing.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and all of our colleagues here tonight for standing for the sanctity of every human life.

Mr. Speaker, I was born on January 30, 1972, 357 days before *Roe v. Wade* became the law of the land. Before I came to Congress, for almost 20 years, I defended religious freedom and the sanctity of human life in the courts and the court of public opinion.

We often summarized our conviction on this issue by stating, very simply, what I have said in this Chamber now many times, that this is part of the very foundation of our Republic. It was the British philosopher, G.K. Chesterton, who said one time:

"America is the only nation in the world that is founded on a creed."

He said that creed is articulated with "theological lucidity in the Declaration of Independence."

What is the creed?

We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal and that they were endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. Among these are the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Founders understood that this is essential to who we are as Americans, but, more fundamentally than that, who we are as human beings. They understood that because we are made in the image of a holy God, every single person has inestimable dignity and value. And our value is not related in any way to our race, our socioeconomic status, where we came from, where we went to school, how talented we are, or what we may be able to contribute to society. Our value is inherent because it is given to us by God.

It is for all of these reasons we fight for the sanctity of every human life, we cherish our children as a heritage from the Lord—as the scripture says—and we defend the defenseless. It is our solemn obligation before the Lord, and I pray that we are always faithful in doing so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding. CHRIS SMITH is one of the leaders in the pro-life movement that we have had not just here in the House, but in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I want to commemorate the 45th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*. Every year in January, families, religious leaders, and students come to Washington, D.C., and march from the National Mall to the Supreme Court. To me, the March for Life means having renewed hope and faith in our Nation's young people, as I see hundreds, many from perishes just like mine, come to our Nation's Capital to stand for human life.

I want to recognize all of the groups from Illinois, who are traveling to participate in this week's March for Life event, including the 250 young people and chaperones from my Diocese in Springfield, Illinois. As a father of a daughter and twin boys, I want to thank our youth for their commitment to life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CHRIS SMITH for leading the Pro-Life Caucus and for organizing this evening's Special Order.

This Friday, our constituents from all across the country will arrive on the National Mall for the 45th annual March for Life. Last year's March for Life was one of the first events that I had participated in, here in Washington, after I took office in January of last year.

Hundreds of my constituents had marched down the National Mall. I had the opportunity to meet with them afterwards and hear from them about their hopes for the pro-life movement. They had just come back from hearing the Vice President speak. He had spoken about life is winning here in America. He said:

I've long believed that a society can be judged by how we care for its most vulnerable, the aged, the infirm, the disabled, and the unborn.

Since that day, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that this Chamber has taken steps to protect the lives of the unborn.

We passed the commonsense Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, banning abortion after 20 weeks, the point at which we know that an unborn child can feel pain.

We passed the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, ending taxpayer subsidies of abortions, and codifying the Hyde amendment governmentwide.

I was very happy to be part of a body that passed both of these bills and, of course, voted for and supported those measures.

And this week, the House will vote on legislation—the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act—requiring medical care be given to any child who survives an attempted abortion,

with strict penalties for those who do not comply with the law.

Voting against this legislation would be unconscionable. A child, made in the image of our Creator and born into this world, should not need additional legal protections requiring medical care if they are born alive after an attempted abortion.

But here we are, continuing our fight for the rights of the unborn and the born. It is a fight worth fighting, and we aren't going to stop.

I look forward to joining my constituents on the National Mall on Friday to raise our voices for those who cannot yet speak. They have our commitment to continue to work in this Chamber to protect the lives of the unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

What an outstanding turnout tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here tonight and participate in this Special Order to celebrate the sanctity of human life and redouble my commitment to protecting the most vulnerable among us: the unborn.

I want to thank Congressman CHRIS SMITH for hosting this opportunity tonight. He has certainly been a champion of the pro-life moment, and this week marks the 45th anniversary of Roe v. Wade, the Supreme Court decision that set constitutional precedent on the issue of abortion.

That decision also ignited the pro-life movement, which was already taking shape.

And this movement will be witnessed on Friday, when more than 100,000 pro-lifers from across the country will come to Washington, D.C. for the 45th annual March for Life. This year's theme is "Love Saves Lives."

And, Mr. Speaker, it surely does.

Thanks to the pro-life movement, abortion rates across the country are at the lowest since 2013.

Proudly, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania remains one of the top protective states in the nation to provide legal protections for human life from conception to natural death, according to Americans United for Life.

From 2015 to 2016, we saw a 3 percent decline in abortions in Pennsylvania, and these statistics reflect important Pennsylvania State laws, such as, the ban on sex-selection abortion.

These figures are certainly welcome news, but the fight is not over and there is more work to be done.

I know this House will continue to work tirelessly at the federal level to put the health and safety of women and children first. Pro-life education and legislative efforts are making an impact on our culture and in the lives of women facing unexpected pregnancies.

We must always be a voice for the voiceless. And we must continue to build a culture that values life and respects mothers and their children.

I am proud to be part of this movement and I thank every individual here tonight for their commitment to this important cause.

Because we all know that "Love Saves Lives."

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

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I wanted to do, actually, two or three things. Some of this has been bouncing in my head since we were on this floor a few weeks ago doing the tax reform discussion debate, and the number of things that were said that just sort of drive you a little crazy because the math was wrong, or there was sort of make-believe.

For those who have been, shall we say, sleep deprived enough to stay up and watch some of my presentations, which I do every couple of weeks, you know I have a theme that Congress is often a math-free zone. So I thought this evening we would actually do a little math history and also talk about some really great things that are happening.

This is important. Think about the economy right now and what was happening in the anticipation of tax reform and now that tax reform is passed. During the tax reform debate, we would hear arguments, often coming from our brothers and sisters on the left, talking about income inequality.

