



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2018

No. 188

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 29, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRUCE POLIQUIN 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.

MY WORK FOR AMERICA IS NOT DONE

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, when I was born, separate but equal was the law of the land. Even in a northern city like Chicago, a young Puerto Rican kid knew where he could and could not go, which beaches and pools were open to him, and which were off-limits.

Segregation and discrimination by race, gender, religion, and sexual orientation were deeply embedded in the

customs and culture of our society, and upheld by the State and Federal Government.

So as I prepare to leave office after 26 years representing the people of the Fourth District of Illinois, I think it is important to reflect on how far we have come and how far we still have to go before this country lives up to its lofty ideals enshrined in our most sacred documents and origin mythology.

That a Puerto Rican born in Chicago in 1953, 65 years ago, the son of Spanish-speaking immigrants with little education who were driven by poverty from the mountains of Puerto Rico, would be able to speak into this microphone at all is perhaps a ringing endorsement for what this Nation stands for.

But let us be clear: People sacrificed and died so that I could speak here today. People I never met, like Medgar Evers, Emmett Till, and countless others, died in the struggle against discrimination and American apartheid, and opened the path for me to be here today.

The Voting Rights Act and other civil rights legislation passed in my lifetime on this floor were soaked in the blood of martyrs, old and young, who kept moving forward until everyone had the right to vote and every vote was counted.

Even as the President and his party challenge the principles of the Voting Rights Act today, I have always tried to honor those who have given their lives to make America freer and stronger.

To be blunt, were it not for the sacrifice of Black Americans, Black people in this country and their allies, who literally had their homes and churches bombed fighting to make this country live up to its own creed, I would not be here speaking to you today. That has always and will always guide me.

When the Fourth District was created to give Latinos an opportunity in

Chicago to have a voice in Congress, I was the first to win that seat. While the majority of my constituents then in 1992 were 65 percent Latino, on election day, the majority of voters were White.

In 26 years and 13 elections, that has changed. Today, voters on election day in the majority Latino Fourth District, which I represent, are, in fact, Latino.

Early on, I realized the constituent services in my district were not restricted to veterans' benefits and Social Security, although we work hard on those issues. In my district, helping people navigate the complex and expensive process of citizenship was a top need and became a top priority for my office.

We helped more than 55,000 people—let me underscore that, 55,000 immigrants—become citizens, sponsoring workshops, helping people resolve issues, and setting a standard that I feel is unmatched by any congressional office.

Just last month, I spoke with a woman who told me a remarkable story. Her daughter had assembled all of her documents and was prepared to apply for citizenship, and then she left the file on a Chicago subway system train. A few days later, this woman told me, a knock came at her door. Someone had found her daughter's folder, and they didn't give it to the CTA's lost and found, but, rather, they made sure it got to my office on Fullerton Avenue in Chicago.

My office and staff were so associated with citizenship and helping the immigrant communities that this Good Samaritan felt there was only one logical place to return the documents. Indeed, we worked with her daughter to make sure all of her documents and fees were filed. Today, she is a citizen of the United States of America.

When I walk through my district and talk with moms and dads, they tell me how my office touched their lives.

□ 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.

H9693

Whether it was for citizenship or fighting someone's wrongful deportation, my office has done more than just help constituents. We have literally helped them preserve their families.

It is the legacy of helping families and individuals, and making this country a more welcoming place for people, people a lot like my parents from rural Puerto Rico, that is what I carry with me as I leave.

My work for America, her immigrants, and the character of our great Nation is not done. It is simply switching to private life. We who believe in freedom cannot rest. But to all of my colleagues, past and present, thank you for walking with me on this journey these many years.

INCREASING COAST GUARD ASSETS IN THE POLAR REGIONS

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the urgent need for increased U.S. Coast Guard assets in the polar regions of the globe.

America has been a world leader and a dominant force in the Arctic and Antarctic regions for over a century. While both of these areas are currently models of internationally shared territory, the geopolitical relevance of the polar regions is rising, and with it comes a larger and stronger presence of countries such as Russia and China.

Russia and China have both declared plans to grow and strengthen their presence in the polar region. China recently announced its status as a near-Arctic nation and continues to rapidly grow its ice-breaking fleet. Over the last 3 years, Russia has constructed six new bases in Russian Arctic territory.

These are concerning and clear signs that Russia and China have intentions to change the nature of their presence in the polar regions.

In order to compete with these countries, we must protect our sovereignty in the Arctic and our national interests in the Antarctic. It is time for Congress to reinvest in Coast Guard assets in this area.

The Coast Guard's sole heavy icebreaker, the Coast Guard cutter Polar Star, is 40 years old, and the task of accessing the polar region becomes more difficult for this ship every ice season.

Immediate investments in new heavy icebreaker ships, the Polar Security Cutter fleet, is critical to ensuring a long-term presence for the U.S. in these polar areas.

The U.S. Coast Guard has created a 6-3-1 approach to rebuilding its polar region fleets. With this 6-3-1 position, the Coast Guard will build a fleet of six polar icebreakers, including three Polar Security cutters similar to the Polar Star, and the U.S. Coast Guard's first Polar Security cutter.

These new heavy icebreakers provide continued access to the polar region

and, ultimately, will prevent the U.S. from ceding any ground to our political adversaries.

I appreciate the hard work done by the folks at the Coast Guard, not only in the polar regions, but across the world. Their efforts play a role in ensuring our national security, and it is vital that we continue to provide the Coast Guard with the funding they need in order to do their jobs.

This investment will arm the Coast Guard with the tools, equipment, and personnel it needs to complete its missions on the polar front.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in Congress to join me in supporting the requested \$750 million in funding.

ELIMINATE BIGOTRY AND HATE

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I rise, proud to be an American, proud to have the opportunity to speak for people who cannot speak for themselves in this place.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mention the midterm elections of 2018, said by many who count and who are supposed to know to be one of the highest turnouts ever, exceeding 100 million voters, said to be approximately 48 to 50 percent of those who are eligible to vote, depending on how you count and who is counting.

In Texas, it is said that, on November 1, the number of Texans voting early exceeded the entire turnout for 2014. The numbers indicate that 3.3 million or more 18-to-29-year-olds voted early, a 188 percent increase over 2014. It was a record turnout.

Why was there a record turnout? is the question that we have to grapple with. Yes, people turned out because they wanted better healthcare. They turned out because they want better jobs. They turned out because they want better schools, better education. They want better housing.

But they also turned out because they were opposed to bigotry and hate. Nobody can give you the empirical evidence to support entirely the number that turned out because they were antithetical to bigotry and hate. But we know by anecdotal evidence that many people turned out, in addition to the other things, because they want to see bigotry and hate not managed, but they want to see it eliminated in the greatest and richest country in the world.

Many people turned out with the expectation that we would do something about all of the things that I have named, including bigotry and hate. Many people turned out because they want bigotry and hate to become more than talking points. They want bigotry and hate in this country to become action items.

They want to see us visibly do something about the bigotry and hate that has found a means by which it can multiply, it can grow, in this country.

We have seen evidence of it in elections, a Senator who says: I'd go to a public hanging.

We have seen evidence of it in our places of worship, people killed in a synagogue.

We have seen evidence of it in the streets with words and behavior that are unacceptable. "Jews will not replace us," they said in Charlottesville.

We have to do something about bigotry and hate, and it has to be more than simply talk. Talking points are good; action items are better. It is time for the Congress of the United States of America to stand up for the many people who suffer from bigotry and hate in this country.

THE SPEECH POLICE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment is first for a reason. It is the most important right we have as Americans and at the very core of who we are.

Without the First Amendment, freedom of religion, free speech, freedom of the press, freedom in assembly, the rest of the Amendments are meaningless.

The purpose of the First Amendment is to permit free and open discussion about the important issues of the day. It protects the right to speak freely about the two most controversial subjects of the day: religion and politics. This is exactly what was forbidden under King George, and it is exactly why our Founding Fathers chose to make it first among the original 10 in the Bill of Rights.

□ 1015

But, somehow, the speech police have decided to replace free speech with their self-determined fair speech. If it is not fair to them, then it must be banned.

What does fair mean?

Fair means different things to different folks. In some places in our country like Texas, fair is where you take the chickens or prized pig to sell it or eat anything you want to on a stick when it is deep fried.

Fair means different things to different folks. But the word "fair" is not in the Constitution. The Constitution protects free speech, not fair speech. It says Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, and the Constitution applies to the elitist speech control police whether they think that is fair or not and whether they like it or not.

Our Founding Fathers established individual rights to protect our liberties, not our feelings. We have become so caught up in the politically correct restriction that everyone has the right not to be offended that we are, in fact, losing the right of free speech.

Where does the Constitution say you have the right not to be offended?

The right of free speech belongs to the speaker and cannot be regulated by the listener because it may be offensive and certainly cannot be regulated by government because it is not fair—fair in the eyes of government.

But our most important freedom is being replaced by fear: the fear to speak openly. Some wish to prohibit the voice and speech of others they disagree with or if the opposing view may be offensive. So the controlists want speech regulated or, to put it bluntly, it must be politically correct.

It is interesting that the one place where diversity of thought, ideas, and speech should be promoted is at our universities. But universities are prohibiting free speech in the name of protecting the students, while at the same time professors say anything they want to say about all issues—the doctrine of free speech for me but not for thee.

To make matters worse, the controlists want government to regulate speech. That is a Stalinist concept. Stalin used government to silence all opposing views, views that offended the government and the elitists. It is not just those in the public eye. Everyone feels they must weigh every thought and decision against who and how it could possibly be offensive to someone, somewhere, somehow. It is ridiculous, and it is a threat to our freedom and our prosperity.

We cannot live in fear of speech. We cannot live in fear to speak.

The Founding Fathers intended free speech to include criticism of the government and to advocate unpopular ideas, including controversial ideas. Freedom of speech allows individuals to express themselves without interference of the government and truly debate all issues. But we must not allow that to be lost to this out-of-control, politically correct crowd that only wants to allow speech that agrees with their agenda and, literally, destroys anyone who disagrees.

Law professor Alan Dershowitz said: “Freedom of speech means freedom for those who you despise, and freedom to express the most despicable views. It also means that the government cannot pick and choose which expressions to authorize and which to prevent.”

Voltaire, who lived at the time of our Revolution, said: “I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.”

Lively disagreements are the foundation of a free republic.

George Washington said it very well when he said: “If freedom of speech is taken away, then dumb and silent we may be led, like sheep to the slaughter.”

America must always remain a free and open space where the marketplace of ideas—even those we detest or disagree with—are freely expressed. It seems our very founding document is at risk of fading into the abyss of history.

The irony of it all is that free speech is becoming anything but free, and

that ought not to be. We should all speak out against the controlling speech police.

And that is just the way it is.

TOXIC CAPITALISM

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, GM went to bed with a record \$3.2 billion in profits last quarter alone. Its shareholders went to bed with a 5 percent surge in stock prices, plus the \$10.6 billion the company has spent on buybacks since 2015. Meanwhile, 14,000 GM workers spent a sleepless night wondering if their jobs and livelihoods would still be there for them the next morning.

There is no better snapshot of our country's current, toxic brand of capitalism, where we are operating in a system that demands that workers labor harder and harder to meet basic human needs but refuses to share even a slice of the success that they helped create.

For those of us in this Chamber this morning, it is about more than one company or one balance sheet. It is about 50 years of giving the private sector explicit permission to cast workers aside. It is about an economy that has become the antithesis of what our country stands for: equity, decency, justice, and hard work.

President Trump has made his response to these economic inequities very clear. His is a country of bitter rivalry between fellow citizens forced to endlessly spar over the scraps of that system: “My wages can't go up unless your food stamps are taken away.” “Your medical bills can't fall unless my insurance goes.” So Americans spend their days fighting each other over economic crumbs while our system quietly delivers the entire pot to those at the top.

That is the reality that our new Democratic majority must address for the coal miner in Kentucky, the daycare worker in New York, the fifth-generation farming family in Ohio, the first-generation immigrant family in Massachusetts, the mostly White towns in West Virginia devastated by an opioid epidemic, and the communities of color across our country terrorized by the war on drugs.

Forget where they are from or what they look like or how they vote. All of these Americans face an economy that does not operate for them. They live in cities and towns that are likely to be medically underserved, educationally ostracized from today's job market, plagued by inadequate infrastructure, and burdened by crumbling homes or houses that no one can afford.

They disproportionately shoulder the hard words that can make life hurt: “eviction,” “addiction,” “bankruptcy,” and “violence.”

They hail from the places where polling locations disappear, where the big-

gest economic engine is a payday lender, where lead poisons their children's water, and where injustice and insufficiency fester for generations before a government thinks to step in.

This is the challenge of our time. It is the injustice that we have to solve not just because of our politics, but because our system will not survive if we don't.

I believe in that system.

American capitalism has done great good for a great number of people. It has given the average American a better standard of living than anywhere else in the world, lifted millions out of poverty, and powered our globe. But its current iteration is badly broken, and the sooner we admit it, the sooner we can strip it to the studs and build something better.

A moral capitalism is judged not just by how much it produces, but by how widely it shares, how much good it does for how many, and how well it takes care of each and every single one of us.

ENTREPRENEURIAL CAPITALISM

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I came here this morning, Mr. Speaker, and I picked up a copy of this morning's edition of The Wall Street Journal. Many Americans would consider it to be the most influential newspaper in America, but certainly, at least on economic matters, I think most would agree.

I just happened to read the lead editorial today, Mr. Speaker, and it says the House, this body, has “done yeoman's work shepherding a compendium of bipartisan bills to expand access to capital.”

This is in the most influential newspaper in America.

There is a lot in between, but let me go to the last sentence, where it says: “Senate Republicans shouldn't scuttle what could be one of this Congress's better achievements.”

That is in today's Wall Street Journal, Mr. Speaker.

The Journal is talking about JOBS 3.0. It is a bill that came out of this body, 406-4. Its purpose, Mr. Speaker, is to promote small business, to promote entrepreneurial capitalism, and to promote venture capital.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it came out of this body, 406-4—we couldn't get a 406-4 vote on a Mother's Day resolution—and yet it languishes on that side of the Capitol.

So I have been in this body for 16 years, Mr. Speaker, and I have learned a few things. One of the things I have learned is never underestimate the Senate's capacity to do nothing. Unfortunately, so far, the United States Senate has done nothing on a bill that passed, 406-4.

Now, Mr. Speaker, thanks to the leadership of President Donald Trump, thanks to the leadership of Speaker

PAUL RYAN, and thanks to the leadership of Chairman KEVIN BRADY, we have what, for most Americans—not all, but for most Americans—is simply the greatest economy they have had in their entire lifetimes:

Unemployment is at a 50-year low, cutting across all socioeconomic groups;

Small business optimism and consumer optimism is off the charts;

We are seeing more people come back into the labor force.

This is all great news, but we cannot be blinded by the fact that, as good as the economy is today, we still have to concentrate on the economy of tomorrow. We need to know:

Can we ensure that the seed capital is there?

Can we make sure that our public policy nourishes the drivers of tomorrow's economy?

The next Amazons, the next Googles, and the next Ubers, where are they going to come from?

So, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is that, as recently as 2016, startups in America have been cut in half.

And, oh, incidentally, the regulatory burden—more securities regulatory burden—has increased by over 50 percent in the last 10 years, and by over 80 percent. It now costs, Mr. Speaker, twice as much to go public today as it did 10 years ago.

What do we see? We see half the number of companies going public.

They don't seem to have that problem in China, Mr. Speaker, because China has over one-third of the world's IPOs, or initial public offerings; yet, in the United States, our IPOs have been cut in half.

That is why it is so important that every Congress go back and we ensure that our securities laws are written in such a way that we make sure that entrepreneurial capitalism can't just survive in America but absolutely thrive.

So I come to this floor again to ask that our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol—and I have many friends in that body, but I am often confused why they cannot act on something that has received incredible support in the House.

Mr. Speaker, November is National Entrepreneurship Month. There are only 2 days left in the month. I hope that my voice can be heard on the other side of the Capitol, and I would ask the United States Senate to immediately take up the JOBS 3.0 Act and make sure that the economy of tomorrow for our children and grandchildren is as healthy and thriving as the economy of today.

□ 1030

HUMANITARIAN MORAL COMPASS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the uniqueness of this Nation is the idea

that we have coddled democracy, freedom, and justice. We have maintained a constitutional government and have been respected worldwide. This has been through wars, times of peace, times of depression, and times of devastation in our own Nation. Yet, we remain a Nation that has a moral guidepost.

I rise today to announce to this House that America can do two things at once. It can condemn the terroristic, violent act of killing a Saudi reporter who worked at the Washington Post, and, at the same time, maintain its status and prominence to engage in the affairs of the Middle East, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage the legislation that is now moving through procedurally in the United States Senate to remove our support for the Yemen war that the Saudis have enacted upon against the people of Yemen and stand against the violent acts against children—the killing of children on school buses, which has happened over and over again—and the bloodshed and starvation that is going on in Yemen with our affirmation.

It is time now to end that bloody war with our handprints on it. I hope the other body will engage in debate and be fully informed by this thoughtful, bipartisan legislation. I believe that it should come to the House and that we should act on it with all expeditiousness.

Now just imagine that a tape exists, which I believe Members of Congress should have the right to listen to, but I understand we are brilliant people and our imaginations are vivid. Imagine that you went into a consular's office with the hopes and dreams of a new marriage. You are following the codes and laws of your native land to get permission to marry again, to have joy again, to be able to be with someone you love.

Rather than having the process on paper, your blood was splattered on the floor. You are greeted with a brutal force that demanded whatever—loyalty to the crown prince—and you were bludgeoned and killed by allegedly the biggest untruth: it was an accident. Then, tragically, to your family comes the evidence or the word that you were mutilated or dismembered.

Our imagination, tragically, can allow us to see that picture, ordered by the crown prince. We must cease and desist any relationship in this war and, at the same time, maintain diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, we also need to be more merciful to those who are at the border. As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, we have created this crisis here in the government, the White House, and the administration. We must be humanitarians. Tear gas can be used to protect our men and women at the border, but it must be used sparingly and not against mothers and children.

I hope to be able to discuss this issue. I hope to be down at the border to see this disgraceful behavior. We can do

better in feeding them and providing cover as they are processed. Our law has not changed. You can seek a legal asylum request to enter the legal ports of entry—even those who are not. The White House knows that. Let us not be known for the brutality against women and children as we have been known to separate women and children.

Finally, again, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, we need to rush disaster housing assistance to California. None of us have seen the magnitude of the Camp fire fires. FEMA has not provided disaster housing assistance. The President must issue that order. We must rush to provide for those people who are homeless. We know that it is more efficient to provide funding for housing as opposed to hotels. They are begging for it. I believe that we should convene a Homeland Security hearing to be able to assist these individuals as quickly as possible.

Where is the humanitarian moral compass of this Nation to stop killing children in Yemen; to understand that we must help those suffering refugees at the border; and finally, Mr. Speaker, to help our neighbors in California get housing after everything is gone?

WAR IN YEMEN

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have closely followed the recent developments in the war between Saudi Arabia and the Houthi rebels in Yemen.

This is one of the world's deadliest wars. Air strikes and other acts of war have killed tens of thousands of civilians. Yemen has become a wasteland, with widespread disease and famine. An estimated 85,000 children have been killed or died from malnutrition. The United Nation estimates that Yemen is now facing the specter of a famine threatening 14 million people: half of their population. Three-quarters of Yemen's population now requires urgent humanitarian assistance.

The time has come for us to reconsider our support for this disastrous war and to consider the moral imperatives that form the foundation of our values, as well as our strategic interests. In this instance, I believe both our moral values and strategic interest require that we reassess our involvement in this tragic human catastrophe. We must reject war and pursue peace.

The day I was sworn in as a Member of Congress, I joined the House in passing a resolution calling on all parties involved in the conflict to increase efforts to prevent civilian casualties and to increase humanitarian access. In addition, the resolution denounced the conduct of the war in Yemen that is, directly or indirectly, inconsistent with the laws of armed conflict, including the deliberate targeting of civilians

and the use of civilians as human shields.

It is my fear that our continued support of this war will only increase resentment of the United States and the region. It will diminish U.S. security and undermine America's moral authority and reputation as a champion of our foundational values such as human rights and civil liberties.

In addition to the horrendous humanitarian costs in Yemen itself, it makes the entire region less secure and makes humanitarian disasters in the wider region more likely. But more importantly, what is happening in Yemen is just simply wrong. It is out of harmony with America's values. Ironically, the very reason we want to support a strong ally in Saudi Arabia is to prevent this type of situation, not foster it.

These conditions provide a breeding ground for violent extremism and for terrorist groups to expand. Prolonging the war in Yemen only strengthens the Islamic state in Yemen and al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. Additionally, the conflict undertaken by the Saudi-led coalition under the objective of "eliminating Iranian influence" has achieved just the opposite.

Iran has been able to use the conflict as an opportunity to establish a foothold across the Middle East. They send soldiers to prop up a dictator, Bashar al-Assad, in Syria. Additionally, Iran-supported Hezbollah is now the dominant political force in Lebanon, and able to threaten neighboring Israel, our closest ally in the region, with its growing missile and rocket arsenal. This threat to Israel is in addition to the ongoing barrage of missiles fired into Israel by Iran-supported Hamas in Gaza.

I welcomed Secretary of Defense Mattis' comments in October, when he said, "It's time to stop this." He urged all parties to sit down and pursue peace. Secretary of Defense Mattis' comments were followed by Secretary of State Pompeo's statement in which he said, "The time is now for the cessation of hostilities."

I echo Secretary of Mattis' further comments when he said, "We have got to move toward a peace effort here, and we can't say we are going to do it sometime in the future." We should support the U.N.-led efforts to bring peace to this devastated country and urge the Saudi-led coalition and Houthis to start peace negotiations immediately.

Ending our support for the Saudi-led coalition highlights the gross inhumanity of the war and that we do not support the way the conflict in Yemen is being conducted. It underlines our growing concerns about the behavior of Saudi Arabia as it affects larger American strategic interests in the region and our interest in preserving global humanitarian norms. Ending our support for the war will force the Saudi-led coalition to reconsider its policies and will signal our support for peace

negotiations as, as called for by the administration.

American foreign policy requires a balance between our national security and moral values. In the case of the war in Yemen, these competing imperatives are not in conflict. Ending U.S. support for the war in Yemen supports both American strategic interests and humanitarian values.

EYE DONATION MONTH

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to acknowledge November as Eye Donation Month, dedicated to increasing awareness of the need to register as an eye, organ, and tissue donor.

Since 1983, the Eye Bank Association of America, EBAA, and each of its 75-member eye banks across the U.S. have dedicated this month to honoring the Nation's eye donors and their families, and to celebrate the transformative impact of corneal transplants on the lives of their recipients.

With a 97 percent success rate, corneal transplants are the Nation's most successful organ transplant procedures. Since the Association's founding in 1961, nearly 2 million corneal tissue recipients have regained their sight.

In 2017, EBAA member eye banks recovered 135,203 corneas from 68,565 donors across the United States. This made it possible to provide the gift of sight to approximately 51,000 men, women, and children in the U.S., and over 26,000 recipients internationally. These eye banks also provided more than 24,000 corneas for research and educational purposes.

My home State of California is served by eight eye banks that recovered nearly 8,000 corneas last year, making it the largest source of corneal tissue for transplant and research in the country. These donations allowed thousands of Californians to regain their vision and resume the lives they had planned on living before disease or injury deprived them of their sight.

In addition to improving their recipients' quality of life and giving comfort to donor families, corneal transplants also have a considerable economic impact on America's healthcare system. A recent EBAA analysis found that the net lifetime economic benefits of cornea transplants performed in 2017 will exceed \$6 billion, due to the elimination of medical expenses related to vision care and the increased productivity of both the cornea recipients and their caregivers.

I thank the Eye Bank Association of America for its decades-long dedication to the restoration of sight. I thank all of those who list themselves as an organ donor on their driver's license. I thank all of those who are willing to give of themselves for others. I want to reassure and thank their loved ones, because those who have passed have done a great good for society, for peo-

ple who have lost their sight, and for future generations who will one day benefit from the research they have contributed to by donating their corneas.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in urging all Americans to give the selfless gift of vision and life by registering to become eye, organ, and tissue donors.

RECOGNIZING LOIS WHEELER

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we recently returned to Congress after celebrating Thanksgiving, a time when we pause and reflect on the many blessings that our community bestows upon each one of us.

Today, I am proud to recognize an outstanding citizen from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who worked tirelessly for over three decades to ensure residents were able to enjoy the holiday surrounded by friends and good food.

Lois Wheeler of Lower Makefield began serving Thanksgiving meals to the underprivileged in our community in 1980. Known as "Bountiful Harvest Feasts," Lois hosted between 125 and 200 people yearly at the Masonic Lodge in Fairless Hills.

Lois' dedication to serving the hungry began in high school. While attending Neshaminy High School in Langhorne, Lois saw a classmate who was not able to afford lunch. Wheeler was so moved, she would bring him sandwiches to eat. When they were not available, she would give away her own lunch.

Lois is truly beloved in our community. Her continued generosity has earned her the nickname "Sister Wheeler," and she has also been called the "Mother Teresa of Bucks County."

While Lois' health prevented her from participating this year, her legacy of service to Bucks County cannot be erased. We applaud Lois for her charity and generosity, and wish her and her husband, George, all the best.

□ 1045

RECOGNIZING THE LINGHOCKEN VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANY AND THE COUNCIL ROCK SCHOOL DISTRICT'S ACHIEVE PROGRAM

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize students and public servants in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who recently teamed up to spread awareness of fire safety and vocational training.

Last month, the Linghocken Volunteer Fire Company met with students in the Council Rock School District's ACHIEVE program, which is geared towards providing students with special needs the tools and skills needed for self-sufficiency.

The Linghocken Volunteer Fire Company's presentation, which took place in a fire safety trailer to simulate real-life emergencies, was aimed

at preparing students to respond to a fire hazard.

I would like to thank Council Rock ACHIEVE staff John Engelhardt, Dan Bartleson, Steve Ruane, and David Marcinkowski for their work in preparing Bucks County students for the future.

I would also like to thank Lingohocken Chief David James, along with firefighters Gary Davis, Charlie Vaughn, Ted Middleman, and Glenn Forsyth of Newtown Township Emergency Services for their dedication to our community.

At a time when our fellow citizens in California are experiencing devastating wildfires, firefighters' skills and expertise are appreciated and so sorely needed. We need them now more than ever.

RECOGNIZING LINDSEY SPRITZLER

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a student from Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, for her outstanding achievements.

Lindsey Spritzler, a senior at North Penn High School in Lansdale, was recently selected as a member of the 2018 All-National Honor Mixed Choir and is performing at their annual conference this week in Orlando, Florida.

Lindsey was one of only 240 individuals across our country to be selected to join the vocalist team. This is certainly no small feat. In order to even qualify, Lindsey had to be selected for the Pennsylvania All-State Chorus and placed near the top of her section.

I applaud Lindsey for her hard work and exceptional talent.

We are also proud to recognize Music Department Chair Matthew Klenk for his commitment and dedication to our community and for his service to the North Penn School District as well.

On behalf of our entire community, we all look forward to seeing what Lindsey will accomplish in the future. We know they will be great things.

RIGHT HONORABLE WINSTON CHURCHILL'S 144TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this week Speaker RYAN and Leader PELOSI welcomed members of the Churchill family and the distinguished Ambassador from the United Kingdom to the United States Capitol in honor of the 144th anniversary of the birthday of the Right Honorable Winston Churchill. It is always a touching and fitting ceremony here in the people's Capitol.

I recall well one of the most fateful assignments of our predecessor body, the Continental Congress, when a special committee was formed, something Congress is great at. That special committee included John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson, and Jefferson was assigned this great task of drafting the Declaration of Independence.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he completes his work, and he comes back to the com-

mittee and he outlines his 27 grievances against the King. He has worked on it for days. Benjamin Franklin and John Adams review that work, and they make 80 changes—80 changes.

It just shows that, no matter how good the author is, once it is turned over to a committee, there will be change.

Of those 80 changes, about 25 percent of the Declaration of Independence that we know today, one of those changes speaks to the heart of the friendship, the underlying friendship, between the British and American people, for one of their changes was Jefferson's poignant lament, which reads as this: "We might have been a free and great people together."

So that was taken out of the document, even though Jefferson outlined the 27 grievances why America should separate itself from Great Britain.

I like to reflect on that when we fast-forward to Winston Churchill coming to America in 1946 and speaking at Westminster College in Missouri, when he toasted what he called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples.

He said in that talk: "But we must never cease to proclaim in fearless tones the great principles of freedom and the rights of man which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world and which through Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the habeas corpus, trial by jury, and the English common law find their most famous expression in the American Declaration of Independence."

So, on this 144th anniversary of the birth of Winston Churchill, someone who was of both, American and British, I salute his birth. I salute that special relationship between the United Kingdom and this great country.

RECOGNIZING ALICE ANDREWS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Alice Andrews, a good friend who was recently awarded the 2018 Neil Compton Award for her tireless work in conservation in Arkansas.

Born and raised in El Dorado, Alice received her undergraduate degree in fine arts from Henderson State University, where she fell in love with arts and the environment.

She is more than a 40-year member of the Ozark Society and has served extended terms as Ozark Society president and conservation chair.

Alice has worked for decades to preserve water, air quality, and wilderness areas throughout Arkansas. Her lifetime of service to the State of Arkansas and environmental conservation will not be forgotten.

I join all Arkansans in congratulating Alice on this achievement and wish her much continued success.

FARM BUREAU PATRIOT PROJECT

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Arkansas Farm Bureau for participating in the American Farm Bureau Federation's Patriot Project. Arkansas is one of only four

States currently participating in this project.

The Patriot Project is a program that connects military veteran beginning farmers and ranchers who are starting their careers with experienced Farm Bureau farmers, who act as mentors.

The Arkansas Farm Bureau works to identify military veterans and Farm Bureau mentors and facilitate long-term educational and professional mentorship relationships. The military veterans should be actively farming and using their own resources while their mentor guides them towards success.

I thank Randy Veach, president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau, for his leadership in bringing this program to Arkansas, and I extend a warm hand of gratitude to the Arkansas Farm Bureau for its worthwhile commitment to our veterans.

LGBT EQUALITY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, throughout my tenure in Congress, I have been so proud to work and promote LGBT equality here at home and around the globe.

When I was first elected as a Member of this distinguished body in 1989, our country was in a very different place than it is today in how we understood people who are LGBT and the rights and the respect due them.

Although much progress still needs to be made, it is true that we are moving in the right direction. Let me give you some examples, Mr. Speaker:

By voting to end the misguided Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy;

By funding much-needed human rights programs abroad, implemented by a wonderful agency, USAID, such as its LGBT Global Development Partnership;

By endorsing the principle of equality as it applies to marriage rights and responsibilities;

By including LGBT individuals within nondiscrimination provisions and by ensuring that these and other services funded by this body are made available without regard to sexual orientation or gender identity.

As a founding member of the Congressional LGBT Equality Caucus, I have continued to build on these successes by supporting education legislation, including:

The Student Non-Discrimination bill to end bullying and harassment continually faced by LGBT students throughout our Nation;

Adoption bills, such as Every Child Deserves a Family Act;

Legislation to modernize laws and eliminate discrimination with respect to people living with HIV/AIDS; and

The Equality Act, which gives consistent protection for LGBT individuals across existing civil rights laws.

Each one of these efforts seeks to put an end to the discrimination and to the violence against individuals as a result of their sexual orientation or their gender identity, and I believe each one of them is so strong and deserves to continue to be an American value because discrimination of any kind runs counter to who we are as Americans.

As a refugee from the brutal communist, the dictatorship in Cuba, I have always viewed my adopted homeland, the United States, as a symbol of freedom, of equality, of opportunity; and these are fundamental values that must be applied to everyone in our country, regardless of who they are or whom they love.

The United States has a unique and important role in the world. Many people look to us for leadership. They aspire to be like us. They emulate our values. So, as a country, we have the opportunity and the awesome responsibility to promote the best of our American values.

One way to do this is to take a stand against the violence, against the harassment, against the discrimination that LGBT community members face around the world. Mr. Speaker, I will give some examples.

Our American values dictate that we should respect and embolden individual freedoms for all. That is our guiding principle. But in 70 countries throughout the world, being gay or transgender is cause enough to be locked away, imprisoned. In seven of these countries, the penalty is death.

Our State Department Human Rights Report, a report that Congress has requested or mandated be filled out every year, is reported to us. It is filled with examples of abuses, of discrimination, of violence carried out against LGBT individuals everywhere.

In Russia, basic political freedoms of speech, of assembly, and of expression are denied to those who are LGBT. In the Russian republic of Chechnya, Chechen government officials are directly responsible for rounding up and executing LGBT individuals. We in Congress condemn these actions by Chechen authorities through a resolution that I authored and we passed.

In Egypt, LGBT individuals have been subjected to forced exams in order to prove if someone is gay, whatever that means; and, later, they are incarcerated.

In Indonesia and Nigeria, gay men have been stoned.

In Jamaica, lesbians have been subjected to rape, purportedly to correct their sexual orientation.

In Brazil and in many Central American countries, transgender individuals have been subjected to abuse and murder.

This is unimaginable in our country, but those are but a few examples of the range of injustices and disrespect that LGBT individuals face around the world.

Those who remain in their countries face these humiliations. They are even

denied employment, employment that they need in order to feed their families. And those who seek to flee their countries to escape a fate that you and I cannot even imagine are often denied the expedited refugee protection that they need.

So, Mr. Speaker, as my time serving in this body comes to a close, my fight for what is right will not end. I say to my colleagues: We may be from different parties, we may have different points of view and different philosophies, and we might serve on different committees, but I ask us all to commit, beginning today, to working across the aisle with a view to becoming more consistent, more fair, more respectful, and more principled on this issue. We as a country need to take action to set the right example.

There are many issues upon which we as a body may never agree, but LGBT equality should not be one of them.

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 59 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

Pastor William Hild, Jr., FirstSarasota, the Downtown Baptist Church, Sarasota, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, we beseech You this morning to grant unto this House abundant wisdom, such as we read of in the epistle of James, a wisdom that "is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, open to reason, full of mercy and good fruits, without uncertainty or insincerity." May such wisdom be the foundation upon which debate and decision is made.

We pray for the health, wholeness, and peace to be upon each and every esteemed Member, their spouses, their families, and the dedicated staffs who undergird them. May the great challenges that confront our land, debated in this Chamber, become opportunities for even greater blessing as, together, we seek Your will for this, our beloved Nation.

May we be reminded today that Your Word teaches us: "Blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord." We thank You for Your incredible goodness, remembering all Your many blessings, both individually and as a Nation.

We earnestly pray for a deeper desire to make You the foundation and center of our life as we offer this humble pray-

er in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. LAWRENCE 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 28, 2018.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Ruth Johnson, the Michigan Secretary of State, indicating that, at the Special Election held on November 6, 2018, the Honorable Brenda Jones was duly elected Representative in Congress for the 13th Congressional District, State of Michigan.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

I, Ruth Johnson, Secretary of State and Custodian of the Great Seal of the State of Michigan, certify that the following persons were duly elected in Michigan at the November 6, 2018 General Election to the Office of U.S. Representative in Congress for a term commencing immediately and ending on January 3, 2019, as shown by the official returns certified for the election and placed on file in this office.

District 13, Brenda Jones.

In witness whereof, I have hereto attached my signature and the Great Seal of the State of Michigan, at Lansing, on November 26, 2018.

RUTH JOHNSON,
Secretary of State.

DIRECTING THE SPEAKER TO ADMINISTER THE OATH OF OFFICE TO THE REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT FROM THE 13TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1161) and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1161

Resolved, That the Speaker is hereby authorized and directed to administer the oath of office to Ms. Brenda Jones, a representative-elect from the 13th Congressional District of Michigan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE BRENDA JONES, OF MICHIGAN, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the Michigan delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise her right hand.

Ms. JONES of Michigan appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 115th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE BRENDA JONES OF MICHIGAN TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I proudly present BRENDA JONES as a new Member of Congress for Michigan's 13th Congressional District for the remainder of this Congress.

BRENDA JONES was elected in a special election earlier this month. She very much wanted to essentially be faithful to the votes of her constituents, so all of us are here proudly to be with her.

Her career in public service started in 2005 when she was elected to the De-

troit City Council. My brother was once president of that city council.

She has subsequently been reelected three times and rose to become president of the council in 2014 and again in 2018.

BRENDA is a former small-business owner, a past president of the Communication Workers of America Local 4004, and a proud alumnus of Wayne State University.

We all welcome you here to Congress, especially fellow colleagues from the Michigan delegation.

But if I may add, the former Speaker is here, NANCY PELOSI. It is so characteristic of her to join all of us.

In addition to the Michigan delegation, I see others who are here who either know BRENDA JONES or will come to know her in a short period while she is here in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, with those words, I appreciate the chance to address the House, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. JONES). I proudly leave this place to the Member, now, of the House of Representatives, BRENDA JONES.

Ms. JONES of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let me start out by saying: To God be the glory. I want to first thank God for giving me this great opportunity. I want to thank my family; Pastor John Pitts; a special thank you to my colleagues BRENDA LAWRENCE, Congressman BRAD SHERMAN, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Chairman CEDRIC RICHMOND; all of the Congressional Black Caucus; and all of the Michigan delegation. To the leader and to all of my supporters, volunteers, my church family, the 13th Congressional District, and the State of Michigan, I say thank you.

This truly is a humble feeling to stand here and be sworn in amongst the men and women who do the work every day for the United States of America.

The voices of constituents of the 13th Congressional District have been heard, and I am now seated as their Representative of the United States of America. It is time to get to work. I am ready to roll up my sleeves during this lame-duck session, do what is expected of me, and join my colleagues in getting the job done for the 13th Congressional District and for the United States of America.

God bless the 13th Congressional District. God bless the United States of America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentlewoman from Michigan, the whole number of the House is 433.

WELCOMING PASTOR WILLIAM HILD, JR.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to welcome to the United States Capitol my pastor, William Hild, who led us in the opening prayer today.

Pastor Hild is not only a tremendous community leader in my hometown of Sarasota, Florida, but he has been a great friend to Sandy and me, and a resource to me and my family, for nearly 18 years.

Since 1997, Pastor Hild has served as the pastor of FirstSarasota, the Downtown Baptist Church. Under his leadership, the church has grown. It is very dynamic. It makes a big difference in my community. Also under his leadership, we have seen the incredible outreach that he has done in terms of strengthening and encouraging people on our beautiful Gulf Coast.

My wife Sandy and I want to personally thank Pastor Hild for what he has done for us in our life and what he continues to do in our community to make it a better community. It is a privilege to have Pastor Hild and his family here today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CONGRATULATING IRA A. LEESFIELD

(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 am so proud to rise today to recognize Ira Leesfield and congratulate him on receiving the 2018 Lawyers for Children America's Janet Reno Outstanding Community Partner Award.

As a University of Florida Law School graduate, Ira proved himself to be an intelligent and driven individual from the very beginning of his legal career. Upon graduation, Ira entered the honors program at the U.S. Department of Justice and served as a trial attorney in the U.S. Army and in the Judge Advocate General's Corps before opening his own practice in 1976.

Since then, Ira has become well known for his work throughout our State and the U.S., where he has consistently made it his mission to be a voice for the less fortunate and those in need.

In the early 1990s, Ira established the Leesfield Family Foundation, which supports both local and national nonprofits, and emphasizes protecting the elderly and underprivileged women and children in our south Florida community.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ira on this well-deserved recognition. I thank him for

his tremendous efforts throughout the years, and I am so honored to call Ira Leesfield my amigo.

EMANCIPATION NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation loves its history. We in Texas love our history. Today, I rise to encourage and to announce the legislation that reflects history.

H.R. 4745, to designate the Emancipation National Historic Trail, is a wonderful legislative initiative that reflects history in the State of Texas and throughout the Nation.

We are all reminded of the Emancipation Proclamation that was issued in 1863. We know that there were areas of the South that did not get the word that the slaves were free for 2 years.

Earlier this week, I celebrated the commemoration of the birthday of the Honorable Mickey Leland, who died some years ago alongside an Ethiopian mountain while attempting to feed those struggling. But he believed in stopping food insecurity.

In honor of him, reflecting on the history of our community, I ask my colleagues to sign on to H.R. 4745 because it recounts the announcement by Captain Granger that the slaves were finally free in Texas and throughout the Southwest, and creates a wonderful trail that all of us can enjoy that chronicles the story from Galveston to Houston.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation that says that America can accept all of our history, and I ask you to join H.R. 4745.

□ 1215

THANKING THE PEOPLE OF WISCONSIN'S FIRST DISTRICT

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express profound gratitude to the people of the First District of Wisconsin.

Any time I get to swear in a new Member as we just did, it brings me back to the time when I was first sworn in here in 1998. I remember just being awestruck the first time I walked down that center aisle. That feeling just never goes away. I still feel it when I walk onto the floor each and every time.

I am immensely grateful to the people of southern Wisconsin for their trust and their confidence. I have always had this thing about calling the people I represent not my constituents but my employers. It is the way I have always thought of this, and I think it is important that we as Members understand that we work for the people and not the other way around, and that we

are in this to make a difference for them.

We work every day to keep that obligation, especially, actually, when it comes to constituent service. It is the lifeblood of the work we do here as Representatives. It is something that goes unreported, but it is extremely important, extremely valuable, and very gratifying.

Any success that we have had is really, in my case, due to our humble and our hardworking staff. I have had the chance to work for and to work with the very best people. I really have.