So a couple of weeks ago, we did a presentation here on the floor demonstrating that if you live in the world of the last decade, where you are only growing about 1.8 percent GDP, and that joint tax and CBO—the people who are our scorekeepers—are saying, "Hey, for the next 30 years, you are only growing about 1.8 percent GDP growth," that crushes people.

If you care about income inequality in our society, the way you solve it is growth. And there are lots and lots of data from leftwing groups, rightwing groups, and academic groups that say that growth is the greatest cure to a society that has actually started to move apart where the haves have more and the have-nots have less. It turns out that occurs when you have a stagnant growth society. It is obvious. Think about the last 10 years. Think about the projections of going the next decade at 1.8 percent GDP growth.

One of the things I wanted to talk about is: if I came to you right now and said, "Let's just drop our partisan hats; you are not right; you are not left;" are you joyful that we are seeing data right now, today, where folks with felony convictions are finding jobs at a rate that has not been seen in decades?

How would you feel when you see other populations that have actually had a really rough decade finding jobs?

Isn't that what we all come here and stand behind these microphones and talk about?

Well, guess what, it is happening. If you look at some of the unemployment data, populations that have actually gone the last decade in a really rough position are finding employment, and there are some amazing indicators.

Early last year, we came here and did a series of presentations on what was happening to the Social Security Disability Insurance Trust Fund. It was collapsing.

About a month ago, we had a meeting with the Social Security disability actuaries. Guess what. All of a sudden we went from the trust fund is gone in about 2 years to, hey, they just added an additional 4 years on it.

It turns out that parts of our society, which would have been heading towards disability payments and, therefore, leaving the labor force, were finding employment that actually worked with their difficulties.

This is great. These are good things. I know in this town of Washington it is just a partisan knife fight all of the time. I understand many of our brothers and sisters on the left believe rage is a way to politically communicate.

I would actually like the math. And what we are seeing happen in our communities and our society for the populations we both care about, good things are happening.

So how do we build policy around here that keeps it going?

The chart I have right here is sort of talking about what the projections were as of October 2017—so fairly recent data—of what was going to happen over the next couple of decades in the amount of our society that would be in the workforce, and you see these lines just crashing and crashing.

And all of a sudden—do you see the little dotted line—that is what we were projecting in 2016.

Then, all of a sudden—do you see the solid line—it is up substantially. And that was the 2017.

What was happening between those 2 years—2016 to 2017—that, all of a sudden, we start to see a substantial hopeful increase in people saying there are going to be opportunities in the labor force?

It was a combination of what this body has been doing in 2017, whether it be a rational regulatory model heading towards the optimism of tax reform.

□ 2015

If you love and care about people, providing opportunities to have your income grow, the ability to save for yourself, your family, your kids' education, good things are happening. How do we keep it going?

So I want to walk through a couple examples out there if you follow the press in our communities. I came across this story just last week in one of our counties in the southern part of Arizona, beautiful area. All of a sudden, there is such a labor demand that our local correctional facility is actually now having demand to do skills training and, actually, employment for

folks that, if it were just a year or two ago, were often being discarded.

Look for these stories, find joy in them, because this is what we care about: someone having an opportunity, saying they may have had a bad act in their life, but now that they are going to find employment, maybe they have a future.

This is true, also, for many of our urban populations, for our low-skill populations, for populations that may not have graduated high school. We have story after story after story of employers now having the resources that they are actually providing the training for skill sets for employment.

Isn't this what so many of us have gotten behind these microphones over and over and over and talked about, saying there is a way for everyone to participate in this growing economy and have a joyous, hopeful future and economic stability?

So I want to actually take this a bit further. Some of this is additional discussion on the debate that happened here last month and talking about revenues. Let's see if this makes sense.

My grandfather used to have a saying. He said: It doesn't matter how you play the game; it is who keeps score.

I know; it is an adjustment on an old colloquialism.

It turns out around here, we were having these discussions about previous tax reforms, previous tax cuts, and we would hear things, and you would go back and look it up, and the numbers were just made up. They were not what was actually done. So we are going to actually correct some of that record today.

But the other thing we are going to finish on, the final two boards here, we are going to actually sort of set the benchmark, the goal line of what the tax reform is expected to produce, what the tax reform should be judged by so we never experience what we had last month where people just make math up for their own argument, but we will actually know, saying: This is the goal line. Judge us by what we call the baseline.

So the slide right next to me right now was sort of talking about what we expected revenues to be. This is the history going back to 1967. You will actually see in here, from 1967 to 2016, the mean was 17.4 percent of the GDP came in as Federal revenues, and we had actually expected it to move up to about 18.4 percent.

I am sorry for this, but it gives you an idea.

And you are going to see this on the next couple boards. In times when we have raised taxes, when we have lowered taxes, when we have done all sorts of things, that line of the amount of the economy that comes in in Federal taxes actually stays within a very, very tight band, which lets you know maybe the fixation isn't on the tax rate but the fixation needs to be on a tax policy that maximizes economic expansion; because, if you are going to

be always in there about that 17.4 to 18 percent of GDP, have a bigger GDP, have a bigger economy if you believe we need the additional revenues, which we do.

So on this, I want you to sort of take a look, because, overall, you can look at times where we have had recessions and you see the revenues go down; but you will see these dotted lines here, and these are some of the different, we will call them, tax cuts, tax relief. If you look on every location, there is the 2003, and then look a year or so later, revenues spike up.

In 2010, part of the Obama administration and this Congress, there was a tax change that actually gave back more revenues to workers and those who were creating employment, and revenues actually went up.

So it is on the chart. You cannot pretend that there hasn't been societal and economic expansions during these times.

So to actually drill this point down a bit more, in a lot of the debate we had here last month, we had Member after Member from the left come behind the microphones and say there is no such thing as a tax reform tax cut paying for itself. That is just absolutely not true. Now, there are lots of tax cuts over the history that didn't, but there are lots of them that have.