Before I was a Member, I was part of a legion of Hill staffers. I was a staffer here before I got elected as a Member. I started as an intern in the mailroom, and I worked my way on up: legislative correspondent, legislative assistant, legislative director, and chief of staff, all of those things.

I figured I knew everything about these jobs, all long hours and all sacrifices, but nothing can truly prepare you for having people willing to help you in such a big undertaking on the front lines. So I am profoundly grateful for the dedicated public servants who have helped us serve the people—my employers—of the First Congressional District.

I want to thank the members of our team who have stayed with us to the very end: Rebekah Cullum, Jordan Dunn, Brandon Farnsworth, Megan Wagner, and Laura Wiley.

I want to thank Allison Steil, our deputy chief of staff, who has been with us for 10 years.

I want to thank Tricia Stoneking, our director of scheduling and office operations, who has been with us for 15 years.

I want to especially thank the members of our team who have been with us from the very beginning, from the start. We call them the lifers: Danyell Tremmel, my chief of staff; Chad Herbert, director of military and veterans services; and Susie Liston, district director.

Chad is a hunter. He is a veteran. Danyell came from my predecessor. She knows every nook and cranny in the Federal Government and how to help constituents navigate their problems. Chad has helped countless veterans. He knows the veterans system so well, and he has done so much good for the veterans of southern Wisconsin.

Susie Liston, our district director, has one of the most pleasant and happy demeanors. You can get a lot of angry constituents walking into a district office. She handles them better than anyone I have ever known.

Teresa Mora, director of outreach, has run my bilingual services. She has helped me with all my bilingual Hispanic townhall meetings. She has done a spectacular job of doing constituent outreach throughout my district.

Many of you know Joyce Meyer. Joyce was my first legislative director.

Andy Speth started off as my district director then my longtime chief of

staff. He is my silent partner. Andy and I met in sixth grade basketball camp at St. Paul Lutheran School where he went and where his kids go. We have been friends ever since we went to high school together. When I moved home to run for Congress, he was the guy who helped me. He has been my partner in this venture all along, and I am so grateful for his friendship. I am so grateful for his partnership.

I also am just grateful for the people of Janesville, Racine, Kenosha, Oak Creek, Elkhorn, Lake Geneva, Walworth County, Racine County, Kenosha County, Rock County, Waukesha County, and everyone in between.

Since becoming Speaker of the House—which is not something that we are used to in Wisconsin; I am the only one who has done that—I appreciate the indulgence of the people I work for who indulge the fact that I had other responsibilities in addition. When I took on these additional responsibilities, the people of our staff really stepped up and really helped serve our constituents so that they continue to enjoy those flawless constituent services.

I am just so grateful for these people in my life. I am so grateful that they were able to serve the people of southern Wisconsin so well, and I am absolutely grateful to the people of southern Wisconsin for entrusting me as their Representative.

LAFAYETTE, WE ARE HERE: THE AMERICAN LAFAYETTE ESCADRILLE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we remember the 100th anniversary of the great World War I, it is vital to honor American pilots who fought for freedom in Europe before the United States officially entered the war.

Under the French Air Service, the Lafayette Escadrille was formed. It was an all-American, all-volunteer squadron.

In 1916, 224 Americans formed the unit. They wore French uniforms, and assembled on their biplanes was a courageous Native American chief.

Being a pilot in World War I was deadly dangerous. The life expectancy of an Allied pilot was 11 days. Daily combat operations saw casualty rates of 400 percent. Fifty-one Americans were killed in combat, and the Americans downed 199 enemy planes. They flew in all the major battles over the Western Front's bloody trenches of no man's land.

In 1918, when the United States entered the war, these men of the Lafayette Escadrille were incorporated into the United States Air Service. These young flyboys of World War I were some of America's best. They went over there and flew the skies fighting

for freedom, proudly proclaiming, “Lafayette, we are here.”

And that is just the way it is.

**HONORING THE MEMORIES OF
SERGEANT DAVID
KINTERKNECHT AND DEPUTY
SHERIFF DEREK GEER**

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of two pieces of legislation. First, H.R. 6216 will designate the United States Postal Service facility in Montrose, Colorado, after Sergeant David Kinterknecht, who was killed in the line of duty on July 25, 2009.

Sergeant Kinterknecht was born and raised in Montrose, Colorado, and graduated from Mesa State College and Delta Montrose Technical College. His career in law enforcement began in the 1980s, and throughout his career, he served in the Telluride Marshal's Office, San Miguel County Sheriff's Office, and the Montrose County Sheriff's Office.

The second bill, H.R. 6217, will designate the Postal Service facility in Grand Junction, Colorado, in the Third Congressional District after Deputy Sheriff Derek Geer, who was killed in the line of duty in 2016. Deputy Sheriff Geer went to school in Grand Junction and eventually raised his family there. He was a U.S. Navy veteran, and after his Navy service, he went into the Mesa County Sheriff's Office for 15 years.

Both Sergeant Kinterknecht and Deputy Sheriff Geer were respected law enforcement officers dedicated to public service and family men. Their deaths were mourned by people throughout the Third District and the State of Colorado. Passage of H.R. 6216 and H.R. 6217 will help preserve and honor the memories of these police officers in their communities.

**WELCOMING CLEBURNE
FIREFIGHTER KRIS WATSON HOME**

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to speak about a courageous Texan who is a part of the Cleburne Fire Department in the district that I represent, Lieutenant Kris Watson.

We all have been closely watching the recent fires in California that have been catastrophic to families and businesses. Thousands of buildings, including homes, were scorched in the blaze, and at least 85 people lost their lives. I cannot imagine what the California community is going through, and my heart breaks for them.

While these fires were treacherous and unpredictable, our very own Cleburne firefighter, Lieutenant Wat-

son, was one of 200 Texan firefighters who answered the call for help. He selflessly went into harm's way and put his life on the line to save others. This man is a true hero, and I am humbled to speak about him today on the House floor in front of my colleagues and the Nation.

Even though the fires have finally calmed down, the effects will be felt for years to come, and it is important to let our friends in California know that we are with them and that we will continue to keep them in our thoughts and our prayers.

I am happy to report that Kris made it back to Cleburne safely last week. Everyone in Texas' 25th District is proud of our fellow Texan, and I thank him for his valor.

May God bless the Cleburne Fire Department and God bless the people of California.

In God we Trust.

**CONGRATULATING JUDGE RICK
DAVIS ON HIS RETIREMENT**

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Garland County Judge Rick Davis. Judge Davis is currently serving his fourth and final term in my home county in central Arkansas.

Since becoming the county executive 8 years ago, Judge Davis has worked hard to improve county roads, stabilize the water supply, and improve the business environment of Garland County. He has excelled in his role, bringing more than 30 years of private industry experience to his job.

Before taking the helm of the county judge's office, Rick was chief executive officer of Daveco Construction and, along with his wife, Denise, raised registered Angus cattle on his farm. In fact, the Davis family was named Garland County Farm Family of the Year in 2004. Rick and Denise are important members of our community who have dedicated their lives to service.

I congratulate Rick on a successful tenure as county judge and his long-deserved retirement.

**RECOGNIZING MARC COMMUNITY
RESOURCES**

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the special work of Marc Community Resources of Mesa, Arizona. Marc is a nonprofit organization dedicated to providing education, rehabilitation, and other social services to children and adults with physical disabilities and developmental health challenges.

Since 1957, Marc has been committed to helping those with disabilities live,

learn, work, and play. Each year, Marc helps more than 4,000 people overcome the limitations of their disabilities to reach their full potential.

The challenges that the disabled face in day-to-day life are often underappreciated, and their achievements in overcoming those challenges are frequently overlooked.

I am sure the employees of Marc would say that it is their patients who are the real heroes; and while they courageously battle severe challenges, today I rise to commend the heroic efforts of Marc Community Resources—its owners, managers, and employees—in the work they do. I am grateful for their service to Mesa and the entire east valley.

**MOURNING THE LOSS OF
CHRISTOPHER RISNER**

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of Christopher Risner, a friend and constituent of mine from Jackson, Michigan. He died last week at the age of 29, truly heart-breaking and far too soon.

I met Chris through a group called Andy's Angels, which fights the opioid epidemic in our communities.

A star basketball player in high school, Chris battled his own addiction as a young adult. He bravely and openly shared his personal struggles in recovery to educate young people and their families about drug addiction. By doing so, he touched many lives and inspired them to follow the right path.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost too many lives of sons and daughters to this devastating epidemic. That is why earlier this year we enacted a bipartisan law to combat the opioid crisis in a comprehensive way. Yet in memory of Chris and so many others, we still have more work to do.

May all of us commit to redoubling our efforts in this year ahead, and may God provide His peace and comfort to Chris' parents, Julie and Dan; his sister, Angela; and the entire Risner family.

□ 1230

**HONORING THE LIFE OF
SERGEANT JOSHUA RODGERS**

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 2017, U.S. Army Sergeant Joshua Rodgers gave the ultimate sacrifice for our country during a raid on an ISIS headquarters in eastern Afghanistan.

Despite being just 22 years old, Sergeant Rodgers, a member of the U.S. Army Rangers Special Operations unit, had quickly become a decorated hero, earning numerous awards and medals, including the Bronze Star with Valor and Purple Heart.

Today, the House will consider my legislation renaming a post office in the name of Sergeant Rodgers. With this legislation, we worked closely with the U.S. Postal Service; local State Representative Dan Brady; and Joshua's mother, Vonda Coulter Rodgers. This is a way to pay tribute to Sergeant Rodgers by renaming the post office in his hometown of Bloomington-Normal, Illinois.

This legislation has the backing and bipartisan support of the entire Illinois delegation. We hope that the renaming of this post office will forever remind the Bloomington-Normal community of their hometown hero and Joshua's commitment to serving our country.

While we can never fully repay Sergeant Rodgers and his family for the sacrifices he made, renaming the post office in his honor is a small way to thank him for his service and dedication to protecting America, the greatest country in the world.

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women, which was November 25.

According to the World Health Organization, one in three women around the world experience violence in their lifetimes, across all class, race, country, and age groups, but less than 10 percent of abused women seek judicial or legal help.

That is why I recently cosigned a bipartisan letter to Secretary of State Pompeo and USAID Administrator Green, urging their continued support for the citizen security program in Guatemala, which addresses crime and violence at the community level while working with Guatemala's Attorney General and judiciary to bring criminals to justice. The letter also called for the creation of similar programs in countries that have high levels of corruption and violence against girls and women.

It is crucial that nations work together to strengthen the rule of law and support institutional structures that protect women and girls from abuse and violence.

RECOGNIZING ERIN SMITH

(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 congratulate a young woman in my district for creating a remarkable application to help detect Parkinson's disease.

Erin Smith, a Shawnee Mission West High School graduate, created

FacePrint, a facial expression recognition system that uses a web camera or smartphone to detect facial masking, a common Parkinson's symptom caused by stiff facial muscles. FacePrint will analyze facial movements and compare them to a database of people with and without Parkinson's.

Erin's app will help lead to early detection of Parkinson's. Early diagnosis means early treatment, and appropriately targeted therapies can be initiated before further tissue damage is done.

This creation earned Erin a spot on the Forbes 30 Under 30 list, making her the youngest person to make this list in a decade.

We are extremely proud to have Erin in the Third District of Kansas. She is a testament to our local schools and a shining example of the hardworking and innovative Kansas spirit. I wish the best for Erin as she continues this important work to combat Parkinson's disease.

RECOGNIZING MAYOR HARVEY SKOOG

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mayor Harvey Skoog of Prescott Valley, Arizona, who will be retiring next month after a long career of public service. Mayor Skoog has served the community of Prescott Valley for almost three decades on the city council, 19 years of which he served as mayor.

Along with his many years of public service, Skoog is known for his pride and appreciation for his family. He moved with his family from the Valley of the Sun to Prescott Valley in 1982. He and Edna, his wife of 60 years, have 9 children, 61 grandchildren, and 43 great grandchildren.

During his time as mayor, he has received many honors, including serving on the League of Arizona Cities and Towns executive board and as the chairman of the Greater Arizona Mayors Association. He was also appointed by Governor Jan Brewer to the Homeland Security Senior Advisory Committee for the State of Arizona.

Outside of public service, Mayor Skoog has been a successful small-business owner, developing three accounting practices in the Prescott Valley area.

Mayor Skoog has been a shining example of a true public servant and an outstanding friend to me and my staff over my years in Congress. I wish him well in his retirement and thank him for his service to the Prescott Valley and the entire State of Arizona.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO) at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 29, 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 November 29, 2018, at 3:06 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without an amendment H.R. 6651.

Appointments:
Federal Law Enforcement Congressional
Badge of Bravery Board.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 88, SHILOH NATIONAL MILITARY PARK BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AND PARKER'S CROSSROADS BATTLEFIELD DESIGNATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1160 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1160

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 88) to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-85 modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the ranking member, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The rule provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 88, showing the text of the Retirement Savings and Other Tax Relief Act of 2018 and the Taxpayer First Act of 2018.

This past December, Congress passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act in the interests of the American people. It was done around December 18, this last year.

The legislation was a bold, pro-growth bill that helped overhaul our Tax Code, and I believe it has unleashed the free enterprise system all across this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this was done because 8 years of anemic economic growth is what America had been working through. We had been working through high taxes, high rules, high regulations that were taking American jobs away from Americans and moving them elsewhere. It was limiting the future of not only America, but also Americans: the newest Americans in the job market, whether they be high school graduates, whether they be college graduates, or whether they be those that entered and finished professional school.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that for too long, for some 8 years, we had had a circumstance where the American Dream for so many fathers and mothers became to get their child out of the house after college, and that became an American Dream if a job was possible.

No longer, as a result of this tax act, do we find America in that sort of circumstance.

Today we find not only are there jobs aplenty, but the market is rising, wages are being increased, and the opportunity for all Americans is bright again. That is because Republicans and President Trump worked together to pass not only a jobs and tax bill, but we had a bill that would increase the amount of revenue that is flowing into the United States coffers and Treasury right now.

Despite what is being told by many in the marketplace, that we are simply running at a huge deficit, more money is coming into the Treasury supporting not only America, but the American Dream, and more people have money in their pockets.

So growth and competition have always been keys to an expanding economy, more jobs, increased wages. And in my home city of Dallas, Texas, and across the country, it is seen by people every single day.

Now, does that create new responsibilities and new issues? Yes, it does. And I will tell you that we must be prepared as a Nation to tackle those issues also.

But today, this legislation is about the person that goes to work. This bill today is about the entrepreneur, the family, the small business owner, the American people.

And also, as we will soon learn as we work through this debate, people who were impacted by disaster, whether it be floods, typhoons, tornados, fires, or other things that have occurred in this great Nation, we are turning the attention to ask for people back home to help and to help more, and we are going to do that through encouraging them as a part of the Tax Code.

We are going to do much more. We are going to help the soldier and the soldier's family. We are going to help the people who are those that see tax cheats and tax fraud, and protect the whistleblower.

We are going to take what is 300 pages of a small bill that can easily be read in a short period of time and understood, this is all about, not helping any one person or persons, it is helping millions across the country for an extension of their taxes and tax relief for yet one more year.

This is simply a jump-start to make sure that the economy looks forward, not backwards, does not look to one year, but looks to two in the relief that we are going to have.

Mr. Speaker, the question is, how is it going in America today?

Well, the answer is we have the lowest number of people who are searching for jobs and entering the jobless market to about the same number since 1996.

The annual skyrocketing amount that we have of business investment, of people who are taking jobs, people who are reinvesting in America is at a high level.

This package today will build upon that, it will build upon the successes that we are presently having and will make sure that we are doing the right thing.

We know that America is still hurting. We know that not all of America has recovered. As a matter of fact, we know that about 40 percent of Americans would not be able to cover an emergency expense of \$400 or more without having to take out a loan. We know that half of American working age adults say they do not still have enough savings to be prepared for their retirement.

That is why Republicans are here, once again at the end of the year, to say we need to look at the aggregate, the whole country, and to make sure that we are looking at the effects of a

year. We are trying to make sure that we continue making sure that the American family has a chance with an opportunity, not just to save, but to be able to use the Tax Code to their advantage.

Mr. Speaker, what this is about is continuing economic success, economic development, the ability that we have to continue giving the American worker, the American who is out of perhaps work, the newest student, or someone who was deeply impacted by a natural disaster, or a person who serves in the United States military, or for a person who sees a tax fraud or tax cheat to have a fair and equal footing to continue to call out those that take advantage of our system rather than using it properly.

That is what this small bill is about. It is about trying to end the year to give the American people the advantage that they need.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, that I like him a lot, he is a great friend, and I respect him a lot, but I don't like this bill and I don't respect this process.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today with the majority's last ditch effort to ram through another partisan tax bill before the end of this Congress.

And like so many of the Republican tax bills that came before it, this legislation hasn't been considered by the relevant committee. There was no hearing. There was no markup. Regular order was thrown to the wind. And Republicans didn't even consult with us, us Democrats, on this legislation.

This 300-page bill was drafted in the dark of night behind closed doors in some back room somewhere. Apparently the majority has completely abandoned any semblance of responsible governing.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are rushing to discuss how this is a commonsense plan and the result of some kind of negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, are they discussing the same bill? Because this one was introduced late Monday night. Democrats learned about it after it was released to the press. To claim otherwise is revisionist history.

This legislation goes beyond a traditional tax extenders deal. It is a vehicle for the majority to rush in fixes to their disastrous tax scam, which added \$2.3 trillion to the debt to give the wealthy more tax cuts, fixes that are necessary because they rushed the bill through the House and the Senate in just 51 days. That is not a deliberative

process, Mr. Speaker. That is a disastrous process.

This majority just had its worst election since Watergate. Democrats earned 9 million more votes, and counting. But apparently Republicans still haven't gotten the message, because they are continuing to fight for corporations instead of truly working with us to advance changes to our Tax Code that actually improve the lives of hardworking Americans.

Let me say it as clearly as I can: this is no real fix for the tax scam monstrosity. So why are we wasting legislative time?

We have real work to do, by the way. There are seven appropriation bills that still need to be signed into law over the next 5 legislative days, otherwise, our Nation faces yet another Republican shutdown. I read an interview with President Trump yesterday. He said he would "totally be willing" to shut down the government if taxpayers aren't forced to pay for his offensive border wall with Mexico. This is the same wall the President promised Mexico would pay for.

Apparently the majority is willing to have the American taxpayer get stuck with the bill, because instead of fulfilling our most basic responsibility of keeping the lights on, we are here today with another Band-Aid for their tax scam.

They are also ignoring the need to reauthorize the farm bill, which expired on October 1.

Oh, and the Violence Against Women Act will expire on December 7. It deserves a full reauthorization after a comprehensive floor debate so it could be updated to reflect the changing times.

We still have no long-term plan to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program. This majority continues to kick the can down the road little by little, leaving millions of Americans that rely on this important program in limbo.

But the only thing the majority apparently wants to debate over and over and over again are partisan tax bills.

And by the way, for all their talk about the importance of providing disaster relief, the Republicans are refusing to support nationwide relief. They are picking and choosing which disaster victims deserve aid.

Mr. Speaker, where is the coverage for the devastating flooding in Wisconsin or Montana or Kansas or many other States that aren't included here? Apparently to this majority, getting disaster relief depends on your ZIP Code.

So I hope everyone watching here today isn't fooled when the majority presents its bill as just some mundane tax extenders bill, because this is really another partisan attempt to fix their tax scam before a Democratic majority takes over in January.

□ 1545

The American people made abundantly clear that they want Congress

to listen to them. Yet today we are once again considering a tax bill to try and fix the Republicans' unfixable tax scam. This is the same agenda the American people rejected from coast to coast.

The majority may be content continuing to turn a deaf ear to the public, but we will not.

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

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

Yesterday, we had an opportunity in the Rules Committee to hear many of the same words, words certainly of very kind and sincere remarks. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman. He and I personally get along very well and have enjoyed my time during the some, I guess, 18 years or so that we have worked together in the Rules Committee.

But, Mr. Speaker, I also would say to you that there is kind of a different story to be told, and the different story is the actual bill. That is what we are going to focus on today.

I had a chance to read the bill—I actually read it—and there was a conversation yesterday about that. I actually read it for comprehension to understand what is in it rather than to read it with the viewpoint of opposing it—actually, read it to learn more about it, to learn the business behind a lot of work that had been taking place by the Ways and Means Committee, a lot of work that had been public debate and public discussion for a long time.

For instance, if we were to talk about those seniors who are required to begin taking part of their IRA at 70½ and start spending down that money that they have saved hard for over the years, government coming and telling them how they are going to become less able to support themselves by diminishing, taxing, using their IRA when they may not want to, that is a policy discussion. That is not related to millionaires and our GOP friends. That is related to some common sense and some policy.

Perhaps, page 73, as an example, Mr. Speaker, disaster-related tax relief, providing for people who were in hurricanes, tornadoes, typhoons, and wildfires, it says here the Camp and Woolsey wildfire disaster area. These were declared disasters that had become national priorities, not only people from my home State of Texas, my home city of Dallas going to help our neighbors to the west, but actually getting this in legislation quickly to make sure that people who live there are able to give more charitable deductions and get credit not just for that, but doing the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on and on, treatment of payments to Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

It is undeniable, as you read the bill, that you do this with an idea of understanding, comprehension. This isn't about special interests. This is about everybody who lived in these areas.

The deferral of people who are in the military, for reservists of the armed services. For the American people, Mr. Speaker, and you, page 131 of the bill, this is what we are attempting to get across, that this is for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, page 203, the IRS Free File Program, this is something that came from lots of work with one of my colleagues, LYNN JENKINS. Ms. JENKINS from Kansas, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, worked carefully for a long period of time with a large group of people who were involved in this program.

We were able to upgrade not just tax law, but also to look at retaliation when people see tax cheats, tax frauds. They were given on page 238, Mr. Speaker, antiretaliation whistleblower protection for employees who see this.

Mr. Speaker, I could keep going and might in a few minutes. That is what this bill is about.

This bill is not as you have heard, but, as advertised, it is a year-end extension to make sure that the things during the year that needed to be addressed are getting addressed.

I read for comprehension to find a good deal, and, Mr. Speaker, I found one.

The Ways and Means Committee, our young chairman, KEVIN BRADY, his membership, these hardworking people, this is done for the American people. This is not done, as we have heard, for special interests, rich people, or millionaires. It is done for the right reason.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just make a couple of points before I yield time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee mentioned the great people on the Ways and Means Committee. I just want to say that there are great people on the Ways and Means Committee, both Democrats and Republicans. Unfortunately, they didn't get to do their job.

When I think of committees doing their work, I think of them holding a hearing. I think of them doing a markup, or amendments are offered and things are adjusted and changed where everybody has an input. This bypassed the committee.

We can say all the nice things we want about the members of the Ways and Means Committee, but they had nothing to do with this. Leadership kind of drafted this in the back room and put it forward.

The gentleman talks about disasters. We need to help the areas of this country that have been subjects of natural disasters. The problem is—and I have a list that I am happy to share with the gentleman—there are, like, 38 areas of this country that have experienced disasters that get nothing in this bill—not

a thing. Maybe if you had a hearing, you might have figured that out.

Finally, there are a couple of good things in this bill we all can agree on, but let's not kid ourselves. This bill really is a way to fix the disastrous tax scam monstrosity which was about giveaways to corporations and wealthy individuals that they rushed through so quickly that it is filled with errors. That is what this is about.

I stand by what I said when I said that this is not a good bill and this is a lousy process. We need to do better. I hope in the future, when we talk about tax legislation, we come to the floor where the committee of jurisdiction takes the time to deliberate on it, to do hearings, to do markups, and to hear from both sides.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of that committee of jurisdiction. I also remember growing up as a kid in Wisconsin, and many of us looked forward to this radio program that Paul Harvey would deliver giving the news of the day.

There was also a special segment of that program called "The Rest of the Story," where he would fill in the blanks of what actually is taking place here. That is what I am here today to explain, the rest of the story of what is happening with this legislation and why I rise in opposition to the rule and opposition to the underlying bill.

A little over a year ago, this Chamber passed comprehensive tax reform for the first time in over 30 years. I thought the process then was deplorable with no hearing, with no vetting, with no stakeholders, with no feedback from people back home, or with no opportunity for there to be any constructive review of what was attempting to be passed. In a little over 50 days, a major overhaul of the Tax Code.

And yet, today, we have a process with this tax bill before us that is even worse. Not only was there no hearing held on it or vetting or feedback from any experts or feedback from people back home about the impact this is going to have, we didn't even have a markup in committee for us Members to be involved and try to find where mistakes were being made, and now with the rush to judgment with this bill that was finally offered late Monday night.

I have been poring over this document over the last 2 years. I will guarantee the American people that the average Member of Congress had no way of reviewing this or even understanding what was in this bill, especially given all of the legalese that is involved with it.

They will be forced to come to the floor tomorrow morning expecting to vote on a major piece of legislation

with no clue of what it does or what the mistakes and the unintended consequences are. That alone is reason to reject this process and say "no" on the bill.

But the other reason why this process is so bad is because of what we discovered the last time they jammed a major tax bill through: the mistakes that were made in it.

They are attempting to try to clean this up again without any hearing or without any scrutiny of what policy needs to be corrected, and that, too, is wrong.

Let me just give you one example, as my friend from Massachusetts pointed out. There is also tax relief for nationally declared Federal disaster areas in this country. Unfortunately, 44 disaster areas were declared in the last year. Only nine of them are qualifying for tax relief assistance under this bill, and they are on the coast: the East Coast, the West Coast, down South. It is the wildfires. It is the hurricanes.

There were other regions of the country, including my home State of Wisconsin that was hit with devastating flooding this summer. For whatever reason, the chairman of the committee decided to exclude those areas. The pain that those communities are facing—the homeowners and the small businesses—are just as real in the upper Midwest due to the devastating flooding as what has been taking place on the coast, yet there is no logical explanation why there has been this wholesale exclusion of other areas around the country that don't qualify for these tax provisions. That is something I would have anticipated we could have brought up in committee and tried to correct through the normal regular process but was deferred.

Finally, let me add this thought. The last tax bill that they passed is going to increase our national debt over the next 10 years by \$2.3 trillion. This bill is another \$53 billion downpayment on the fiscal irresponsibility that has been coming out of this Congress for too long.

This last session of Congress under Republican majority leadership is going to go down in history as one of the most fiscally irresponsible Congresses that has dug such a deep fiscal hole for the future of our children and grandchildren. It is going to be incumbent upon us as the new majority in January to start cleaning up the mess.

Let me tell you how things will be done differently:

We will immediately start having hearings on that massive tax bill in order to correct the problems and the mistakes and the unintended consequences by calling people with knowledge before us to get feedback.

We will go through the regular process of having hearings, of having markups, of doing proper vetting, and giving Members who aren't even on the committee an opportunity to weigh in on significant pieces of legislation rather than it coming out of one person's of-

fice—the chairman, in this case—in the dead of night on Monday night and rushing this to the House floor later on expecting the rest of the body to make an informed and reasoned judgment on it.

This whole process is embarrassing. We can do better in January.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and oppose this legislation tomorrow morning.

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

I appreciate the feedback from the gentleman from Wisconsin, a very dear and very good friend of mine, and I appreciate the differences between our parties.

The differences between the philosophies of the parties and the differences of the direction are apparent. But what is also apparent, Mr. Speaker, is that what these dadgum Republicans did is working; more money is coming into the Treasury; millions more people have a job.

The opportunity that happened—a result of the Tax Code changes—have brought, at minimum, \$50 billion back into America in less than about 9 months, money flowing back in, which is the reverse of what was described in the nineties with that sucking sound of jobs leaving America. It is now the rush of the beautiful breeze of jobs coming back in, manufacturers not just in Wisconsin, but all through the Midwest, down even as far as Dallas, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, there was one point where I held a meeting and a press conference at a manufacturer, and that manufacturer said that this is the most robust period of time he had had in the history of the company and actually challenged the TV stations to say he was looking for 12 more workers. He found two the next day, people who called who were looking for jobs.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about things that work, not axioms of these feel-good things: Oh, we can do better.

Well, for 8 years, they didn't do better. For 8 years, the philosophy was tax, spend, regulate, overregulate, move jobs overseas, blame somebody else for their problem.

That is not a winning hand. A winning hand is more people having jobs. Today, the highest numbers of people ever are working in America. The facts of the case are: more African Americans today work than ever, more Hispanics, more women, more opportunity, better chances for you to get a higher paying job, better opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have to say too much, but these same policies that they talk about here today are the same policies that you would get out of the State of California that has 125,000 homeless people, 55,000 homeless people in Los Angeles. How can that be?

Well, it is easy to understand. The same policies that they want for us in Washington are the same policies they

have in Los Angeles and in California. That is called overregulate, overtax, and run them the heck out of town.

That is why there are so many unemployed people. That is why there are 55,000 homeless people in Los Angeles. Friends of mine who visit the beautiful, coveted city of San Francisco come back and tell the story of heart-breaking demise of people living on the streets of San Francisco, a drug-ridden, crime-ridden, despicable opportunity for people to see a great city in despair, in ruin.

That is what you get when you raise taxes, when you don't give opportunity, and when America fails to be able to look forward for the best opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I get what they want. They don't want this bill that gives opportunity. They don't want the opportunity for people to have a fighting chance, and then they will blame it on somebody else.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to stand behind this bill, and we are going to pass it. I think there will be some Democrats who will vote for it. We are going to be proud to have them.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, is right. There are differences between Democrats and Republicans on how we should approach some of these issues, including tax issues. We believe that the focus ought to be on the middle class and those struggling to get in the middle class.

My friends on the other side are more interested in helping those who are well-off and well connected. We are horrified by the fact that my Republican friends seem to have no regard for adding to the debt the way they have. We think that there has to be some responsibility.

But we can have those fights. I think whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, whether you are a liberal or a conservative, the one thing that we should all agree on is that the process should have some integrity.

When you bring bills to the floor like major tax bills, it ought to have been the result of the committee process. There should have been hearings where you have people who are pro and con come forward and testify and give their advice, or you have a markup where Democrats and Republicans can offer amendments to try to make the bill better.

I still don't understand why so many areas of the country that have been victims of disasters are not even mentioned in this so-called wonderful bill that the gentleman from Texas talks about.

Process has to matter. The committees of jurisdiction—in this case, it is the Ways and Means Committee—matter. But this is not unique. We have

seen bills come to the Rules Committee time and time again that have bypassed committees of jurisdiction, have had no hearings, have had no markups, no nothing.

If I were a Republican on the Ways and Means Committee, I would be upset that a major piece of legislation would come to the Rules Committee without having gone through the committee that I am on. That is not the way this place is supposed to work. We need to do better.

I would say that if this were subjected to a normal process where committees could work their will, maybe we would be here having a different discussion. Maybe there would be more bipartisanship here, not just on a couple of items that are tucked into this bill, but on the whole package. I don't know. But I would like to see us go back to having committees matter again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, for years now, certainly over the last few months, we have been hearing concerns from our Republican colleagues about the exploding national debt. Yet, here they are today asking us to vote for another unpaid-for, multibillion-dollar, partisan tax cut. With the clock ticking on this lame-duck Congress and the Republicans' unchecked control here in Congress, they are rushing through another round of costly, reckless cuts.

Now, as my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the soon-to-be chairman of the Rules Committee, said, Democrats were locked out of the process for this 300-page bill. There were no hearings, no debate, no markup. It went straight to the floor with the hope that the American people aren't looking.

The thing is that the American people have made it very clear, both in polling and at the polls, that they did not support the Republicans' trillion-dollar tax cuts for wealthy corporations last time, and they certainly won't support even more tax cuts this time.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, a very thoughtful and sincere individual, talked about all of the successes of the prior tax cut. But remember what they promised when they rammed this thing through in 2017: that the corporate tax cut from 35 to 21 percent was going to unleash incredible investment in the country, creating thousands of jobs and new facilities and new investments in plants and equipment.

What has happened? This year alone, there was \$800 billion in stock buybacks—let me repeat, \$800 billion in stock buybacks—increased dividends that mostly go to wealthy investors, about a third of which actually go to foreign investors.

Where are all of these new investments? They weren't realized, and they weren't realized because the corporations said at the time that they don't need these crazy tax cuts. Republicans insisted on it. Part of the reason they insisted on it was because it is part of their three-step plan, which we talked about in 2017 during the debate on the tax cuts. We had charts. Here is what they are going to do: cut taxes; then complain about the additional debt; and then ask for cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security in order to pay for those new debts.

That is exactly what we have seen this year. The majority leader of the Senate from my State complained the other day: Oh, these deficits are getting really high. The debt is getting really high. We need to look at these mandatory spending programs.

That is the playbook we have seen time after time after time. Let's stop pretending that my colleagues across the aisle are there for the American people. They aren't the party of fiscal responsibility or economic growth. They are the party of one thing and one thing only, and that is tax cuts for their wealthy corporate donors. This is a reflection of that truth.

The American people don't want these tax cuts, and our country can't afford them. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman who will, presumptively, be the new chairman of the Budget Committee.

I think what is interesting is, he said that Republicans promised more investment. Yes, that happened. Republicans promised more jobs. He said thousands. It is millions, Mr. Speaker, not thousands. We promised millions more jobs. He then said we promised thousands.

Mr. Speaker, then he went to a very interesting perspective, and that was: all companies really use this money just to buy back their own stock. Mr. Speaker, investment in a company is great, and while that might not be necessarily one of the greatest ways to do it, it buoyed the stock market up 40 percent.

It buoyed the stock market up to where every senior, every person that would have a stock market account, a savings account, a saving for their future, saving for their children, it buoyed that opportunity with value.

That is what we promised, and it worked, and they don't like that. They don't like the success of the stock market. They don't like the success, and so they act like it didn't even happen.

Mr. Speaker, the difference between thousands and millions is literally a thousand times difference. I spoke about this earlier when we were talking about this bill right here.

Oh, it is full of giveaways, they say, to millionaires and GOP fat cats.

It is extenders. It is continuing the success. It is doing the right thing. It is about people who had fire ravaging their homes and their areas, not just the Republican houses. It was about helping members of the military. It was about good policy from the Ways and Means Committee that was equally known as bipartisan with the work that was done there to make sure that we acknowledged tax cheats and let the employees who saw that get a better footing.

There were lots of hearings, lots of information. But if you simply read to have a jaundiced view of the world and to oppose it, as opposed to reading for substance, I see how you could get it wrong, Mr. Speaker. I see clearly how you could get it wrong if you don't read for comprehension.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee keeps on talking about success and how the Republicans delivered and how great everything is. If that were the case, I think the election results in November would have been much different.

The bottom line is that—this is according to exit polls that were conducted by major news outlets—28 percent of the people surveyed said that the Republican tax bill has helped them—only 28 percent. That is it. Sixty-eight percent say it has had absolutely no impact or has hurt them. That is what the American people think.

So my friends can pontificate all they want and talk about how wonderful everything is, and it may be good therapy. But at the end of the day, the American people have a very different opinion of the performance.

When the gentleman talks about investing in our country, where is the infrastructure bill? Where is the infrastructure bill that the President promised, that the Republicans said they were going to work on to rebuild our country, to put millions of people to work in good-paying jobs? It is nowhere to be found.

So the bottom line is, the American people issued their verdict on the Republican performance, and, quite frankly, it wasn't a positive one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in allowing me to speak on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hear my friend from Texas talking about the booming stock market and the increase in employment. Actually, the statistics will bear out that the increase in employment has been a steady line through the Obama administration. It hasn't spiked. It is just kind of continuing the slow recovery.

About that stock market, now maybe my friend was distracted for the last

few weeks, but the gains for the entire year disappeared in a couple of weeks. The uncertainty troubles people who care about the future of this country.

As the 115th Congress staggers to its conclusion, this rule enshrines the failure of the Republicans to deal meaningfully with America's scandalous Tax Code, although promising to reform the Tax Code.

□ 1615

I was one of the people on the Ways and Means Committee who worked the 8 years they were in charge to try and find areas of bipartisan cooperation, but they have repeatedly failed at reform. Instead, every year, they made the Tax Code more complicated and less fair. That came to a glorious conclusion with their tax scam which made a hash out of the Tax Code. It means that millions of people actually will pay more. Irony of irony, Americans trying to deal with a more complicated Tax Code won't even be able to deduct the accounting expenses to deal with this monstrosity.

The centerpiece of the 8 years in charge was the tax scam costing taxpayers \$2.3 trillion of additional debt. Now, you would think if we were going to borrow \$2.3 trillion and lavish tax breaks, admittedly on people who need them the least, that you would think that would at least be popular. My friend from Massachusetts cited some of the perceptions of the American public. But what I think is most telling is that their tax cut that costs the American taxpayer \$2.3 trillion in additional debt was less popular than Bill Clinton's tax increase.

What was supposed to be the centerpiece of a ride to victory in November ended up being the largest net increase for Democrats since Watergate, and at the end they weren't touting it. They weren't campaigning on it.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. In fact, if that was such a great idea, don't you think they would have had a hearing on this bill?

Don't you think they would get their Members involved?

Where are the dozens of Republicans coming to the floor to celebrate the rule for this flawed piece of legislation?

It is complex, and it is unfair. It is raising taxes on millions, destabilizing our economic future, and making it harder for us to compete in the future.

Mr. Speaker, reject the rule, and reject the bill.

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

Once again, I will reiterate that this bill is about doing great things for events that have happened in this country. I really can't imagine that Members would want to simply take the things that the leadership class of

people from Mrs. Pelosi want to vote against—disaster tax relief for people all across California, all across the Mariana Islands, and all across the country—except just to say that I do know that people in their party oppose the tax bill. I get that.

But there is more money coming in today than there was yesterday. There are millions of more people who have a job today than yesterday. I do know the numbers that were expressed are numbers that they want to tout, but that is not the way it worked. That was what the CBO said. But the reality of the circumstance is some 4 million people today have a job who did not have one and had been looking.

Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago, the major newspapers and major magazines across America said:

We are going to just have to get used to this is the way the world is now—high unemployment, higher taxation.

Newsweek magazine had on its cover: "Is America Really Turning Socialist?"

The answer came back that the American people disagree with unemployment. The American people disagree with high taxes. The American people see what is happening in California, 55,000 homeless people in Los Angeles. That is not an accident. That is policy in action; 125,000 homeless people in California, that is not an accident, that is policy directly from the Democratic Party that ran jobs out of the State so that the average family there didn't have a job.

That is what they are pushing right here. We are not going to do that. We are going to stand up and say: We read the bill. We read the bill. That is what it is here for. That is why we can stand up and tout this.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, when you are from Texas, if there is one riot, all it takes is one Ranger.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from the gentleman from Texas how many more speakers he has?

Mr. SESSIONS. Just one Ranger, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, people are beginning to read the bill. Members should have just received a letter from 27 national groups, including labor unions, good government groups, and anti-poverty groups, who just sent us a letter strongly urging us to oppose this partisan tax bill. These groups represent millions and millions of people in this country. They don't represent the big corporations or the people who are well-connected and well-off. They represent working-class people and middle-class people, those who are struggling in poverty. But they are asking us to oppose this, and I urge my colleagues to take note of their appeal.

Mr. Speaker, this very week, General Motors announced that they are laying off nearly 50 percent of their workers

in North America and shuttering five plants. That is thousands of workers—thousands of families—who are going to spend their holiday season applying for unemployment and worrying about what is next. They don't have the luxury of waiting until the Democratic majority takes over in January. They are hurting right now. Many of them believed President Trump when he visited Ohio last year. He told them:

Don't move. Don't sell your house. The jobs are all coming back. They are all coming back.

So what are House Republicans doing to help? Are they making good on their promise to help support working families?

The answer is absolutely not.

They are spending their last month in power doubling down on their tax scam to help the corporate elite. I have to ask my friends on the other side of the aisle: Are you kidding me?

All the while, the President's disastrous trade war has been making things even worse. According to General Motors, his tariffs have cost the company an extra \$1 billion—that is billion with a B.

Tell me, is this what winning is supposed to look like? Because it feels an awful lot like losing.

This bill is what happens when Republicans rush bills through so fast that there is no time to understand its impact.

Let me tell you: things have to change around here. They really do. I say this over and over and over again, but I believe it. This should not be a partisan matter for debate, and that is that committees of jurisdiction in this House ought to do their job. They ought to do their work. On major issues like this, there ought to be hearings. There ought to be markups. People ought to be able to express themselves.

People fight to get on the Ways and Means Committee because they want to have their fingerprints on tax legislation. They don't fight to get on committees like Ways and Means so that somebody in the leadership just bypasses the committee totally, we go right to the Rules Committee with a closed rule.

So much of what has happened in this last session has happened with total disregard to regular order. I think, quite frankly, it has negatively impacted the products that have come out of this Congress. But I also think it has been insulting to, not just Democratic Members, but to Republican Members as well.

So we really need to step back and to figure out how we can run this place better, and I hope that a Democratic majority will do that.

We are days away from a possible government shutdown. We have seven appropriation bills left to sign into law, and we are helping corporations instead. What an embarrassment and what a shame.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I do want to take a moment, despite my strong res-

ervations with how we are proceeding here today, to recognize the chairman of the Rules Committee, Congressman SESSIONS, for his service. He and I, obviously, don't agree on every policy or every piece of legislation, but despite our disagreements, he has always had my respect, and I have always appreciated his professionalism and the courtesy that he has shown those of us on both sides of the aisle who have testified before the committee over the years.

The Rules Committee has a reputation for long hearings, and that is because the chairman insists that everybody has an opportunity to say what is on their mind, and sometimes people can't say it in 5 minutes. Sometimes they say it in 5 hours. Nonetheless, he has presided over a committee that has always been receptive to people's views.