So let's actually walk through the actual data.

This is one of those occasions where, if you know what the baseline was, saying this is what the projections were of revenues before the change in policy, you can't keep moving the goal line after the policy is done to get your own argument to sound like it is competent.

So, in this case, we are going to actually look at when we did the capital gains cuts back in, I think that was, 2003. A handful of Members here on the other side came behind the microphones and talked about how much money it lost. It turns out that is not true.

So, if you actually look at the blue, that is what CBO and Joint Tax actually calculated that the revenues were going to be before those tax changes. Remember, the 2003 was functionally just a capital gains tax with a couple other things. The red was actual revenues.

Now, this isn't the debt, this isn't spending, because, you understand, when you actually look at a deficit number, there are multiple parts. There is the revenue and then there is the spending around here. And this body loves to conflate that argument, saying, well, the debt went up to this. It is because we kept spending.

Look at the revenues in isolation and see what happened in that trend. Well, if you look at this chart here, you actually see the red.

Now, this is capital gains taxes. There were lots of predictions that said capital gains taxes, you are cutting them, obviously we are going to take

in a lot less revenue. It turns out it didn't work that way.

Let's walk through a couple more of these to just sort of demonstrate what that calculation is.

Also, as we discussed, the previous slide was actual hard revenues. This one has its percentage of GDP, and you even notice even on a calculation the size of the economy, there were more revenues coming in after the capital gains tax cut of 2003. Many of you actually will refer to it as the Bush tax cuts. I believe they expired in 2008.

Either way you try to judge it, whether it be on hard revenues or as a percentage of GDP, guess what. It not only paid for itself, it made money; and yet we have Member after Member after Member who will come behind these microphones and tell you it didn't.

So let's actually look at what the actual math was.

Prior to the 2003 to 2008 capital gains tax cut—sorry, I know sometimes these are big numbers and you are going sort of as fast as you can—we expected about \$13 billion in revenues from those capital gains. Excuse me. It is \$13 trillion over that time.

If you take a look at that \$13 trillion number, that is what the baseline was before the 2003 capital gains tax cuts.

At the time it was modeled, CBO, Joint Tax came in and said: Guess what. You are going to go from the \$13 trillion to only \$12 trillion, \$12.9 trillion.

Turns out, though, from 2003 to 2008, when you actually calculated the actual revenues from those capital gains tax cuts, what happened? How much money did we lose? Turns out we made \$77 billion more than the projection of revenues before the tax policy change.

This is really, really important to get our heads around.

So when someone comes behind these microphones and says, well, there is no such thing as a tax cut paying for itself, sure there is, because here is the goalpost. The goalpost was set—or goal line was set before the tax policy change. That is what the projection was over those coming years. Then when the tax policy changed, it was projected to be down here. You have got to look at the data from 2003 to 2008; and when 2008 added up, it turns out the capital gains revenue was \$77 billion higher than the policy before those tax cuts.

So just understand, this place loves to tell stories, but they often don't demonstrate the actual math.

So let's actually talk about what is going on right now. We heard predictions of everything from the end of the world to the end of the world in regards to tax reform. As you know, there is functionally a \$1.5 trillion placeholder for the tax cuts and reforms that we did in December that are now in effect.

So let's actually lay this out. This is actually what the projection was going back to June. So this is fair and honest, saying this is what we call the

baseline. The baseline is what we should be judged by. Every year, whether I am here or another Member is here, I am hoping someone will come up here and say: Okay, here is what we took in. Did we exceed what the baseline was? Did we get less?

Well, over the next couple years, we will probably get less than that June baseline. But what also happened to the projections, the curve, the size of the economy? Remember, at the beginning of this discussion, we talked about some really neat things happening in our society.

When we started to work on the actual drafting of the tax reform bill at the beginning of the year, we were living in a world that was only going to grow in the United States about 1.8 percent GDP growth, and today we are over 3. Now, some of that is anticipatory effects. Some of that is a little excitement. There is a lot of confluence. But understand what that means in revenues and opportunities and just good things for everyone in our society.

So we are going to go to the next board just because this one is really hard to read.

So here is what I am asking everyone to do. If you be on the left, if you be on the right, if you happen to be in the media, understand that the June number was that, over the 2017 baseline, for functionally the next 10 years, was \$43 trillion of revenue. That is fair. Judge us on that.

So 10 years from now, maybe someone will remember this and look back and say: Did we take in more revenues or less revenues in that time? Because, if you consider what was said by the left, it was the end of the world.

So that is the baseline number. We have on the previous chart sort of what was projected each year for the next 10 years.

So, if I am blessed to be here a year from now, I will come back January 2019, stand behind this microphone, and we will look at the revenues that came in in the 2018 fiscal year compared to what we projected months before the tax reform became real. Judge us by that, but don't come behind these microphones and make up Armageddon and then make up stories about what has taken place in the past.

This is important, because if you care about people, if you care about opportunity, we have some real difficulties coming towards us.

In lots of the data and lots of the charts, in about a decade and a half, 18 years or so, we hit a debt crisis, and your options are really simple. You have to do substantial reductions to the dollars flowing out that are substantially in entitlements because, remember, three-quarters of this government's money rolls out in entitlements.

□ 2030

Only about 15 percent of our spending is actually defense, and another 13 or

so is everything else you think of government. Three-quarters of it is Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—all the things that are just formula.

And where we are right now, the peak of the baby boom is 60 years old today. So economist after economist after economist, particularly those on the left, have told us you can't grow more than 1.8 percent GDP. You are heading towards a debt crisis. You are heading towards this Armageddon.

So why wouldn't you stand up here, work to reform regulatory codes, the Tax Code, the immigration codes, these things, and maximize the things that will create growth and opportunity? I think that is just what, at least on the Republican side, we have been doing.