It is important as we discuss policy here that we don't lose sight of the people we serve with, and I know he will lead a professional transition as we prepare for the next Congress. But I wanted to say, for the RECORD, that despite our sharp disagreements on issues like today, and even on process, that I have high regard for him, and I thank him for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and vote "no" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

I, of course, want to acknowledge and thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. His time in the committee has been forthright, honest, and straightforward. The opportunity that he has to serve in the minority will be reflected with an opportunity for him to serve in the majority.

I think the Rules Committee is also headed for a bright future with an opportunity to fully vet ideas, the opportunity to talk, and to hear dialogue. I must say I have been through a number of chairmen, several at least, and I attempted to craft my own way for the committee.

I appreciate and respect the gentleman. I think it is also important to state that it extended to his young wife and his daughter who visited the committee several times. His wife, who, in a most genuine, professional and straightforward spousal context, to my wife, Karen, enjoyed a relationship and they found common interests, not only in working with cancer, but JIM's wife sent me a gracious letter acknowledging the work that I personally have done in cancer and in the areas of the FDA and dealing with cancer research and trials. That professionalism extended not just from JIM but to his young bride who was most genuine in her remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity for us to close today is a chance to reflect upon not just the ideas that we represent, but really our commitment to the American people. The American people do deserve a right to see a better process, and that I acknowledge. They have a right to know that the forthrightness of a committee, whether they are up at 2 in the morning or 8 in the morning because we had not completed necessarily our work the night before, the Rules Committee did its service. It did its service to this body on a bipartisan basis. It did it from professional content of a professional staff, not only from the minority that was led at the very top with Don Sisson, who did an awesome job, but also Steve Cote, the staff director. It was a relationship that has been successful for this body.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say this, that just as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the soon-to-be chairman—I assume chairman of the Rules Committee—as he has asked his side to look at and how they would vote, I would also ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the team, which today is in the majority, to make sure they read this bill with content orientation to the needs of the American people, to look at the real successes as we walk outside today to see that the booming economy that is taking place in America where people who did not have jobs do; for those who have been on our TV sets and in our prayers where some natural disaster has claimed them, whether it be through a mistake or through necessarily Mother Nature, that we as America are better when we work to solve problems together.

□ 1630

We are better in America when we believe there is no problem bigger than a solution, where we in America want to put our best foot forward and can work together.

Mr. Speaker, we are all better, all of us, than any one of us. My party is better with the Democratic Party than without the Democratic Party. My ideas are better to be vetted and even challenged. That way, the American people have a chance to see not only the possibility and probability, but also to vet the ideas that have made this Nation a great nation for so many years.

While it is true my service to this body will be coming to a close after 22 years, I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that your service, too, to this great Nation has made our country better.

For those who are on the floor today, I would thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I would thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. I would thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida, one of my fraternity brothers, who has brought forth ideas on this for other colleagues of Texas, like Mr. GREEN, who might be in attendance today.

I would say that we have tried to make this work as evidence that the

American people can see, and I think they can see it today. Mr. Speaker, I end my statement with a focus on this innovation and entrepreneurship.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM FURTHER EXTENSION ACT OF 2018

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7187) to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until December 7, 2018.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7187

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 “National Flood Insurance Program Further Extension Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. PROGRAM EXTENSION.

(a) FINANCING.—Section 1309(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)) is amended by striking “November 30, 2018” and inserting “December 7, 2018”.

(b) PROGRAM EXPIRATION.—Section 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4026) is amended by striking “November 30, 2018” and inserting “December 7, 2018”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), the chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee. He is also the author of the 21st Century Flood Reform Act, which was passed by this body over a year ago, and we still await the Senate to take up this version.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his great work as the chairman of the Financial Services Committee and on flood insurance reform.

There are a lot of things we could talk about today in regard to flood insurance:

We could talk about the fact that repetitive loss properties make up 2 percent of all the policies but account for 25 percent of all of the claims.

We could talk about the fact that the NFIP is \$30 billion in debt, and that is after last year when we forgave \$16 billion in debt. Again, we forgave \$16 billion. We are still \$25 billion in debt and actually racked up \$10 billion of new debt in this program over the last year.

I have got to tell you I am frustrated. We passed a bipartisan bill in this Chamber. We actively and aggressively negotiated it. This is a big issue for families back home, for constituents of our Members. We have listened to them. We heard them. We modified, we tweaked a bill, and we passed it—and the Senate won't take it up.

Mr. HENSARLING and I have worked across the aisle with Members not just in the Democratic Party, but also in the Senate. I have come to the opinion that there are very powerful players in this Chamber and in the Chamber next door that don't want anything done with flood insurance.

It is a sick and broken program that goes deeper and deeper in debt, that incentivizes people to build in dangerous places. And they say: No, no, no. We don't want any reform. Let's march on with a program that doesn't work.

I listened to all the conservatives in this Chamber. They throw out: Who is more conservative? Who is less?

You have some really great conservatives who absolutely refuse to deal with a program that is burning billions of dollars in our Federal budget.

My question is: Why don't we start looking out not just for the Federal budget, but also have a program that will work for our people?

We were willing to make one offer of reform for a long-term extension. We said: Let's let the private market work. Let's let the private sector come in and take up some of the policies that are paying more than what the market would bear, let people get a lower rate and reduce the risk to the Federal taxpayer.

And guess what. No one said yes. We couldn't get a “yes” from the opposition to flood insurance reform.

I guess I thought conservatives wanted a free market. They like markets to work. In flood insurance, the NFIP, the

Federal program, is the only program in town. We are saying: Let it open. Let the private sector come in.

That is the one thing it would have taken for a long-term extension, and the answer to that from the conservatives and some of the liberals was no.

I think that is a sad shame. I think we owe better to our constituents, and we owe better to the Federal debt and deficit on a program that doesn't work.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's leadership.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some of my time to tell Mr. DUFFY: Just calm down. This is easy. We are all together on this. I want to make sure he doesn't damage himself in all of the display that he is doing today.

It is disappointing that we find ourselves on the House floor yet again to temporarily extend the National Flood Insurance Program's authorization.

The NFIP provides flood insurance coverage to more than 5 million families across the country. Communities rely on NFIP for flood maps and mitigation assistance, and small businesses rely on the NFIP to pick up the pieces when the inevitable storm hits. Yet the long-term stability of this critical program continues to fall victim to our inability to agree on a number of items.

Mr. Speaker, Americans across the country are experiencing natural disasters of an absolutely catastrophic magnitude. Just this month, the Camp fire devastated California, amounting to the deadliest and most destructive wildfire in California history. Current estimates are that 88 individuals have lost their lives and tens of thousands of structures, including over 13,000 single-family homes, have been destroyed.

2017 was an absolutely catastrophic year in terms of hurricanes. In 2017, for the first time on record, three Category 4 hurricanes made landfall in the United States. Hurricane Maria decimated Puerto Rico.

Meanwhile, the administration's National Climate Assessment, which is a report prepared by 13 Federal agencies and more than 3,000 scientists, recently documented the numerous impacts of our warming climate. According to the report, climate change is costing billions of dollars in property damage from sea level rise. High tide flooding has increased by factors as high as 10 in some communities, and fire season is now over 80 days longer than a couple of decades ago.

Faced with these realities, we stand here today still lacking a credible plan to end the partisan problems that we have that has brought the NFIP to the brink of a lapse several times already in this Congress.

I, too, and others, are disappointed that we have missed opportunities to responsibly help homeowners, businesses, and renters who all need access to affordable flood insurance by taking sensible steps to stabilize flood insurance premiums, deal with the NFIP's

debt, and invest in up-to-date and accurate flood maps.

Thankfully, the American people have demanded a change in Washington; and I am sure that, if we continue to concentrate on this issue, we can find bipartisanship and get something done.

Given the critical importance of the NFIP to our housing market, I am pleased that we are taking this small step today of reauthorizing the program through December 7 to at least avoid its doors from shuttering. But our work is far from done.

I have led the effort for years to provide long-term reauthorizations of the NFIP so that we could ensure the affordability and availability of flood insurance. I will continue to do so in the Financial Services Committee next Congress.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the chairwoman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise because today we are voting on a 1-week extension of the National Flood Insurance Program. This will be the eighth short-term extension since fiscal year 2017, and it is unacceptable.

My district floods every year, and it is imminently clear that we must reform our flood insurance program, not just repeatedly extend it. Requiring taxpayers to fund construction projects in severe flood zones over and over again is extremely expensive, and it isn't a sustainable solution. The numbers prove it: NFIP is currently operating on a \$1.4 billion annual deficit, with no end in sight.

As Chairman HENSARLING knows all too well, I have personally spent the better part of a year, along with the ranking member, Mr. AL GREEN, working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in other disaster recovery programs. We must ensure that funds go to the people who truly need them, like the disaster recovery program. The current flood insurance is broken, and we must fix it once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 1 year since the House passed a reform package that would have vastly improved the National Flood Insurance Program. It has been 1 year since the Senate has refused to act. I urge my colleagues to support the serious structural reforms that the Committee on Financial Services passed last November.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Financial Services Committee and someone who has been extremely active in monitoring the aftermath of the devastation from Hurricane Harvey.

□ 1645

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for allowing the time and commend her for her many years of service and her efforts, in a bipartisan way, to establish the NFIP program such that it would be responsible, such that it would take care of the needs of the many people across the length and breadth of our country.

I also thank the chairperson of the committee for his years of service. I know this is not the last time that he and I will be on the floor together, but I do want to thank him now for his years of service.

Mr. Speaker, the NFIP is important to families because if the family cannot get the flood insurance, they cannot purchase the home. It is important to Realtors because if the home can't be purchased, the Realtors, obviously, cannot sell the home. It is important to the builders because the builders are the people who rely on home sales to make determinations as to what the market will bear and whether they should construct homes in a given area.

So this really is about people in terms of their families, but it is also about people and the economy. It is about whether this economy will continue to grow. It is about whether or not we will provide a program that will give builders some sense of stability such that they can move forward with their construction projects.

My hope is that this 1-week extension will be granted. I pray that my colleagues join us and vote for the extension. But my hope also is that we will have a long-term program developed, because the Realtors are depending on us; the contractors are depending on us; the families are depending on us; and the country is depending on us.

The National Association of Realtors estimated that, if the program lapses for 1 month, about 40,000 home sales might not close nationwide. This is a significant number of homes in a market that currently needs an additional shot in the arm.

Mr. Speaker, we are here for the families, the builders, the Realtors, and the economy.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, the headlines are pretty clear:

“Hurricanes Bigger and Costlier than Ever Before”;

“2.3 Billion People Affected by Flooding Disasters in 20 Years”;

“Rising Sea Levels Could Cost the U.S. Trillions.”

Yet, somehow, Congress fails to act.

I share with you that Mr. DUFFY has articulated this problem very well. We are here again for the 40th time. Forty times since 1998 we have passed an extension of the National Flood Insurance Program, but without the needed

reforms. Four months have passed since the last vote. We still have nothing to show for it.

No one has been a greater advocate for reform than our colleague, Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon. Together, he and I have authored a number of bills that would better prepare Americans for rising floodwaters, as had Mr. DUFFY, reforms that would address the fact that fewer than 2 percent of 5 million policies have absorbed more than \$80 billion in payments.

So, are we here today to talk about reforms? No. We are here to support a program that tells Americans that, if you buy flood insurance from Uncle Sam, no matter how many times your house floods, we will give you money to rebuild it without requiring mitigation; a program that currently makes it more difficult for people to move than to rebuild, that fails to encourage communities to mitigate flood risk, that promotes continued construction in the highest risk areas.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this 1-week extension absent reforms, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), a member of the Financial Services Committee and long-time supporter of affordable flood insurance coverage.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member WATERS for her tireless leadership for a strong, affordable National Flood Insurance Program.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bill. More than 5 million middle class and working Americans rely on the National Flood Insurance Program for economic security and peace of mind.

Congress cannot allow this program to expire. A lapse would leave countless families unable to renew their policies, putting them in financial peril if disaster were to strike. It would also upend the housing market, with closings coming to a full stop due to the inability to secure required coverage.

While I wish this bill included a much longer term extension, providing American families with another week of coverage is far preferable to a damaging lapse.

But, my colleagues, we must do better than 1 week. The people have endured seven stopgap extensions, including two brief lapses, since September 2017—7 extensions, 14 months. The bill before us is number eight.

While almost everyone can agree that flood insurance is long overdue for reform, particularly to address the affordability challenges that plague policyholders, we should not allow that goal to threaten the program's very existence.

I urge my colleagues to not only support today's bill but to work together in the coming days to reach agreement on a longer term extension.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. ROSS), the vice chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee and the true author of competitive flood insurance.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the subcommittee chairman, Mr. DUFFY, for his efforts, too, in trying to provide significant reforms. I support their efforts in opposing this additional reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program.

We have done this eight times in just over the year, and what have we gotten in return? Some would say nothing. I would say, no, it has been worse than nothing. You see, we forgave \$16 billion in debt and got no reforms in response to that.

Now the NFIP is \$20 billion in debt again, yet we look at: Oh, but it is just \$20 billion.

In over 13 years, the interest on that is \$5 billion. When are we going to stop this insanity?

More disturbing, however, Mr. Speaker, is this House's failure to stand up to even the most modest technical reforms that would benefit the program.

During my time in this body, I have been proud to champion one such bill, the Private Flood Insurance Market Development Act.

To me, it defies logic that this co-equal Chamber would pass a bill unanimously through the authorizing committee this Congress and then unanimously through the whole House in the last Congress and, yet, abandon its opportunities every time thereafter.

My legislation is simple. It is a technical correction that will facilitate the growth of a private market alternative to the drowning national program that we have today. It is bipartisan. It is desperately needed.

Yet, here we are again with a clean reauthorization that makes no progress and no promises that tomorrow will be any different. That, Mr. Speaker, is a shame. It is a shame that we have once again folded in the face of unjustified inaction.

When does it end? When do we say enough is enough?

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to shut down the NFIP. We don't need to. All we need to do is for the Senate to accept just one of the many eminently reasonable pieces of legislation that the House has passed, to be included alongside the short-term extension. Even the simplest reform would indicate that the Senate is serious about coming to the table to negotiate a long-term reauthorization.

Anything would be better than the hollow promises this clean extension puts before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), a friend from the opposite side of the aisle who is a true expert on flood insurance issues.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about this program. We have heard a lot about affordability, folks talking about being fiscally conservative and making sure that this program is financially solvent, hearing numbers like \$20 billion in debt.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you another number: \$1.5 trillion. \$1.5 trillion, that is the amount of money we have spent on just 120 disasters since 1980, billion-dollar-plus disasters.

If we are fiscally conservative, then we need to address the \$1.5 trillion, not focus on this small component of disasters.

How do you do that? You do that by making your communities more resilient.

The Congressional Budget Office, FEMA, Corps of Engineers, and many other organizations have come out and said that the way that you do this is by being proactive and making investments in community resiliency, in ecosystem resiliency. That is what you do.

If we are fiscal conservatives, if we are concerned about solvency and the debt, why are we just focused on this one small program?

Mr. Speaker, here is the reality: Under the proposals that have been put forth, it charges people for things they have no responsibility over. That is called a tax. That is a tax.

The people in my home State of Louisiana are at the bottom of one of the largest watersheds in the world. More water is being sent to us because of development in the Upper Mississippi River Basin. Because of the Federal Government's actions on our coast, we have lost 2,000 square miles of our coast.

You are going to charge these people higher premiums because of what people above us are doing in other States and because of what our own Federal Government did to us with the river? That is not a premium. That is a tax. You are charging people for things they have no control over.

We have structures and homes that have been in these places for 300 years, and you are suddenly going to charge them unaffordable rates?

This program does need reforms. It absolutely needs reforms. Those reforms should include, as the chairman has stated, buyouts for repetitive-flood-loss properties—absolutely—because that is the fiscally appropriate, fiscally conservative thing to do. Not to mention, no one wants their house to be flooded over and over again.

We have to make reforms, but this is not the right approach.

Let me be clear: I don't like a 7-day extension either. I don't. We need to do a year extension where we can sit down and talk about the right reforms to put us on the right trajectory to sustainably manage this program and, importantly, in the face of changing disasters and rising seas, so that we can prepare our Nation for the future.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another gentleman

from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), the vice chairman of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program.

Mr. Speaker, for 20 years, Congress has been putting off making meaningful reforms to this problematic program. Taxpayers continue to pay the price for our failure to act. With every year that passes, the NFIP goes further and further into debt.

The unsustainability of this program has even caused Congress to cancel \$16 billion in NFIP debt last year.

Without meaningful reform like what this body approved when we passed the 21st Century Flood Reform Act, what protections do taxpayers have?

Mr. Speaker, the reauthorization before us today is not reform. By simply changing the date of the NFIP expiration, this body is tacitly stating that reform can't be done.

Enough is enough. We can't continue to pass our problems along to those in the future. The time to fix this problem is now. I will oppose extensions of the NFIP as long as this body continues to ignore meaningful reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who serves on the Judiciary Committee, the Homeland Security Committee, and the Committee on the Budget.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her unceasing—unceasing—commitment to the National Flood Insurance Program. I can't thank her enough.

I know that my colleagues and I are from different States, but how many have walked through gutted homes and seen families full of sorrow and tears? Hurricane Harvey was the singular largest flood next to, of course, Hurricane Michael. Mr. Speaker, 51 trillion gallons of water in 2017. How many have walked in Puerto Rico to see the devastation, as I have, or walked in the U.S. Virgin Islands and seen homes and hotels and places for home and for business devastated?

The National Flood Insurance Program is a necessity. I wish this was a longer extension. But I have seen the desperation of those who have suffered. They need flood insurance. And those of us who have felt the pain of the fires in California driven by the Camp fire know that they need aid as well.

□ 1700

If you want to know a number, what about \$1 trillion plus in the tax scam bill that was passed where my constituents say they have not seen one dime from the tax bill, and here we are going to be on the floor tomorrow with a tax extender.

So I ask the question: Can we help desperate families by ensuring that this program goes for a week and that we can do better? Yes, we can do better. But let's stop the pain now with homes that are about to close. With real estate, builders, and others, the economic engine has been, in many instances, the buying and selling of homes.

This is an important extension, but let's be truthful. You can't match up billions to a trillion, and you can't match up the pain of families looking at gutted homes versus fat cats filling their pockets with a tax scam. I ask for the support of this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), the Financial Services Committee majority whip.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I thank the ranking member of the committee as well for her work on this issue over the years. I appreciate Mr. DUFFY's leadership, and I appreciate Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. GRAVES, and their work on this issue because the House has done its job, Mr. Speaker.

We painfully passed this bill over a year ago. We have done our work. We have a bill that represents a compromise of coastal States and not coastal States. We have taken into account all these issues about climate change and floods and hurricanes. We have taken all that into account, but we have had no action from the Senate.

What we are here for today is because the Senate has not taken one step to constructive reform of the National Flood Insurance Program. That is why we are here.

So I think we should be working together. We need the ranking member and the chairman down the hall in the Senate asking them, why can't they get their act together? Where is Senator CRAPO, where is Senator KENNEDY to read this bill and take into account the incredible work that we have done on a bipartisan basis here?

So it is very hard for me, Mr. Speaker, to support a 7-day reauthorization status quo for the eighth time. It is just very hard to do that because it is not right. We need the reforms that are in this bill. We need the pressure on the Senate to come up with their own reforms if they don't like our reforms.

I happen to like our reforms. I like the fact that I see more of what is happening in Arkansas where we have two private insurers now, Mr. Speaker, for floods. They cover \$2 million instead of \$250,000. They cover replacement cost instead of actual cost. That is the kind of reforms and progress we can make if we take account of the hard work of this House and get the Senate to join us in significant flood reform.

So, it is with a lot of regret, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the reauthorization of this program for 7 days. We need the Senate to wake up and take action.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), a hard-working member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to yet another short-term extension of the National Flood Insurance Program, or the NFIP. This is our eighth one—our eighth one since fiscal year 2017 began.

I think we owe it to the taxpayers and I owe it to the residents of North Carolina's 13th District to fight for reform. We cannot support another short-term renewal, especially considering the program is \$20 billion—and I have even heard that it is even upwards of that—\$20 billion in the hole. It is hemorrhaging money, Mr. Speaker. And it is concerning that folks cannot even agree to or even support modest reforms to one of the most flawed government programs we have ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition of this extension and believe this continuous kicking of the can down the road cannot go on forever. There is still time to adopt even modest reforms, and I sure hope that we do so.

I think Senator MIKE LEE of Utah said it best when he gave his description of a "yes" vote to extend the NFIP yet again with no reforms back in the summer. He said: "This is terribly discouraging. It's not just this program; it's all that it represents. If we aren't willing to adopt even modest reforms to a minor program like NFIP, how will we ever address any of the far more vexing problems facing our government?"