So the reason I put up this chart is more to lay a marker. I used the term "goal line" before. Understand that is the number before the tax reform, and I believe a lot of it is anticipatory effects on the economy. Hold us by that.

Now, who knows who will still be around here 10 years from now, but will revenue exceed \$43 trillion? That is the benchmark. You can't say: Well, the debt went to this, our spending went to this, because they operate outside the revenues. That is policy decisions made here on what to spend, our disasters—God forbid—military action.

But the revenue number is what we should be judged by. And when you see what is happening right now in our communities, in our society, the number of organizations that have started to pay their employees more, the number of organizations that are bringing back billions of dollars to invest here in our country, the research, the development, maybe a lot of the Malthusian economists out there—and for those of you who don't get that, go look it up—who basically said the next three decades of our life are basically constrained, dear God, I hope they are wrong.

We as a body need to continue this optimistic opportunity of coming and saying: Okay. How do we get more of our brothers and sisters to actually be in the labor force?

We know today we have about 6 million jobs that are going unfulfilled, lack of skills. We also know from recent publications, because of the tax reform, businesses are taking some of those resources and putting them into job training and taking populations that were often being left on the sidelines and they are being drawn in. This is wonderful.

How do you actually turn to others and say: Should turning 65 or 67 be hitting a wall? How do we actually provide you the opportunity, if you so wish and so desire, to actually stay in the labor force and continue to help to grow this country? Because work, we know, is often good for the soul and the individual, but it is also really good for our tax revenues and really good for the size of our economy.

Remember, the bigger the economy gets, the less that cliff, that wall, that

debt crisis that is about a decade and a half away, the more that gets pushed off into the future and the demographic curve that is those of us who are baby boomers, maybe that doesn't create a debt crisis. Maybe it actually turns into an opportunity for this economy, for this society to continue to grow and be happy and healthy and prosperous.

This is one of those times I get behind the microphone and I am actually excited from what I am seeing out there in the data. I ask this body, even with the partisan rancor, let's continue to adopt those policies that grow, that bring people, provide opportunities to be part of the labor force, to be part of the American Dream; and by doing that, the thing the left tells us they care about, income inequality, actually closes. The things so many of us care about of not hitting that debt crisis maybe get postponed, maybe never happen.

There is a path here, but it has to be everything. It has to be the tax reform. We just accomplished that. It has to be rationalizing our regulatory system. We are working on that. It has to be an immigration system that focuses on maximizing economic expansion. It has to be the adoption of technology. We are working on it. I think we can get there.

This is just fun having a chance to get behind this microphone and actually be positive and optimistic after the last few years of where things were quite dour.

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

MEDICAL MARIJUANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening with a heavy heart, deeply concerned about my fellow Floridians and my fellow Americans who have seen benefits as a consequence of medical marijuana.

Throughout this great country, there have been circumstances where States have chosen to experiment and afford their citizens the opportunity to receive medical marijuana treatments, and that opportunity flourished as a consequence of a series of actions, one of which was the Cole memo.

The Cole memo was direction from the Attorney General of the United States in the last administration not to prioritize the arrest and prosecution of people who were using medical marijuana legally under their State laws, not to punish the doctors or prescribers or dispensing organizations that were assisting in the logistics for that care but, instead, to focus our precious Federal resources where they could do the most good: to stop drug trafficking, human trafficking, illegal illicit activity that surrounds the drug trade, to

ensure that there wasn't access for minors or cartels or people who would drive a medical practice deeper into the black market.

It is deeply unfortunate that Attorney General Jeff Sessions has recently rescinded the Cole memo, placing into question the very channels of medicine that have helped so many of my constituents and so many fellow Americans.

This evening, I am going spend some time speaking about this issue, but I wanted to take the opportunity first and yield to my good friend, my colleague from the State of Florida, who has been a leader not only on this issue, but on so many of the critically important bipartisanship reforms that we should be working on here in the Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague Mr. GAETZ for this special hour to shine a light on this issue, on the Federal Government's overreach and unjust treatment of legally operating businesses all across our country.

Businesses that operate legally and in compliance with their State's laws and regulations deserve a Federal Government that respects the 10th Amendment of the Constitution.

Like my colleagues, I have been disappointed that, when it comes to the treatment of these legal marijuana businesses, the current administration, which supposedly respects the federalist model of our government, continues to take such drastic steps to ignore States' rights and the decisions of voters and State legislatures across the country.

In the 2016 elections, over 70 percent of Florida citizens voted to legalize the use of medical marijuana. The two counties that make up my own congressional district in south Florida, Monroe and Miami-Dade, voted in favor of the measure 80.3 percent and 68.3 percent, respectively. The voices and the votes of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, matter.

The 10th Amendment of the Constitution matters, and for those who like to call themselves constitutionalists, the entire Constitution has to matter, not just the parts that are convenient at a given time.

In addition to the witch hunt opened up by the Attorney General's actions last week, current Federal law also prohibits these businesses from deducting the common expenses associated with running a small business when they file their taxes, expenses necessary to running a business like rent, most utilities, and payroll. Simply put, this rule places legitimate enterprises which have been established under State law at a major competitive disadvantage where legal employers are paying exorbitantly higher effective tax rates.

That is why I introduced H.R. 1810, the Small Business Tax Equity Act,

last year. This bipartisan bill amends the Tax Code to allow legally operating marijuana businesses to utilize common tax deductions and credits, thus providing them with tax parity.

The Federal Government should not be ignoring States' rights and the decisions of voters and State legislatures across the country. We must work to afford all businesses selling legal products the opportunity to make appropriate deductions and contribute to our economy and create jobs.

Another important point, Mr. Speaker—and again I thank my colleague for taking this time and bringing us together to talk about this issue in a bipartisan manner—the best ally of those who are operating illegally, the drug cartels, the drug traffickers who do not pay any taxes, who target children, the best ally they have are the policies that the Attorney General has embraced. Because what happens, Mr. Speaker, is that these legally operating businesses can no longer compete and people turn to the black market.