This Senator from Utah gets it, and, Mr. Speaker, I wish others would as well.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, while I would prefer a longer term reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program, I strongly support today's extension to provide homeowners, businesses, renters, and communities with the certainty they deserve. Let me just say that I think we are all aware that for those people who are trying to obtain homeownership that live in flood zones, they won't be able to do it if they cannot get the insurance that is provided by the National Flood Insurance Program. And just think what that is going to do to the real estate market. So we have to do this in order to deal with the fact that this program literally shuts down at the end of November.

And let me just say that I have been in cities and towns that have been devastated by floods and by storms, and I want you to know the time that I spent after Katrina, helping to get people who were abandoned on highways, put-

ting them in buses, and traveling down through the various cities, was heart-breaking. I want you to know that I went up to Baton Rouge and I was in Mississippi, and I understand the pain and the destruction that is caused by these storms.

And I am absolutely committed, make no mistake, I remain committed to putting partisanship aside and working with my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle to come together on commonsense reforms that protect the continued affordability and availability of coverage, a long-term reauthorization of the NFIP that ensures that affordable flood insurance continues to be available to communities across our country. It must be Congress' priority when we start the 116th Congress.

And let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that despite the fact that my colleague and chairman of the committee and I worked very hard to try and deal with some of our concerns and even differences, we not only both have demonstrated our commitment to long-term NFIP, and while we did not get exactly where we wanted to go, we were able to provide protection for those families who were in desperate need of insurance and to continue, even though we have had to do it on a short-term basis.

So I would like to take this moment to just thank him for the opportunity that I have had to work with him. Now, everybody knows we didn't always agree, but they didn't know what we were laughing about as we sat next to each other exchanging a few jokes every now and then. So I am going to miss him as our chairman. I don't know if this is his last time on the floor and whether or not we are going to be able to put flood insurance reauthorization into the continuing resolution.

If we are not, perhaps I will see him again, but I don't know. I just wanted him to know that his presence here in the Congress of the United States has been noted in the history of the Congress of the United States, and whether or not he was agreeing or disagreeing, he had a powerful voice on a powerful committee, and I am going to miss the times that I have spent with him, good times and bad times, and I just wish him well on his future. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). The gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I return the kind words of the ranking member. One, she very much negotiated in good faith on the flood program, something she has a lot of passion and expertise on. We didn't get quite there as we did on a few other items, but, again, she negotiated in good faith. She has a lot of

expertise on the matter. If we don't get it in this Congress, I have no doubt that she will play a key leadership role in the next in order to effectuate long-term flood reform.

And I appreciate the kind words. Although, I must admit, I have learned many things in the 16 years I have served in Congress, and one is, the best way to get people to say kind words about you is to announce your retirement. I have never had kinder words spoken, but I know they were sincere, of the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, November 14, 2017, was a proud day for the United States House of Representatives, because that is the day, on a bipartisan basis, we passed the 21st Century Flood Reform Act, and I negotiated with the House majority whip, Mr. SCALISE, this bill, among others.

And here we are, over a year later, and no action from the Senate. And, today, November 29, 2018, is a sad and embarrassing day for the United States House of Representatives. And I must say, as a Republican, it is a sad and embarrassing day for something we call regular order, something that my party ran on.

And now we have a bill coming to the floor, within the jurisdiction of the House Financial Services Committee; regular order says the committee of jurisdiction first works their will before the House works their will. The committee didn't work its will on this bill. And, in fact, I have yet to find anybody in the Republican leadership who will own up to how this came to the floor in the first place.

So, unfortunately, because my party lost at the ballot box, we are going to soon be out of the regular order business and apparently we have forgotten how to do it. So it is a sad day in that regard. It is also a sad day because what we see here with this bill is a perpetuation of the status quo.

Now, let me tell you what the status quo is, Mr. Speaker. The status quo is 100 different people are dying in America every year from floods. At least a part of that tragedy—a part of that tragedy is a failure to reform the National Flood Insurance Program.

Status quo is that we continue to pay people to build the same homes in the same fashion in the same places that flood over and over and over and somehow expect a different result. We are not helping them. We are not helping them at all. We are helping put them in harm's way. That is what the status quo is, and if you vote for this extension, you are voting for the status quo.

Status quo is a government monopoly—a government monopoly with no competition, no innovation, and, by the way, it is subsidized, and it is still not affordable. We are seeing average premium increases of 7 percent a year. You know, on the Republican side of the aisle, why don't we give free enterprise a chance? Why don't we allow competition to bring in innovation, to bring down rates as opposed to, again,

making taxpayers subsidize it and still have unaffordability? Only government can bring about that insane result.

What else is the status quo? The status quo is \$35 billion of debt—\$35 billion of debt with \$1½ billion actual actuarial annual deficit a year. Totally unsustainable. Totally unsustainable.

The status quo is that taxpayers, hardworking factory workers in Mesquite, Texas, are having to subsidize millionaires' beach condos. That is the status quo. That is the bill that is on the floor right now.

The last several tragic hurricanes we have seen, 80 to 90 percent of the affected flooded homes didn't even have flood insurance. Why? Because it is not part of the homeowner's insurance policy due to the government monopoly. That is the status quo. And we are paying on the back end because we are not allowing market competition on the front end. That is the status quo.

The status quo is, we are taking environmentally sensitive areas, and they are getting paved. They are getting paved in flood-prone areas.

□ 1715

That is the status quo, and so that is really the debate that is before us today.

We know what the classic definition of insanity is: doing the same thing over and over and over and expecting a different result. Eight times—this will be the eighth time since the House passed the 21st Century Flood Reform Act on a bipartisan basis that there will be yet another vote for status quo.

Here is a radical idea. Why don't we do something different? Why don't we tell the Senate it is time, after a year, that they do their business?

I have got to tell you, once again, Mr. Speaker, I have learned a number of things in my 16 years of service in this body. One is never underestimate the Senate's capacity to do nothing.

Why do we allow them to do nothing? Let them bring a bill.

I don't believe we are through negotiating, Mr. Speaker, but the House shouldn't negotiate with itself after we have made a House position on a bipartisan basis known. There is no reason to do this.

There can be a better day. There is hope. I imagine a day when we have a flood insurance program with affordable premiums that is brought about by competition, that is brought about by innovation. I can imagine a day where every American remotely placed in a flood-prone area has flood as part of their homeowners insurance so that when one of these great tragedies occurs, at least they had insurance on the front end. So I dream about and I imagine greater take-up rates.

I also imagine a day where, for the people in flood-prone areas, we either help move them up or we help move them out so that they don't continue to be in harm's way.

I went to Hurricane Harvey. I met with the survivors. I heard the tragic

stories. I saw the tragedy of the lost homes. And yet here we are, voting on status quo to put them right back where they were again.

This is a sad and embarrassing day for the House. We need to vote "no."

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 Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7187.

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. HENSARLING. 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.

FEDERAL AGENCY CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE ACT OF 2018

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2846) to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2846

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 "Federal Agency Customer Experience Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Government serves the people of the United States and should seek to continually improve public services provided by the Federal Government based on customer feedback;

(2) the people of the United States deserve a Federal Government that provides efficient, effective, and high-quality services across multiple channels;

(3) many agencies, offices, programs, and Federal employees provide excellent service to individuals, however many parts of the Federal Government still fall short on delivering the customer service experience that individuals have come to expect from the private sector;

(4) according to the 2016 American Customer Satisfaction Index, the Federal Government ranks among the bottom of all industries in the United States in customer satisfaction;

(5) providing quality services to individuals improves the confidence of the people of the United States in their government and helps agencies achieve greater impact and fulfill their missions; and

(6) improving service to individuals requires agencies to work across organizational boundaries, leverage technology, collect and share standardized data, and develop customer-centered mindsets and service strategies.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that all agencies should strive to provide high-quality, courteous, effective, and efficient services to the people of the United States and seek to measure, collect, report, and utilize metrics relating to the experience of individuals interacting with agencies to continually improve services to the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) **AGENCY.**—The term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(3) **COVERED AGENCY.**—The term “covered agency” means an agency or component of an agency that is designated as a “covered agency” pursuant to section 5(a).

(4) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) **VOLUNTARY CUSTOMER SERVICE FEEDBACK.**—The term “voluntary customer service feedback” means a response to a collection of information conducted by a covered agency in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT TO COLLECTION OF VOLUNTARY CUSTOMER SERVICE FEEDBACK.

Sections 3506(c) and 3507 of title 44, United States Code (provisions of what is commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”) shall not apply to a collection of voluntary customer service feedback.

SEC. 5. GUIDELINES FOR VOLUNTARY CUSTOMER SERVICE FEEDBACK.

(a) **EVALUATION AND DESIGNATION.**—The Director shall assess agencies, agency components, and agency programs to identify which have the highest impact on or number of interactions with individuals or entities. Based on the assessment, the Director shall designate agencies, agency components, or programs as covered agencies for purposes of this Act.

(b) **GUIDANCE.**—The Director shall issue guidance that requires each covered agency that solicits voluntary customer service feedback to ensure that—

(1) any response to the solicitation of voluntary customer service feedback remains anonymous, the collection method does not include a request for or opportunity for the respondent to provide information that could identify such respondent, and any response is not traced to a specific individual or entity;

(2) any individual or entity who declines to participate in the solicitation of voluntary customer service feedback shall not be treated differently by the agency for purposes of providing services or information;

(3) the solicitation does not include more than 10 questions;

(4) the voluntary nature of the solicitation is clear;

(5) the collection of voluntary customer service feedback is only used to improve customer service and will not be used for any other purpose;

(6) any solicitation of voluntary customer service feedback is limited to 1 solicitation per interaction with an individual or entity;

(7) to the extent practicable, the solicitation of voluntary customer service feedback is made at the point of service with an individual or entity;

(8) any instrument for collecting voluntary customer service feedback is accessible to individuals with disabilities in accordance with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d); and

(9) internal agency data governance policies remain in effect with respect to the collection of voluntary customer service feedback from any individual or entity.

SEC. 6. CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE DATA COLLECTION.

(a) **COLLECTION OF RESPONSES.**—The head of each covered agency (or a designee), assisted by and in consultation with the Performance Improvement Officer or other senior accountable official for customer service of the covered agency, shall collect voluntary customer service feedback with respect to any service of or transaction with the covered agency that has been identified by the Director, in consultation with

the Administrator, in accordance with the guidance issued by the Director under section 5.

(b) **CONTENT OF QUESTIONS.**—

(1) **STANDARDIZED QUESTIONS.**—The Director, in consultation with the Administrator, shall develop a set of standardized questions for use by each covered agency in collecting voluntary customer service feedback under this section that address—

(A) overall satisfaction of individuals or entities with the specific interaction or service received;

(B) the extent to which individuals or entities were able to accomplish their intended task or purpose;

(C) whether the individual or entity was treated with respect and professionalism;

(D) whether the individual or entity believes they were served in a timely manner; and

(E) any additional metrics as determined by the Director, in consultation with the Administrator.

(2) **ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS.**—In addition to the questions developed pursuant to paragraph (1), the Director shall consult with the Performance Improvement Council to develop additional questions relevant to the operations or programs of covered agencies.

(c) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—To the extent practicable—

(1) each covered agency shall collect voluntary customer service feedback across all platforms or channels through which the covered agency interacts with individuals or other entities to deliver information or services; and

(2) voluntary customer service feedback collected under this section shall be tied to specific transactions or interactions with customers of the covered agency.

(d) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **ANNUAL REPORT TO THE DIRECTOR.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, each covered agency shall publish on the website of the covered agency and submit to the Director, in a manner determined by the Director—

(i) a report that includes—

(I) the voluntary customer service feedback for the previous year; and

(II) descriptions of how the covered agency has used and plans to use such feedback; and

(ii) a machine readable dataset that includes—

(I) the standardized questions or additional questions described in subsection (b) and the response choices for such questions; and

(II) the response rate for each collection of voluntary customer service feedback for the previous year.

(B) **CENTRALIZED WEBSITE.**—The Director shall—

(i) include and maintain on a publicly available website links to the information provided on the websites of covered agencies under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) for purposes of clause (i), establish a website or make use of an existing website, such as the website required under section 1122 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) **AGGREGATED REPORT.**—Each covered agency shall publish in an electronic format and update on a regular basis an aggregated report on the solicitation and use of voluntary customer service feedback, which shall include—

(A) the intended purpose of each solicitation of voluntary customer service feedback conducted by the covered agency;

(B) the appropriate point of contact within each covered agency for each solicitation of voluntary customer service feedback conducted;

(C) the questions or survey instrument submitted to members of the public as part of the solicitation of voluntary customer service feedback; and

(D) a description of how the covered agency uses the voluntary customer service feedback received by the covered agency to improve the customer service of the covered agency.

SEC. 7. CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE SCORECARD REPORT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 15 months after the date on which all covered agencies have submitted the first annual reports to the Director required under section 6(d)(1), and every 2 years thereafter until the date that is 10 years after such date, the Comptroller General of the United States shall make publicly available and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a scorecard report assessing the data collected and reported by the covered agencies and each instrument used to collect voluntary customer service feedback.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a summary of the information required to be published by covered agencies under section 6(d);

(2) a description of how each covered agency plans to use and has used the voluntary customer service feedback received by the covered agency; and

(3) an evaluation of each covered agency’s compliance with this Act.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that adequate Federal funding is needed to ensure agency staffing levels that can provide the public with appropriate customer service levels.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2846, sponsored by Congressman FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

The Federal Government is in the service industry. Members of this Chamber and our staffs work every day, both here and in our respective districts, to serve our constituents, the American people. The same can be said of the executive branch.

For instance, the Department of Veterans Affairs serves this Nation’s military men and women by providing healthcare services, funding education under the GI Bill, and helping veterans and their families afford homes.

However, the 2017 American Customer Satisfaction Index found that the Federal Government ranks near the bottom of all industries in the United States when it comes to customer service. The Federal Government can and must do better for the very people who pay its bills.

In the private sector, companies understand the importance of customer service. As Americans, we can barely

go one day without being asked by a company to provide feedback, whether it is when we make a purchase online, when we call our banks or credit card companies, or when we go out to eat at a restaurant. But Federal agencies often don't prioritize customer feedback because they don't have to compete for customers.

The Federal Agency Customer Experience Act will change that by requiring certain high-impact agencies to collect voluntary feedback on the services they provide, while also making it easier for other agencies to do the same if they choose to.

Using feedback provided by the public, agencies will know more about which aspects of their services are working and which need to be improved. The voluntary questionnaires created under this bill will address the individual's satisfaction with a specific agency interaction and ensure they were treated with professionalism and respect.

Finally, the Government Accountability Office will create government-wide customer experience scorecards to show everyone which agencies excel and which agencies need to improve.

I thank the bipartisan group of my colleagues who supported H.R. 2846 during committee consideration of the bill, and I urge all Members to support this legislation.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, improving government interactions with the public must be a constant goal of Federal agencies and Members of Congress. I support this bill because it moves us toward that objective.

The House bill before us is the companion measure to a bill introduced by Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL which passed the Senate unanimously last year.

H.R. 2846 would require Federal agencies to collect voluntary feedback from the public, a common practice in the private sector. Agencies would have to report the results of this feedback to the Office of Management and Budget and post it on agency websites.

Importantly, agencies would be required to ensure that this information is anonymous and protect their privacy.

However, using customer satisfaction sources to demonize certain agencies or agency personnel is not an appropriate use of this information. This feedback should be used for constructive purposes.

Measuring the public's satisfaction with the service agencies provide is a good step toward improving services overall and will hopefully provide insight into how agencies can improve their operations. The aim is to create a virtuous cycle, not a vicious one.

Congress must also recognize its role in improving agency performance and

customer satisfaction. Agencies will inevitably receive low satisfaction scores from the public if they are woefully underfunded and are not able to hire and adequately train employees, as this has, unfortunately, been the case at some agencies over the past few years.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, every day throughout the private sector, businesses obtain feedback from their customers to improve their products and improve their services. However, this is much less common—if not nonexistent—within the Federal Government, where agencies could be doing far more to improve the customer service experience of every citizen in this country. The latest American Customer Satisfaction Index found the Federal Government is near the bottom of the list when it comes to customer satisfaction.

H.R. 2846 requires certain Federal agencies to collect voluntary feedback from individuals about their interactions with the government. People who interact with government agencies will have the opportunity to give feedback on their experience. Using feedback provided by the public, agencies will figure out just how effectively they are at serving the American people.

The result, Mr. Speaker, will be a win-win. The American public receives better services and customer care, while agencies achieve greater impact and ability to fulfill their missions.

H.R. 2846 also sets guidelines for agencies' solicitation of voluntary feedback from the public. The questionnaire will be no longer than 10 questions, and the response must be anonymous. Agencies are required to work with the General Services Administration and the Office of Management and Budget to formulate their surveys to ensure feedback is both reliable and useful.

However, customer feedback on its own will not improve the relationship between the American people and the Federal Government. H.R. 2846 requires agencies to report publicly on the voluntary feedback that they collect.

This report will include information about the feedback received and a description of how the agency will go about improving customer service. The Government Accountability Office will also create customer experience scorecards for the agencies to foster accountability.

I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 2846.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this bill on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2846, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require the collection of voluntary customer service feedback on services provided by agencies, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALL-AMERICAN FLAG ACT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3121) to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3121

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 "All-American Flag Act".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT FOR AGENCIES TO BUY DOMESTICALLY MADE UNITED STATES FLAGS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR AGENCIES TO BUY DOMESTICALLY MADE UNITED STATES FLAGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 63 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 6310. Requirement for agencies to buy domestically made United States flags

"(a) REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsections (b) through (d), funds appropriated or otherwise available to an agency may not be used for the procurement of any flag of the United States, unless such flag has been 100 percent manufactured in the United States from articles, materials, or supplies that have been grown or 100 percent produced or manufactured in the United States.

"(b) AVAILABILITY EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the extent that the head of the agency concerned determines that satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of a flag described in such subsection cannot be procured as and when needed at United States market prices.

"(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROCUREMENTS.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the following:

"(1) Procurements by vessels in foreign waters.

"(2) Procurements for resale purposes in any military commissary, military exchange, or nonappropriated fund instrumentality operated by an agency.

"(3) Procurements for amounts less than the simplified acquisition threshold.

"(d) PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the requirement in subsection (a) if the President determines a waiver is necessary to comply with any trade agreement to which the United States is a party.

"(2) NOTICE OF WAIVER.—Not later than 30 days after granting a waiver under paragraph (1), the President shall publish a notice of the waiver in the Federal Register.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AGENCY.—The term ‘agency’ has the meaning given the term ‘executive agency’ in section 102 of title 40.

“(2) SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION THRESHOLD.—The term ‘simplified acquisition threshold’ has the meaning given that term in section 134.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“6310. Requirement for agencies to buy domestically made United States flags.”

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 6310 of title 41, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), shall apply with respect to any contract entered into on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 3121, introduced by Congresswoman BUSTOS of Illinois. H.R. 3121 is a bipartisan bill to ensure government agencies only buy United States flags made from 100 percent American-made material.

Most Americans may think American flags purchased with taxpayer money for the government are made here at home by Americans using only U.S. materials. Surprisingly, this is not a uniform requirement in current Federal acquisition laws and regulations. When it comes to the content of American flags purchased by executive agencies, the requirements under the current law are inconsistent.

The Department of Defense and the military departments generally are required to buy American flags made entirely of U.S. materials, but civilian agencies are currently permitted to buy flags that are manufactured in the U.S. consisting of only 51 percent American-made materials, or sometimes even less than that.

This bill brings all executive agencies under a single rule when it comes to the content of American flags bought by agencies across the government.

Rather than impose new rules and exceptions for DOD and civilian agency flag purchases, the All-American Flag Act recognizes and essentially adopts current DOD requirements and excep-

□ 1730

H.R. 3121 contains limited exceptions that recognize practical realities, such as domestic nonavailability, in keeping with current law governing DOD purchases in textiles, including U.S. flags.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BUSTOS and the many cosponsors who are leading this effort to honor America’s greatest symbol of freedom, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the All-American Flag Act is a commonsense bill that all Members should support. It would simply require all Federal agencies to purchase American flags that are manufactured in the United States, using materials grown or produced in the United States.

Under current law, this requirement applies only to the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs. It should be extended to all Federal agencies.

As under current law, the bill would provide certain limited exceptions and allow agencies to purchase American flags made elsewhere if they are not available in sufficient quantity or quality from American manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to reserve my time eventually, but first, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS), my distinguished colleague.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me time. I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan bill, the All-American Flag Act. This commonsense legislation will require all American flags purchased by the Federal Government to be made entirely in the United States from materials grown or manufactured in the United States.

The idea for this bill came to me when I was sitting down and talking with a Vietnam vet. We were at a VFW hall, and he pointed to the corner, saw an American flag there, and said: Do you know that the American flag can be made in China?

I was very surprised that that could even happen. I will never forget when he looked at me and said: ‘I didn’t fight for China. I fought for the USA.’

I later learned that, in 2015 alone, taxpayers footed the bill to import American flags to the tune of \$4.4 million, \$4 million of which went straight to China.

Since that conversation, I have worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to require the Department of Defense to purchase 100 percent American-made flags. With the support of my colleagues today, we can ensure that all American flags purchased with taxpayer money are 100 percent American made.

There is no reason that the symbol of our Nation, our freedoms, and our values, proudly worn on the sleeves of our

American soldiers or displayed right here, like right behind me, in our Nation’s Capitol should be manufactured anywhere but in the United States of America.

By purchasing flags made on American soil, we can ensure that the symbol of our Nation is preserved, while supporting American jobs and manufacturing.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my friend and colleague on this excellent, patriotic bill, of which I am a cosponsor.

I have no further speakers on this side of the aisle, so I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3121, 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.

INSPECTOR GENERAL ACCESS ACT OF 2017

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3154) to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3154

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 ‘Inspector General Access Act of 2017’.

SEC. 2. INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PERSONNEL.

Section 8E of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘and paragraph (3)’’;

(B) by striking paragraph (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking ‘‘paragraph (4)’’ and inserting ‘‘paragraph (3)’’; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ‘‘, except with respect to allegations described in subsection (b)(3)’’.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3154 introduced by Congressman RICHMOND of Louisiana.

Inspectors general perform a critical oversight function with regard to misconduct at their respective agencies. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee has long pushed for IGs to have timely and complete access to all the information they need to fulfill their oversight and investigative functions.

In continuance of that mission, H.R. 3154 removes an outdated statute that prevents the inspector general from investigating certain misconduct at the Justice Department.

Under current statute, the DOJ IG must refer allegations of misconduct by Department attorneys to the Office of Professional Responsibility, or OPR, rather than initiate an investigation himself.

The OPR existed prior to the creation of the DOJ IG in 1988, and OPR retained this specific authority when the DOJ IG was created.

H.R. 3154 seeks to harmonize the DOJ inspector general's investigative authority with that of the rest of the Federal inspectors general, who are not similarly restricted. The bill repeals the provision requiring the IG to refer allegations of attorney misconduct to OPR.

Congress and, in particular, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee have consistently supported the need for independent and transparent oversight of Federal agencies and programs.

The current division of investigative authority at DOJ is inconsistent with the committee's history of supporting the notion of an unburdened IG.

The IG is confirmed by the Senate, is accountable to the public, and only can be removed by the President after notification to Congress. Further, the IG has statutory reporting obligations to both agency leadership and Congress.

In contrast, the Director of OPR is selected and appointed by the Attorney General, answers to the Attorney General, and can be removed or disciplined by the Attorney General.

The IG's independence is critical to the value of their work.

The IG maintains transparency by publishing its reports on a public website. The website contains information about the reports, operations, and functions of the IG, including a full archive of its completed reports and its ongoing work. This standard of transparency does not apply to OPR.

Adverse findings by OPR against a DOJ lawyer are subject to review by

the Department's leadership and can be overruled by the Department's leadership without any transparency.

It is important to note that this division of authority is a unique situation in the Federal IG community. For instance, the Securities and Exchange Commission Office of Inspector General is responsible for handling misconduct allegations against SEC lawyers, including those with prosecuting authority.

The need for this legislation has also been discussed in multiple hearings before our committee and in reports by watchdog groups. The DOJ IG, Michael Horowitz, testified before this committee most recently on November 15, 2017, about the importance of eliminating this discrepancy.

Congress' own watchdog, the Government Accountability Office, has issued reports with recommendations to empower the DOJ IG.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3154, the Inspector General Access Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representatives RICHMOND, HICE, and LYNCH for the bipartisan manner in which they worked on this very important bill.

The Inspector General Access Act would allow the IG of the Department of Justice to investigate allegations of misconduct by Department attorneys. The IG is statutorily independent and currently has the authority to investigate other DOJ personnel, but is barred from pursuing appropriate investigations into the attorneys at the Department.

Under current law, the authority to investigate attorneys is restricted to the Office of Professional Responsibility within DOJ. OPR is not statutorily independent; its head is not Senate confirmed like the IG; and treating attorneys differently from other personnel is unfair.

One year ago, Michael Horowitz, the inspector general at the Department of Justice, testified before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: "This bifurcated jurisdiction creates a system where misconduct by FBI agents and other DOJ law enforcement officers is conducted by a statutorily independent IG appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, while misconduct by DOJ prosecutors is investigated by a component head who is appointed by the Department's leadership and who lacks statutory independence. There is no principled reason for treating misconduct by Federal prosecutors differently than misconduct by DOJ law enforcement agents."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter from Mr. Horowitz expressing his strong support for this bill before us today.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL,
November 29, 2018.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ELLIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS: I write to express my strong support for H.R. 3154, the "Inspector General Access Act of 2017" (Access Act), which your Committee approved unanimously on September 27, 2018. The Access Act would amend the Inspector General Act (IG Act) to provide the Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of the Inspector General (OIG) with authority to investigate allegations of misconduct against DOJ attorneys for their actions as lawyers, just as the OIG has authority under the IG Act to investigate allegations of misconduct made against any non-lawyer in the Department, including law enforcement agents at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), and the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS). Currently, under Section 8E of the Inspector General Act, the OIG does not have the authority to investigate allegations of misconduct made against DOJ attorneys acting in their capacity as lawyers; this role is reserved exclusively for the Department's Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR).

The Access Act has received broad, bipartisan support over successive Congresses because it promotes independent oversight, transparency, and accountability within DOJ and for all of its employees. For these same reasons, in 1994, the then-General Accounting Office, now the Government Accountability Office (GAO), issued a report that found that preventing the OIG from investigating attorney misconduct was inconsistent with the independence and accountability that Congress envisioned under the IG Act.

The OIG has long questioned this carve-out because OPR lacks statutory independence and does not regularly release its reports and conclusions to the public. Moreover, to our knowledge, the DOJ Inspector General is the only Inspector General in the entire federal government that does not have the authority to investigate alleged professional misconduct by attorneys who work in the agency it oversees. Providing the OIG with authority to exercise jurisdiction in attorney professional misconduct cases would enhance the public's confidence in the outcomes of these investigations and provide the OIG with the same authority as every other Inspector General.

Alleged professional misconduct by DOJ prosecutors, like any alleged misconduct by DOJ agents, should be subject to statutorily independent oversight.

Over fifteen years ago, the Department and Congress recognized the importance of statutorily independent OIG oversight over all DOJ law enforcement components (FBI, DEA, USMS, and ATF) when Attorney General Ashcroft authorized the OIG to conduct additional law enforcement oversight in 2001 and Congress legislated it in 2002. Yet, allegations against Department prosecutors for professional misconduct continue to be handled exclusively by OPR. As a result, presently, if an allegation of misconduct is made against the FBI Director, it is reviewed by the OIG; by contrast, if an allegation of professional misconduct is made against the Attorney General, it is handled by OPR, a Departmental component that the Attorney General supervises.

The rationale supporting independent oversight for alleged misconduct by law enforcement applies with equal force to alleged wrongdoing by federal prosecutors, regardless of the nature of the alleged misconduct. There is no principled reason to have two standards of oversight at DOJ—one for federal agents, who are subject to statutorily independent and transparent oversight by the OIG, and one for federal prosecutors, who are not for allegations of professional misconduct. This is particularly true given the extraordinary power that Department lawyers have to charge individuals with crimes, to seek incarceration, and to pursue the seizure of assets and property.

The OIG's independence, established by statutory authorities and protections, facilitates objective and credible investigations of misconduct allegations, as well as unbiased reports that identify and make useful recommendations for improving the Department. The OIG is headed by a Senate-confirmed Inspector General who can only be removed by the President, with prior notice to Congress. The OIG's statutory independence is bolstered by the OIG's dual obligation to report findings and concerns both to the Attorney General and to Congress. The independent OIG is able to make critical investigative and audit findings without fear of reprisal.

Conversely, OPR has no statutory independence or protections. The OPR Counsel is appointed by and answers to the Attorney General, and can be removed or disciplined by the Attorney General. Although a November 27, 2018 letter from DOJ's Office of Legislative Affairs (OLA) on H.R. 3154 states that "OPR has always acted independently," it does not point to any protections, statutory or otherwise, that exist to ensure OPR's independence from the Attorney General, nor has DOJ proposed strengthening OPR's independence by adding such protections. Indeed, the letter fails to explain or even address why DOJ believes it is better to have a non-statutorily independent entity handle attorney professional misconduct cases rather than a statutorily independent organization, as is the case for law enforcement professional misconduct allegations.

The OIG's independent and transparent oversight enhances the public's confidence in the DOJ's programs and improves its operations.

In addition to independence, the OIG considers transparency a crucial component of its oversight mission. With limited exceptions, the OIG ensures that the public is aware of the results of our work. The majority of our reports are posted on our public website at the time of release to ensure that Congress and the public are informed of our findings, in a comprehensive and timely manner. The OIG, consistent with the IG Act, publishes on our website summaries of investigations resulting in findings of administrative misconduct by senior government employees and in matters of public interest even when the subject is not prosecuted. We post such summaries without identifying the investigative subject consistent with the legal requirements under the Privacy Act. Because of this commitment to transparency, there are currently hundreds of OIG reports, audits, and reviews posted on our web site. There are also summaries of dozens of OIG investigative reports posted, including recent reports involving significant misconduct by senior DOJ officials.

In contrast, there are currently only a total of five reports (other than annual reports) posted on OPR's website. Four of those five reports are from 2008 and were the result of OPR's joint work with the OIG, and

which the OIG posted on our website consistent with the IG Act and our practice. The fifth report was completed by OPR in 2013 and only released in 2015 in response to a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. Moreover, although the OLA letter states that "OPR discloses a substantial amount of information about its work and findings in its annual report," this information is not reported in a timely or comprehensive manner. Congress and the public only find out about some, but not necessarily all, of OPR's work when it issues an annual report.

An example of this dichotomy can be found in a case involving an Oregon lawyer who was arrested by the FBI and wrongly imprisoned after mismatched fingerprints linked him to the 2004 bombing at a Madrid train station. The OIG investigated the allegations of FBI agent misconduct, while the Department's OPR investigated the allegations of attorney misconduct. This bifurcation led to inconsistent treatment. The OIG report on the actions of the FBI agents was published on the OIG's website, but OPR did not publish the report on the conduct of the DOJ attorneys who were involved in the same case.

Transparency ensures greater accountability, and sends an important deterrent message to other Department employees. The credibility of the Department's disciplinary process is inevitably reduced when the responsible component operates under the direction of the Department's senior leadership and is not subject to public scrutiny because of limited transparency.

The OIG has demonstrated its excellence in reviewing complex legal and factual issues, including employee ethics and misconduct matters.

Over the past 30 years, the OIG has shown that it is capable of fair and independent oversight of the DOJ. The jurisdictional limitation of Section 8E(b)(3) is an unnecessary historical vestige of the fact that OPR was in existence prior to the statutory creation of the OIG in 1988. Those who unsuccessfully tried in 2002 to forestall Congress from providing the OIG with oversight of alleged misconduct by FBI and DEA agents contended that those cases required specialized expertise—just like the Department argues currently that prosecutorial oversight requires specialized expertise—and that argument was roundly rejected and has proven to be entirely without merit. The decision by Congress to extend OIG jurisdiction in 2002 to encompass misconduct by FBI and DEA agents has allowed for significant and important oversight of DOJ's law enforcement operations, and has had significant positive impact on the integrity of those agencies' operations.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual issues related to our misconduct reviews, including those involving FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions prior to the 2016 presidential election, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior officials, we have investigated the FBI's actions involving its former agent Robert Hanssen, the FBI's activities related to James "Whitey" Bulger, the DEA's oversight of its confidential informant program, the DEA and other components' handling of sexual misconduct and harassment cases, the operation of the FBI laboratory, ATF's actions involving Operation Fast and Furious, and the FBI's use of its national security authorities (National Security Letters, Patriot Act Section 215, FISA Amendment Act Section 702).

Each of those and many other reviews resulted in independent and transparent find-

ings by the OIG, and resulted in changes to Department operations that enhanced their effectiveness and thereby increased the public's confidence in those programs. Moreover, OIGs throughout the government, including at the Department of Homeland Security and the Securities and Exchange Commission, have authority to investigate misconduct allegations made against attorneys at those agencies and they have demonstrated that they are fully capable of dealing with such matters covering a wide range of complex legal issues. The DOJ OIG is the only OIG, to our knowledge, that is barred by the IG Act from reviewing misconduct by lawyers within the agency it oversees.

The Access Act would provide the OIG with oversight over Department lawyers in a manner that is entirely consistent with its oversight authority over Department non-attorneys.

The present oversight system that applies to allegations made against any DOJ non-lawyer, as provided for in the IG Act and Department regulations, is precisely the oversight mechanism that the Access Act seeks to apply to Department lawyers. Specifically, under the current system for DOJ non-lawyers, all non-frivolous misconduct allegations must be provided to the OIG for the OIG's review and determination as to whether it is of the type and nature that warrants and necessitates independent OIG investigation. Given the OIG's limited resources, the OIG handles only those allegations that warrant an independent OIG investigation, and therefore the OIG returns routine and less serious misconduct allegations to Department components, such as the FBI's Inspections Division and the DEA's OPR, for their handling and investigation. For those matters that the OIG retains, when the OIG completes its investigation, it sends its report to the component so that it can adjudicate the OIG's findings and take disciplinary action, as appropriate. The Access Act creates a similar practice, by maintaining the Department's OPR to handle misconduct allegations that do not require independent outside review as determined by the OIG, much as the internal affairs offices at the FBI, DEA, ATF, and USMS remain in place today.

We are unaware of any claims by Department leaders that this approach has resulted in "different investigative standards," "decrease[d] efficiency," or "inconsistent application" of legal standards. There is no evidence that it has impacted the components' "ability to successfully defend any significant discipline decision before the Merit Systems Protection Board." Yet this parade of horrors is precisely what the OLA letter claims will occur if attorneys are treated in the same manner as Special Agents and non-attorneys at the Department, rather than continuing to receive the special oversight treatment granted to them under the current carve-out provision under the IG Act. This argument is meritless. Indeed, the disciplinary processes at the FBI and the DEA have substantially improved since the OIG obtained statutory oversight authority over those components in 2002, in significant part due to the greater transparency and accountability that has resulted from the OIG's oversight.

I very much appreciate your strong support for my Office and for Inspectors General throughout the federal government.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL E. HOROWITZ,
Inspector General.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3154 would not prohibit OPR from investigating attorneys. It would simply add the ability to investigate attorneys when appropriate

in the IG's authority, an additional layer of accountability.

Empowering IGs has been, and should continue to be, a nonpartisan issue.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform relies on the work of IGs, and we strongly support ensuring they can do their jobs effectively.

This bill was ordered reported by the Oversight Committee unanimously. I urge my colleagues to continue their support for IGs by supporting the Inspector General Access Act.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3154.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

21ST CENTURY INTEGRATED DIGITAL EXPERIENCE ACT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5759) to improve executive agency digital services, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5759

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 "21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act" or the "21st Century IDEA".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **DIRECTOR.**—The term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(2) **EXECUTIVE AGENCY.**—The term "executive agency" has the meaning given the term "Executive agency" in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3. WEBSITE MODERNIZATION.

(a) **REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW WEBSITES AND DIGITAL SERVICES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an executive agency that creates a website or digital service that is intended for use by the public, or conducts a redesign of an existing legacy website or digital service that is intended for use by the public, shall ensure to the greatest extent practicable that any new or redesigned website, web-based form, web-based application, or digital service—

(1) is accessible to individuals with disabilities in accordance with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d);

(2) has a consistent appearance;

(3) does not overlap with or duplicate any legacy websites and, if applicable, ensure that legacy websites are regularly reviewed, eliminated, and consolidated;

(4) contains a search function that allows users to easily search content intended for public use;

(5) is provided through an industry standard secure connection;

(6) is designed around user needs with data-driven analysis influencing management and development decisions, using qualitative and quantitative data to determine user goals, needs, and behaviors, and continually test the website, web-based form, web-based application, or digital service to ensure that user needs are addressed;

(7) provides users of the new or redesigned website, web-based form, web-based application, or digital service with the option for a more customized digital experience that allows users to complete digital transactions in an efficient and accurate manner; and

(8) is fully functional and usable on common mobile devices.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS FOR EXISTING EXECUTIVE AGENCY WEBSITES AND DIGITAL SERVICES.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each executive agency that maintains a website or digital service that is made available to the public shall—

(1) review each website or digital service; and

(2) submit to Congress a report that includes—

(A) a list of the websites and digital services maintained by the executive agency that are most viewed or utilized by the public or are otherwise important for public engagement;

(B) from among the websites and digital services listed under subparagraph (A), a prioritization of websites and digital services that require modernization to meet the requirements under subsection (a); and

(C) an estimation of the cost and schedule of modernizing the websites and digital services prioritized under subparagraph (B).

(c) **INTERNAL DIGITAL SERVICES.**—The head of each executive agency shall ensure, to the greatest extent practicable, that any Intranet established after the date of enactment of this Act conforms to the requirements described in subsection (a).

(d) **PUBLIC REPORTING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and every year thereafter for 4 years, the head of each executive agency shall—

(1) report annually to the Director on the progress of the executive agency in implementing the requirements described in this section for the previous year; and

(2) include the information described in paragraph (1) in a publicly available report that is required under another provision of law.

(e) **COMPLIANCE WITH UNITED STATES WEBSITE STANDARDS.**—Any website of an executive agency that is made available to the public after the date of enactment of this Act shall be in compliance with the website standards of the Technology Transformation Services of the General Services Administration.

SEC. 4. DIGITIZATION OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES AND FORMS.

(a) **NON-DIGITAL SERVICES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue guidance to the head of each executive agency that establishes a process for the executive agency to—

(1) identify public non-digital, paper-based, or in-person Government services; and

(2) include in the budget request of the executive agency—

(A) a list of non-digital services with the greatest impact that could be made available to the public through an online, mobile-friendly, digital service option in a manner that decreases cost, increases digital conversion rates, and improves customer experience; and

(B) an estimation of the cost and schedule associated with carrying out the modernization described in subparagraph (A).

(b) **SERVICES REQUIRED TO BE DIGITAL.**—The head of each executive agency shall regularly review public-facing applications and services to ensure that those applications and services are, to the greatest extent practicable, made available to the public in a digital format.

(c) **FORMS REQUIRED TO BE DIGITAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the enactment of this

Act, the head of each executive agency shall ensure that any paper based form that is related to serving the public is made available in a digital format that meets the requirements described in section 3(a).

(d) **NON-DIGITIZABLE PROCESSES.**—If the head of an executive agency cannot make available in a digital format under this section an in-person Government service, form, or paper-based process, the head of the executive agency shall document—

(1) the title of the in-person Government service, form, or paper-based process;

(2) a description of the in-person Government service, form, or paper-based process;

(3) each unit responsible for the in-person Government service, form, or paper-based process and the location of each unit in the organizational hierarchy of the executive agency;

(4) any reasons why the in-person Government service, form, or paper-based process cannot be made available under this section; and

(5) any potential solutions that could allow the in-person Government service, form, or paper-based process to be made available under this section, including the implementation of existing technologies, procedural changes, regulatory changes, and legislative changes.

(e) **PHYSICAL AVAILABILITY.**—Each executive agency shall maintain an accessible method of completing digital services through in-person, paper-based, or other means, such that individuals without the ability to use digital services are not deprived of or impeded in access to those digital services.

SEC. 5. ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each executive agency shall submit to the Director and the appropriate congressional committees a plan to accelerate the use of electronic signatures standards established under the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. 7001 et seq.).

SEC. 6. CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE AND DIGITAL SERVICE DELIVERY.

The Chief Information Officer of each executive agency, or a designee, shall—

(1) coordinate and ensure alignment of the internal and external customer experience programs and strategy of the executive agency;

(2) coordinate with the management leaders of the executive agency, including the head of the executive agency, the Chief Financial Officer, and any program manager, to ensure proper funding to support the implementation of this Act;

(3) continually examine the digital service delivery strategy of the executive agency to the public and submit recommendations to the head of the executive agency providing guidance and best practices suitable to the mission of the executive agency;

(4) using qualitative and quantitative data obtained from across the executive agency relating to the experience and satisfaction of customers, identify areas of concern that need improvement and improve the delivery of customer service;

(5) coordinate and ensure, with the approval of the head of the executive agency, compliance by the executive agency with section 3559 of title 44, United States Code; and

(6) to the extent practicable, coordinate with other agencies and seek to maintain as much standardization and commonality with other agencies as practicable in implementing the requirements of this Act, to best enable future transitions to centralized shared services.

SEC. 7. STANDARDIZATION.

(a) **DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION.**—Each executive agency shall, to the extent practicable, seek to maintain as much standardization and commonality with other executive agencies as practicable in implementing the requirements of this Act to best enable future transitions to centralized shared services.

(b) **COORDINATION.**—The Chief Information Officer of each executive agency, or a designee,

shall coordinate the implementation of the requirements of this Act, including the development of standards and commonalities.