So, hopefully inadvertently—I hope inadvertently—the Attorney General has actually done a great favor to those who operate outside the law and is punishing those who are actually trying to control this substance, to keep it away from young people, to make sure that only those who have permission from their States, prescriptions from their doctors, can access this substance.

I am, again, so grateful to join my colleagues tonight to call on the Attorney General, on this administration, on this President, who, when he campaigned said, "I will defer to the States; I will respect the States," and, in this case, a State like Florida, which voted for the President, also voted 71 percent to allow medical marijuana in our State, all the way from Key West to the panhandle.

The residents of Florida deserve to be respected. I will continue working with my colleagues on this side of the aisle, across the aisle, to make sure that our government respects States' rights, to make sure that our government is on the side of those who want to operate within the law, those who want to pay taxes, those who want to be compliant, not the gangs and the illegal drug traffickers who are celebrating today as a result of this dangerous policy change.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) for joining me this evening. Each and every point that Mr. CURBELO made wasn't partisan. It didn't lend itself to a conservative or a liberal ideology. It just made sense: just adhere to our constitutional principles in a way that we can help people without getting the government in the way.

I am particularly grateful that the movement criticizing Attorney General Sessions for this very poor judgment exercised is not a Republican movement or a Democratic movement. It is bipartisan.

In that bipartisan spirit, I yield to my friend Mr. CORREA from California.

I want to thank the many Californians who have been a part of this effort going forward, and I yield to him.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I also am honored to join my colleagues from across the aisle tonight to talk about Attorney General Sessions' decision to rescind the Cole memo, which has guided the State of California as well as other States in pursuing reasonable cannabis regulation.

As a California State senator, we relied on the Cole memo to help craft California's cannabis industry regulatory framework.

□ 2045

I personally introduced legislation to regulate medical cannabis that was sponsored by the public safety community of the State of California. We all relied on the Cole memo. We all relied on regulating medical marijuana to make sure that it was chemical free, that it was tested, labeled, and that cannabis was kept away from our children, our neighborhoods, and our schools.

I remember working on this legislation, and one day I got a phone call from a Republican doctor who wanted to lecture me about my bill. I assumed he was opposed to the legislation, but, you know what, I wanted to hear him out. So I had him drive out to my district office. And during the meeting, he told me about his daughter, a young Miss Moynihan, who from birth to the age of 10—she was 10 years old—had had seizures. And every year, those seizures had gotten worse and worse. And the medication he had to use to keep the seizures under control had gotten stronger and stronger with terrible side effects on his beloved daughter.

Finally, Dr. Moynihan fell across medical cannabis. He used it. It was like a miracle. His daughter was getting better with no negative side effects. But then he said, "Lou, I want to make sure that my daughter's seizures stop, but I want to make sure she doesn't get high," meaning what he wanted me to do in my legislation was to make sure that my legislation carried language to make sure that medical cannabis was tested and properly labeled.

All this doctor wanted was medical cannabis for his beloved daughter. And there are many patients like young Miss Moynihan that rely on medical cannabis, but she also relies on the proper regulation, and labeling, and manufacturing of medical cannabis.

Attorney General Sessions' doing away with the Cole memo effectively says to the State of California: You can no longer regulate medical cannabis. This will not be available for the young Moynihans of the State of California. I ask Attorney General Sessions to reinstitute the Cole memo. Let States do what States do best. Let's respect the sovereignty of our States, and let's move forward, not backward.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for joining

us this evening. His words are a clarion call to sympathize with, empathize with, and support parents who have children with refractory epilepsy and other diseases that lead to chronic and, at times, unstoppable seizures.

There is a desperation in the voice of parents who have children who have these seizures. That moves me. A child's eyes can roll in the back of their head. They can turn blue, gasping for air. The gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) referenced circumstances where a parent would reach out and ask for help.

I yield to the gentleman to maybe further explain how it makes you feel as a policymaker when you have got someone who wants to cut through the normal discord and disruption in the policymaking process, and they just want their child to be able to breathe in the absence of these debilitating symptoms. If the gentleman wouldn't mind, I yield to him for that explanation.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I just want to add, think about all of the progress that we made as a country, as a nation in regulating cannabis, medical cannabis, how so many States have relied on that Cole memo to be lawfully abiding citizens, lawful citizens, lawful businessmen, and States have also relied on that memo to make sure that their regulatory framework fits within Federal guidelines.

Much time, energy, effort, and resources have been invested by these States to make sure that we are following Federal law. And overnight, the Cole memo is gone. All of that work these States have put together is out the door. How do we tell all of these citizens that want to follow the law, want to pay their taxes, want to do what is right under the law that they are now criminals? This is not right. It is inconsistent with our due process. And at the end of the day, again, these are States' rights.

We have given effectively these powers, these abilities to the States to regulate medical cannabis. We cannot just turn our back and say: We didn't mean it. Sorry. Let's move forward.

I don't believe we can return to those days when we would lock up individuals for minor sources of cannabis. We can't go around the streets and arrest people for cannabis anymore, and, of course, Dr. Moynihan has to have the ability to continue to medicate his daughter.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish his constituents the best of luck in these trying times. One may reasonably wonder: What does the repeal of the Cole memo really mean for a patient, or a doctor, or a dispensing organization? It presents a series of logistical challenges that could be crippling not only to this industry, but to the very vulnerable Americans who rely upon it for medicine.

Today, all across America, banks do not know whether or not their receipt

of deposits from cannabis organizations operating legally under the color of State law would subject that bank to some broader consequence, to the oppressive hand of the Federal Government coming in and creating all kinds of other bad consequences for the people who bank with that institution.

And so the result is that dispensing organizations that want to grow, that want to make investments, that want to do research, that want to be able to deliver to fragile and vulnerable patients, won't be able to meet payroll, won't be able to fund the infrastructure of their companies, and won't be able to do the research so that we find out what strains of cannabis can be uniquely helpful to specific ailments.

So this repeal of the Cole memo isn't merely a circumstance where you are okay, so long as you are not being arrested or prosecuted in that very moment. It literally erodes the framework that has allowed people to be able to bring medicine to the doorstep of some of our most vulnerable Americans.

That is the true danger here: confusing policy and lack of clarity regarding the rules. In an area where innovation could do so much good for people, why would we not want the clearest, most predictable rules possible? Why wouldn't we want the highest standards for testing, labeling, and research? Why wouldn't we want to introduce cannabis, not in a context that could lead to abuse, or money laundering, or other illicit activity? Why would we not want it introduced in the most clinical setting possible, approved by researchers, prescribed by doctors, and then used by patients that oftentimes have seen every other reasonable medical remedy fail.

I am a limited government guy. I just don't understand why any administration, Republican or Democrat, would want to place the government between vulnerable people and something that could potentially help them. Again, recognizing the bipartisan flavor of this evening, I wanted to take just a moment to recognize one of my conservative friends, someone who has led in this institution on conservative causes during his tenure here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wanted to join him just for a few moments to simply applaud the way in which he is raising this issue tonight.

I think it is incredibly important because it was Jefferson who actually said "that the normal course of things was for government to gain ground and for liberty to yield." And you think about the significance of the 10th Amendment and what it says. Its words are real simple: "Those powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This is a gut-check moment on the degree to which we really believe in the

10th Amendment, and we really believe in a limited Federal Government. So I would make very quickly three points: one, what you are talking about tonight is ultimately about this larger question of whether States are simply proxies, if you will, worker bees, if you will, for the Federal Government and nothing more than that.

Are all decisions to be made in simply Washington, D.C., or can they actually be made at the local level? This issue that you are raising is ultimately not about marijuana, but it is about local voice and local control.

For instance, we have an oil drilling issue off the coast of South Carolina, and a number of us have raised it, not because it was our idea, but because every single municipality along the coast of South Carolina came out in unison with different resolutions, different proclamations that said: We don't want offshore, not so much for offshore, but for its impacts in the way that we develop as a coastline. And so this is ultimately about simply this larger question of: Does Washington make all of the calls, or is there a State government, a local government, and an individual involvement that actually are involved in the way that decisions get made?

I would, furthermore, say that this is a gut-check vote on the notion of federalism. Federalism is hard. The reason our Founding Fathers didn't want a king or a queen but wanted this massive process called a Republican and a Democratic voice that went with it was because, though it is a lot harder, it is a lot fairer—one man, one voice; not all voices in Washington.

So what I think is interesting, back when I was in a different role at the State level, I remember different bills coming across my desk from different counties, for instance, for proposed tax increases. And staff would say: You have got to veto that. And I would say: No, the counties are free to make stupid decisions. I don't agree with it. I think it is a mistake, but counties ought to be able to have the voice to decide what they want to do.

This is that exact same principle at play at the Federal level. And by having this quiltwork of different experiments in different States, and then being able to determine what works and what doesn't work, we are able to formulate national policy, not from on high, top down, but from the bottom up.

Finally, I make this simple point: this is about saying the Federal Government does not decide the complexion of a local business. I think that what was significant about one of your earlier speakers, CARLOS CURBELO, H.R. 1810—I am a cosponsor of his bill—it simply says, you have got to treat a local business as a local business. If it is legal locally, then you have got to treat it as such. And you can't come in and preempt from a Federal level and decide how local business is going to operate.

So for a lot of different reasons, I simply applaud what you have raised tonight. And I thank the gentleman for his voice and his very strong stand for liberty and conservative principles in doing so.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. It is worth noting that so many of the experiences that make up the people who serve in this body come from local government, or State legislatures, or governorships. I am very proud to have served in the Florida Legislature. I know my colleague, Mr. SANFORD, served as the Governor of the State of South Carolina. And we have seen how States can function as the laboratories of democracy. And from time to time, a State may look at another and say there is a circumstance where they have done something right, or they have done something that we wouldn't necessarily agree with. And then we can tailor proposals that have withstood scrutiny and review experiences in other States and try to improve upon them.

That is the great federalist system that our Founders promised us that remains guaranteed in our Constitution today. Federalism is not some quaint, little notion of how government should run. It is the enduring promise that we have a right to live under today. And so I thank my colleague for reminding the Congress that it is the States that are the necessary constituents of the Federal Government, not the other way around.

It highlights why the decision of the Attorney General to rescind the Cole memo was so deeply flawed because it highlights the arrogance of a Federal Government that believes that its policies should always stand in primacy to innovation at the State level.

Here, that innovation is helping people, and that is the point that I would really like to stress. I have met with hundreds of families in the State of Florida and throughout the country who have seen benefits from medical marijuana. This isn't a medical theory. It is not something that people are merely hopeful for. It has actually created a more meaningful quality of life in American families.

Why wouldn't we be for that? Why don't we want to champion the opportunity for a parent to be able to hear their child speak for the first time?

Why wouldn't we want to give a grandparent some respite who might be caring for a child that has compulsory and reflexive seizures?

Why wouldn't we want to help a caretaker who might be caring for a parent of their own suffering from Alzheimer's, or Parkinson's, or dementia where we have seen improved research and growing opportunity for progress?

□ 2100

The Attorney General's decision is a step backward, but it doesn't have to be, because the Trump administration can step forward and fulfill the promise

that President Trump made on the campaign trail to respect the rights of States and to have a noninterference policy with medical marijuana.

I have called on Treasury Secretary Mnuchin to issue guidance and instruction to financial institutions that they will not be prosecuted or harmed or they will not face some adverse regulatory action if they continue to accept the deposits of medical marijuana companies. I am hopeful that Secretary Mnuchin has more foresight than we have seen from the Attorney General's Office and that he will provide this guidance.

Mr. Speaker, I would also ask that the President personally engage. I know the President. I know him to be a man with a huge heart who cares about people. Throughout the Trump family, there is a particular focus on caring for the vulnerable and children who have to deal with complex medical issues.

I would hope that the President and that the members of the administration would find it within their hearts to take action on this important priority. Let us not allow Attorney General Jeff Sessions to limit progress on American families and on an industry that is growing and creating jobs and developing key innovations that can help people.

Beyond dealing with this inartful rescinding of the Cole memo, there is broader medical marijuana reform that needs to happen. There is no excuse to maintain marijuana on the list of Schedule I drugs.

Schedule I is reserved for those drugs that have no medical value, that can't help anyone, and that should be subjected to the strictest scrutiny. Not even cocaine is a Schedule I drug. I don't even think that some of the drugs that are doing the most harm and causing the most deaths throughout the panoply of this opioid crisis are all Schedule I drugs. But marijuana is? It is indefensible, and it is indicative of a dogma of a lie that the Federal Government has told to the American people for a generation.

Think of the opportunity if we could come together and make some progress on this issue. Throughout the 115th Congress, we have had robust opportunities to debate about our discord and disagreement and to discuss issues where perhaps we won't be able to come together as Republicans and Democrats, but this should not be one of those issues. This isn't partisan. It is not even conservative or liberal. You just have to believe that the role of government isn't to hurt people who are trying to get better or hurt people who are trying to help others who are trying to get better.

We spend way too much time arresting people for marijuana in the first place. In the year 2015, 643,000 people were arrested for marijuana. That is one person every 49 seconds for a year. 574,000 of these arrests were for possession, not distribution or sale.

Forty percent of all drug-related arrests are for marijuana possession. This is particularly discriminatory. African Americans are more than 2½ times more likely to be arrested for possession than Whites.

Marijuana is a \$20 billion industry in this country. If we allow Attorney General Sessions to have his way, we will drive that \$20 billion into the black markets, into the hands of the money launderers and the cartels, and the consequence will be fewer solutions for patients.

Marijuana has shown tremendous promise in the treatment of Alzheimer's to slow the protein deposits on the brain. For patients with AIDS and HIV, medical marijuana can stimulate appetite and slow muscle wasting syndrome. It can function as an anti-nausea medicine, as an analgesic, and it can reduce peripheral neuropathy. For arthritis patients, there can be a reduction in certain types of symptoms that could clear people's airways suffering from debilitating arthritis.

We have also seen very favorable results for the many millions of Americans dealing with chronic pain who right now are getting prescriptions for opioids. So many of the prescriptions written for opioids today in America causing deaths, taking away our children, our aunts and uncles and our parents, could be avoided if we weren't prescribing opioids in the first place and if we had a lower impact alternative like medical cannabis.

People with cancer have been given new hope not only that these symptoms can be relieved through medical cannabis, but that the actual growth of tumors can be slowed. There is really great research that has been published by the British Journal of Pharmacology regarding the antitumor properties that medical cannabis can have. But, unfortunately, that research has to be done in Israel, in Europe, and in other places in the world because in this country we continue to maintain the indefensible policy that no research can reasonably occur on medical cannabis.

As a matter of fact, this very Attorney General and this very Department of Justice have frustrated reasonable efforts to make more medical cannabis available for research, to unlock cures for the American people and to help American families.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with this.

I wasn't always a believer in medical cannabis, but I met a girl in my district who was being told by her doctor that she was going to have to saw her brain in half to stop the seizures from firing across. Today, that little girl is a medical cannabis patient. She has traded surgeries for softball games; she

has traded doctors for dancing lessons; and she brings hugs, hope, and joy to our entire community. It is for her—it is for the millions of Americans benefiting from medical cannabis—that I call upon this administration to stop the Attorney General from harming Americans through his repeal of the Cole memo.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my bipartisan group of colleagues who joined with me this evening.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2157

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 195, FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-520) on the resolution (H. Res. 696) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 195) to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain

resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for January 16 and today on account of travel delays due to inclement weather.

Mr. VELA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of weather in district.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Of-

ficial Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JENNIFER A. HEMINGWAY, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 27 AND OCT. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jennifer A. Hemingway	10/27	10/28	Estonia		252.46				(³)		
	10/28	10/31	Czech Republic		1,242.15				(³)		
Committee total					1,494.61						1,494.61

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

JENNIFER A. HEMINGWAY, Jan. 2, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX, Chairman, Jan. 5, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ROB BISHOP, Chairman, Jan. 8, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PETE SESSIONS, Chairman, Jan. 4, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Lamar Smith	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Hon. Mo Brooks	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Hon. Thomas Massie	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Hon. Ami Bera	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	57,962	892.90		(³)			57,962	892.90
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	538,319	490.72		(³)			538,319	490.72
Hon. Brian Babin	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Hon. Barbara Comstock	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Ashley Smith	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Chris Wydler	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Emily Domenech	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Tom Hammond	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Raj Bharwani	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Drew Colliatie	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Ashlee Vinyard	10/14	10/14	Italy	224.46	261.12		(³)			224.46	261.12
	10/15	10/18	India	72,073	1,106.36		(³)			72,073	1,106.36
	10/18	10/20	South Korea	769,140	704.18		(³)			769,140	704.18
Committee total					28,576.32		4,024.16				32,600.48

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, Jan. 2, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. KEVIN BRADY, Vice Chairman, Jan. 5, 2018.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3770. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Report on Contractual Flow-Down Provisions in the Federal Acquisition Regulation and Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, pursuant to Sec. 887

of S. 2943 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2017 (Public Law 114-328); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3771. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Deputy Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Streamlining Administrative Regulations for Multifamily Housing Programs and Implementing Family Income Reviews Under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act [Docket No.: FR 5743-I-04] (RIN:

2577-AJ36) received January 10, 2018, 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.

3772. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendments to Investment Advisers Act Rules to Reflect Changes Made by the Fast Act [Release No.: IA-4839; File No.: S7-05-17] (RIN: 3235-AM02) received January 10, 2018, 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.

3773. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grid Security Emergency Orders: Procedures for Issuance (RIN: 1901-AB40) received January 10, 2018, 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.

3774. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendments To Harmonize and Streamline Part 20 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Requirements for Licensees To Overcome a CMRS Presumption [WT Docket No.: 16-240] received January 10, 2018, 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.

3775. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Annual Charges for Use of Government Lands in Alaska [Docket No.: RM16-19-000; Order No.: 838] received January 10, 2018, 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.

3776. A letter from the Executive Director, U.S. World War One Centennial Commission, transmitting the US World War One Centennial Commission Periodic report for the period ended September 30, 2017, pursuant to Public Law 112-272, Sec. 5(b)(1); (126 Stat. 2450); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3777. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rights of Way; Removal of Incorporation by Reference [NPS-WASO-24690; PPWOVPADU0/PPMPRLE1Y.Y00000] (RIN: 1024-AE42) received January 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3778. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — General Regulations; Areas of the National Park System, Free Distribution of Other Message-Bearing Items [NPS-WASO-23396; GPO Deposit Account 4311H2] (RIN: 1024-AE32) received January 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3779. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Annual Operating Plan for Colorado River System Reservoirs for 2018, pursuant to Sec. 602 of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of September 30, 1986, Public Law 90-537; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3780. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation [Docket ID: ED-2018-OGC-0004] (RIN: 1801-AA17) received January 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3781. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties received January 11, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3782. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties [Docket No.: 18-01] (RIN: 3072-AC70) received January 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3783. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Guidance under Section 965 [Notice 2018-07] received January 10, 2018, 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.

3784. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Estate of George H. Bartell, Jr. v. Commissioner, 147 T.C 140 (2016) [AOD 2017-06] received January 10, 2018, 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.

3785. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Domestic production gross receipts (Rev. Rul. 2018-03) received January 10, 2018, 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.

3786. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2018-5 received January 10, 2018, 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.

3787. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulation — Election Out of the Centralized Partnership Audit Regime [TD 9829] (RIN: 1545-BN77) received January 10, 2018, 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.

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. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 696. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 195) to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 115-520). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 4810. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to carry out activities relating to the development and maintenance of a broadband inventory map through the National Telecommunications and Information Administration and not through an agreement with any other agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOST (for himself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 4811. A bill to provide for grants from the Attorney General to local education agencies to purchase and install devices that would allow for the immediate notification of appropriate officials in case of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICCILLINE:

H.R. 4812. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (popularly referred to as the Buy American Act) and certain other laws with respect to certain waivers under those laws, to provide greater transparency regarding exceptions to domestic sourcing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4813. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study to evaluate the role of unlicensed spectrum in offloading broadband traffic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 4814. A bill to amend the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to preserve and protect the ability of local governments to provide broadband capability and services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. POLIS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. POCAN, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 4815. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for a new rule regarding the application of the Act to marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4816. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the use of amounts from the Asset Forfeiture Fund for the Domestic Cannabis Suppression/Eradication Program of the Drug Enforcement Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 4817. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to make grants for the establishment or expansion of internet exchange facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4818. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds made available in the form of an earmark, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 697. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting visits and communication between the United States and the Republic of Artsakh at all levels of civil society and government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. POCAN):

H. Res. 698. A resolution recognizing magic as a rare and valuable art form; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 4810.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 4811.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4812.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4813.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 4814.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 4815.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 4816.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution (relating to the general welfare of the United States).

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 4817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for 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 office thereof.

By Ms. ROSEN:

H.R. 4818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (Clauses 1 and 18) of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 82: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 233: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 566: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 664: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 850: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 881: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 930: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 1120: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1141: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1300: Mr. O'HALLERAN and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1311: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 1360: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1406: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1445: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1626: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1762: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1772: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1847: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1876: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1880: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1954: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2000: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2001: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2119: Mr. WALZ and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 2147: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2206: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2215: Mr. WELCH and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 2267: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2477: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2528: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2545: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2623: Mr. WALKER, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 2687: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2902: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. WALDEN, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2920: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2987: Mrs. RADEWAGEN and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 3079: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3127: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 3128: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 3222: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3252: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3282: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 3330: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 3444: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 3488: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 3513: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3637: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3730: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 3746: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 3806: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3913: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. COMER.
H.R. 3931: Mr. POCAN and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3994: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4059: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 4099: Mr. KATKO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 4107: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 4131: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 4143: Mr. POLIS, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 4202: Mr. MARINO and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 4206: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 4207: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 4229: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 4232: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 4274: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 4312: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 4314: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4319: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4392: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4396: Mr. NEAL and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 4444: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KIND, Mr. KIHUEN, and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 4473: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4525: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 4527: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 4547: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BLACK, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 4548: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 4575: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 4681: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 4682: Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 4684: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4710: Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 4712: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LONG, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 4717: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 4732: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 4736: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 4744: Mr. LANCE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SIREN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 4760: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. YOHO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PITTEMBERGER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 4772: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 4777: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 4779: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4782: Ms. LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 4796: Mr. KILMER and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H. Res. 21: Mr. PERRY.

H. Res. 274: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H. Res. 276: Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 349: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 466: Mr. BEYER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H. Res. 627: Mr. MEADOWS.

H. Res. 661: Mr. POLIS.

H. Res. 673: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. SUOZZI.

H. Res. 683: Mr. NORMAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.