(c) **FEDERAL SUPPLY SCHEDULE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The General Services Administration shall make available under a Federal Supply Schedule the systems and services necessary to fulfill the requirements of this Act.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Federal Supply Schedule described in paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable, ensure interoperability between executive agencies, compliance with industry standards, and adherence to best practices for design, accessibility, and information security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5759 introduced by Congressman KHANNA of California.

The U.S. Federal Customer Experience Index measures citizen interactions with the Federal Government. The 2018 index gave Federal agencies failing scores. Citizens deserve and expect better from their government.

H.R. 5759, the 21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act, or 21st Century IDEA, requires agencies to modernize their websites and digital services. 21st Century IDEA takes a systematic approach to modernizing websites, services, and forms, so as not to unduly burden agencies.

New and redesigned agency websites will have to meet modernization requirements, such as being searchable, customizable, and secure.

□ 1745

Meanwhile, each agency will survey and create a plan for updating its existing websites and digital services, prioritizing those that are used most by the public. Agencies will also digitize forms so that electronic signatures may be used. All these modernization efforts will improve our constituents' experiences when interacting with Federal agencies.

The bill is supported by the Information Technology Industry Council; The Software Alliance; Adobe; Information Technology and Innovation Foundation; Software & Information Industry Association; ServiceNow; CompTIA; and Microsoft.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KHANNA and Congressman RATCLIFFE for introducing this important piece of

legislation, and to all of the cosponsors on the committee.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the 21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act, and I thank my friend and colleague, Representative RO KHANNA, for his bipartisan work on this important bill.

This bill will require agencies to modernize their public-facing websites and increase the types of services and forms available to the public in a digital format.

Improving the capabilities of agency websites available to the public is essential to ensuring that the Federal Government continues to meet the demands of today's citizens. This bill would help to achieve that goal by requiring agencies to make long overdue improvements to the websites and digital services they provide for the public's benefit.

For example, the bill would require that any new or redesigned website be accessible to people with disabilities, offer search functions to allow users to more easily find specific content, and use data-driven analysis to ensure that users' needs are being adequately addressed.

This bill also would mandate that within 2 years of enactment, agencies provide the public with the option of completing any transactions by means of an online, mobile-friendly, digital format. In other words, on their phones.

Finally, the bill would require agencies to submit to both the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform a report on the progress being made in implementing the bill's requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the IDEA Act that Representative JOHN RATCLIFFE and I introduced.

The idea behind this act is very simple. I represent Silicon Valley. Companies in the private sector in Silicon Valley have very sophisticated websites that make it really easy for consumers to use those websites. There is no reason that the United States Government shouldn't have websites that are as user friendly and easy to use. This bill will require our agencies to be as user friendly to citizens as the private sector is for consumers.

This bill would never have taken place if it wasn't for bipartisan leadership. I want to particularly recognize Chairman WILL HURD, who not only helped with this, but gave me advice on how to draft the bill, and, of course, Ranking Member ROBIN KELLY. I also want to recognize JOHN RATCLIFFE for

his extraordinary work; Senator ROB PORTMAN, who has moved this in the Senate; and Matt Lira at the White House Office of American Innovation, who has been instrumental in this. It shows that the Congress can work to bring modern technology into government.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues and Members to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5759: the 21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act—also known as the "21st Century IDEA."

Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my colleague, Representative RO KHANNA, for his leadership on this important legislation.

This bill is bipartisan. Because if there's one thing we can and should agree on—it's the federal government's duty and obligation to serving the American people as best we can.

It's been a privilege to co-lead on this effort to help make sure we do a better job.

We all know that there's a lot of room for improvement when it comes to meeting the needs of the constituents we were sent here to serve.

But the 21st Century IDEA homes in on a particular area where our federal government lags staggeringly behind: digital modernization and technology.

Why's this such a big issue? Because it's hurting our ability to ensure folks get timely and efficient help from agencies like the IRS or VA.

And even though the technology we need to mitigate this problem is already available—we aren't using it. But as times change, and as citizens' needs transform, it's our job to ensure we evolve the services we provide.

In today's world, this means ensuring that when citizens engage with the government, that interaction mirrors other modern, cost-effective experiences in their everyday lives.

With everything from hailing a cab, buying groceries, or ordering a pizza, we've shifted away from phone calls, walk-ins, or pickups, toward online orders and mobile apps that save us time and, often, money.

The same is true when it comes to federal agencies: Digitization increases the quality of service, promotes efficiency, and improves cost-effectiveness. In fact, recent data from the IRS shows that it costs an agency about \$42 to help a customer on the telephone, and about \$54 to respond to letters sent through the mail.

The same assistance costs only 22 cents when conducted online.

The 21st Century IDEA takes steps to catapult our federal government into the 21st Century by requiring specific efficiency-boosting and cost-saving improvements to government websites and digital services.

These improvements include, for example, ensuring that consumers can connect to government sites through a secure connection, that sites offer search functions, that sites provide consumers a personalization option, and that sites consolidate redundant material

These changes will be overseen by a responsible agency official to ensure compliance.

On top of this, agencies will be required to make paper-based forms available digitally within one year, to provide a digital option as an alternative to in-person government services within two years, to submit a plan to increase the use of electronic signatures on contracts and related documents within 180 days, and to modernize their public-facing websites within one year.

Consumers will no longer be required to print and fill out forms that must then be either faxed or mailed in.

These digital improvements will drastically improve the way our federal agencies provide critical services to folks all across the country, including people with disabilities or those who live in rural areas with limited access to traditional, in-person assistance services all while saving countless taxpayer dollars.

I cannot stress it enough that the federal government is supposed to work for the American people. And we owe it to them to do a better job.

The tools we need to restore the United States' global leadership in technology and digital government are already at our fingertips. Now it's time to act.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 5759: the 21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 5759, the 21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act of 2018. This bipartisan legislation, which was reported out of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee by voice vote, seeks to modernize and improve the delivery of citizen-facing and internal digital services by government agencies.

This legislation builds on the Connected Government Act that I authored and which was signed into law last year. Like the Connected Government Act, the 21st Century IDEA requires federal agency websites to be mobile friendly and secure by providing citizens with an improved customer experience. The bill requires agencies to upgrade their online experiences, provide a digital, mobile friendly option for any paper-based form, requires a plan for the expanded use of electronic signatures, and establishes federal agency chief information officers as the responsible officials inside the federal government for carrying out these requirements. All critical factors in improving customer experience.

American citizens deserve and expect a modern, cost effective digital experience when interacting with the federal government. Recent data from the IRS shows that in-person or live assistance calls to the agency cost taxpayers between \$40 and \$60 on average, while digital transactions cost only \$0.22 on average. A recent 2017 Forrester Research study on Federal Customer Experience Index also found that, "federal websites and mobile apps still offer experiences that are worse than those provided by nondigital channels like physical locations and call centers." The need for enhanced citizen-facing digital service delivery is clear and will dramatically drive down the cost of government operations and improve customer experience.

Restoring the United States Government's global leadership in technology and digital government requires a new approach. To that

end, H.R. 5759 is needed to modernize federal agency websites, support the increased use of mobile devices, transition away from paper-based forms and in-person transactions and bring the U.S. government into the 21st Century.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5759, 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.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT INFORMATION DATABASE ACT OF 2018

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6777) to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of settlement agreements, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6777

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 "Settlement Agreement Information Database Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. INFORMATION REGARDING SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.—Chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 307. Information regarding settlement agreements

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'local government' has the meaning given that term in section 6501 of title 31.

"(2) ORDER TYPE.—The term 'order type' means the type of action or instrument used to settle a civil or criminal judicial action.

"(3) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term 'settlement agreement' means a settlement agreement (including a consent decree) that—

"(A) is entered into by an Executive agency; and

"(B) relates to an alleged violation of Federal civil or criminal law.

"(4) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, each territory or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian Tribe.

"(b) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT INFORMATION DATABASE.—

"(1) EXECUTIVE AGENCY REQUIREMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the head of each Executive agency shall, in accordance with guidance issued pursuant to paragraph (2), submit the following information to the database established under paragraph (3):

"(i) A list of each settlement agreement, in a categorized and searchable format, entered into by the Executive agency, as a party to a lawsuit, which shall include, for each settlement agreement—

"(I) the order type of the settlement agree-

ment; and

"(II) the date on which the parties entered into the settlement agreement;

"(III) a list of specific violations that specify the basis for the action taken, with a description of the claims each party settled under the settlement agreement;

"(IV) the amount of attorneys' fees and other litigation costs awarded, if any, including a description of the statutory basis for such an award;

"(V) the amount each party settling a claim under the settlement agreement is obligated to pay under the settlement agreement;

"(VI) the total amount the settling parties are obligated to pay under the settlement agreement;

"(VII) the amount, if any, the settling party is obligated to pay that is expressly specified under the settlement agreement as a civil or criminal penalty or fine;

"(VIII) any payment made under the settlement agreement, including a description of any payment made to the Federal Government;

"(IX) the projected duration of the settlement agreement, if available;

"(X) a list of State or local governments that may be directly affected by the terms of the settlement agreement;

"(XI) a brief description of any economic data and methodology used to justify the terms of the settlement agreement;

"(XII) any modifications to the settlement agreement, when applicable;

"(XIII) notice and comments, when applicable; and

"(XIV) whether the settlement agreement is still under judicial enforcement and any period of time by which the parties agreed to have certain conditions met.

"(ii) A copy of each—

"(I) settlement agreement entered into by the Executive agency; and

"(II) statement issued under paragraph (4).

"(B) NONDISCLOSURE.—The requirement to submit information or a copy of a settlement agreement under subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the extent the information or copy (or portion thereof)—

"(i) is subject to a confidentiality provision that prohibits disclosure of the information or copy (or portion thereof); and

"(ii) would not be disclosed under section 552, if the Executive agency provides a citation to the applicable exemption.

"(C) CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBLE AGENCY.—In a case in which an Executive agency is acting at the request or on behalf of another Executive agency (referred to as the originating agency), the originating agency is responsible for submitting information under subparagraph (A).

"(2) GUIDANCE.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance for Executive agencies to implement paragraph (1). Such guidance shall include the following:

"(A) Specific dates by which submissions must be made, not less than twice a year.

"(B) Data standards, including common data elements and a common, nonproprietary, searchable, machine-readable, platform independent format.

"(C) A requirement that the information and documents required under paragraph (1) are publicly available for a period starting on the date of the settlement through not less than 5 years after the termination of the settlement agreement.

"(3) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATABASE.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, or the head of an Executive agency designated by the Director, shall establish and maintain a public, searchable,

downloadable database for Executive agencies to directly upload and submit the information and documents required under paragraph (1) for immediate publication online.

“(4) STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY.—If the head of an Executive agency determines that a confidentiality provision in a settlement agreement, or the sealing of a settlement agreement, is required to protect the public interest of the United States, the head of the Executive agency may except the settlement agreement from the requirement in paragraph (1) and shall issue a written public statement stating why such action is required to protect the public interest of the United States, which shall explain—

“(A) what interests confidentiality protects; and

“(B) why the interests protected by confidentiality outweigh the public’s interest in knowing about the conduct of the Federal Government and the expenditure of Federal resources.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“307. Information regarding settlement agreements.”

(c) DEADLINE TO ESTABLISH DATABASE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance required by section 307(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and establish the settlement agreement information database required by section 307(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(d) DEADLINE FOR FIRST SUBMISSION.—Not later than 90 days after the Director issues guidance under section 307(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), the head of each Executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code) shall begin submitting information to the database established under such section 307.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.

Section 552(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) each settlement agreement (as defined in section 307) entered into by an Executive agency, with redactions for information that the agency may withhold under paragraph (8) and subsections (b) and (c) of this section;”.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to require the disclosure of information or records that any agency may properly withhold from public disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Freedom of Information Act”).

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.

This Act shall be effective 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply—

(1) with respect to any settlement agreement (as such term is defined in section 307 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 2), entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) to the extent practicable, any such settlement agreement (as such term is defined in section 307 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 2) that remains in effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6777, introduced by Congressman PALMER of Alabama.

Transparency and public participation are critical to maintaining the public’s trust in its government. Since the 1970s, however, Federal agencies have increasingly resolved litigation by entering into consent decrees and other legally binding settlement agreements rather than through a public trial.

These agreements were often negotiated behind closed doors. Secret negotiations prevent the public from holding the Federal Government accountable for decisions made without their input.

States, local governments, industry stakeholders, and taxpayers are often directly affected by the agreements, but are shut out of the negotiations. For example, a consent decree entered into by the Environmental Protection Agency required the city of Fort Smith, Arkansas to reform its sewer systems in 12 years. Sewer utility bills increased by 167 percent in 3 years to fund the obligations of the agreement, while residents’ incomes simultaneously decreased by 11 percent.

Due to poor recordkeeping, it is impossible for Congress and the public to determine the full cost of Federal settlement agreements. Most of the public’s access to Federal settlement agreement information is currently determined by individual agency discretion, usually issued in the form of a press release.

Further, heads of agencies can declare a settlement confidential and seal the contents of the agreement without providing any explanation. The Settlement Agreement Information Database Act seeks to correct this problem by shining light on the details of Federal settlement agreements. The bill requires the establishment of an electronic and publicly-available database of agencies’ settlement agreements. It requires Federal agencies to enter basic information about settlement agreements into the database.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense transparency bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support this commonsense bill. The Settlement Agreement Information Database Act would create a database of settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies that relate to alleged violations of Federal, civil, or criminal law.

The Office of Management and Budget would manage this database and set deadlines for submission. The heads of executive agencies would be required to submit details about the types of settlement agreements, parties involved in the settlements, specific violations, and the dates on which the settlement agreements were entered into.

The information about the settlement agreements would remain public until 5 years after the termination of the agreements. The information within the agreements would remain subject to FOIA regulations. But if the head of the agencies decided to keep an entire agreement confidential, he or she would be required to submit an explanation of that action to the database.

This bill would improve the transparency surrounding settlement agreements, which in the past have been difficult for the public to access.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6777.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CIO AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6901) to amend chapter 36 of title 44, United States Code, to make certain changes relating to electronic Government services, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6901

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 “Federal CIO Authorization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. CHANGES RELATING TO ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT SERVICES.

(a) CHANGE OF CERTAIN NAMES IN CHAPTER 36 OF TITLE 44.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3601 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (8) as paragraphs (1) through (7), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “E-Government Fund” and inserting “Federal IT Fund”.

(2) OFFICE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT.—Section 3602 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “OFFICE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT” and inserting “OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER”;

(B) in subsection (a), by striking “Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “an Administrator” and inserting “a Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and who shall report directly to the Director”;

(D) in subsection (c), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(E) in subsection (d), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(F) in subsection (e), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(G) in subsection (f)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “E-Government Fund” and inserting “Federal IT Fund”;

(iii) in paragraph (16), by striking “the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(18) Oversee the Federal Chief Information Security Officer.”; and

(H) in subsection (g), by striking “the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(3) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS COUNCIL.—Section 3603 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(4) E-GOVERNMENT FUND.—Section 3604 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “E-GOVERNMENT FUND” and inserting “FEDERAL IT FUND”;

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “E-Government Fund” and inserting “Federal IT Fund”;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(C) in subsection (b), by striking “Administrator” each place it appears and inserting “Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(D) in subsection (c), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(5) PROGRAM TO ENCOURAGE INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS TO ENHANCE ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT SERVICES AND PROCESSES.—Section 3605 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “, the Administrator,” and inserting “, the Federal Chief Information Officer,”; and

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(II) by striking “proposals submitted to the Administrator” and inserting “proposals submitted to the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(iii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(II) by striking “E-Government Fund” and inserting “Federal IT Fund”.

(6) E-GOVERNMENT REPORT.—Section 3606 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “E-Government” and inserting “Annual”;

(B) in subsection (a), by striking “an E-Government status report to the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives” and inserting “a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives”.

(7) TREATMENT OF INCUMBENT.—The individual serving as the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government under section 3602 of title 44, United States Code, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, may continue to serve as the Federal Chief Information Officer commencing as of that date, without further appointment under such section.

(8) REFERENCES.—Any reference to the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government in any law, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed to be a reference to the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(9) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) TABLE OF SECTIONS FOR CHAPTER 36 OF TITLE 44.—The table of sections for chapter 36 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to section 3602 and inserting the following new item: “3602. Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer.”;

(ii) by striking the item relating to section 3604 and inserting the following new item: “3604. Federal IT Fund.”;

and

(iii) in the item relating to section 3606, by striking “E-Government” and inserting “Annual”.

(B) PRESIDENTIAL INNOVATION FELLOWS PROGRAM ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 3172(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government of the Office of Management and Budget” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(C) POSITIONS AT LEVEL III.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “Administrator of the Office of

Electronic Government” and inserting “Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(D) TABLE OF SECTIONS FOR CHAPTER 5 OF TITLE 31.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of subtitle I of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 507 and inserting the following new item:

“507. Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer.”.

(E) OFFICE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT.—Section 507 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the heading, by striking “OFFICE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT” and inserting “OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER”;

(ii) by striking “The Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “The Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(F) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT OFFICERS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT POLICY COUNCIL.—Section 1126(b)(3)(A)(i)(II) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(G) ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 305 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(H) CAPITAL PLANNING AND INVESTMENT CONTROL.—Section 11302(c)(4) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” each place it appears and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(I) RESOURCES, PLANNING, AND PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT.—Section 11319(d) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking “Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” each place it appears and inserting “Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(J) E-GOVERNMENT ACT OF 2002.—Section 207(f)(3)(C) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note) is amended by striking “the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF CHIEF INFORMATION SECURITY OFFICER AND REPORT ON IT EXPENDITURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 36 of title 44, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following new sections: “§ 3607. Federal Chief Information Security Officer

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office of Management and Budget a Federal Chief Information Security Officer, who shall—

“(1) be appointed by the President;

“(2) be within the Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer; and

“(3) report directly to the Federal Chief Information Officer.

“(b) DUTIES.—The Federal Chief Information Security Officer shall—

“(1) direct the cybersecurity efforts of the Office of Management and Budget;

“(2) carry out the duties of the Director related to the security of information and information systems for agencies, including the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Director under subchapter II of chapter 35; and

“(3) carry out such other duties and powers assigned by the President, the Director, or the Federal Chief Information Officer.

“§ 3608. Technology investment planning and oversight process

“(a) REPORT ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EXPENDITURES.—The head of each agency

shall submit to the Federal Chief Information Officer a report on any expenditure on information technology by that agency.

“(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Director shall establish a process to implement subsection (a), and may update such process, as necessary, that shall—

“(1) use a widely accepted industry standard taxonomy with common data elements and definitions; and

“(2) display, on a website accessible to the public, timely, searchable, computer-readable data on the information technology expenditures, projects, and programs of agencies, if such information would otherwise be subject to public disclosure under section 552 of title 5, commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 36 of title 44, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“3607. Federal Chief Information Security Officer.

“3608. Technology investment planning and oversight process.”

(3) DEADLINE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish the process described in section 3608(b) of title 44, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the status of establishing the process described in section 3608(b) of title 44, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. PROPOSAL RELATED TO SHARED SERVICES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall submit to Congress a proposal for consolidating information technology across the Federal Government, especially among Federal agencies not referred to under section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code, and increasing the use of shared services, including any recommendations for legislative changes that may be necessary to effect the proposal.

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6901, introduced by Congressman WILL HURD of Texas.

The Federal CIO Authorization Act is a bipartisan measure to modernize legacy Federal technology policy.

The Office of Electronic Government was established by the E-Government Act of 2002. The head of this office is commonly referred to as the Federal Chief Information Officer, or Federal CIO.

This bill authorizes and renames the Office of Electronic Government as the Office of the Federal CIO. Codifying the position of the Federal CIO emphasizes the importance of the role to the formation of government-wide technology policy.

Under this bill, the Federal CIO will report to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

The bill also codifies the position of Federal Chief Information Security Officer, under the direction of the Federal CIO.

The bill promotes cost-efficient and secure technology use throughout the Federal Government.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal CIO Authorization Act would make several commonsense changes to existing law.

First, it would update the name of the Administrator for E-Government to the Federal Chief Information Officer and require that individual to report directly to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Second, it would establish the position of Federal Chief Information Security Officer, who would report to the Federal CIO and assist OMB in its cybersecurity efforts.

Finally, the bill would require the Federal CIO to submit a proposal on consolidating IT across Federal agencies, especially smaller agencies, through the use of shared services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member in this Congress to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, it should come as no surprise to anyone in this Chamber that technology is integrated into every facet of our daily lives. We have come a long way since the bill that established the role of the Federal Chief Information Officer, the E-Government Act, when it was originally passed.

Less than 50 percent of the U.S. population had access to the internet in 2001. Nearly every American now has access to the internet.

Just 62 percent of Americans had cell phones when the original bill passed. Now 95 percent of Americans own cell phones and 77 percent own smartphones.

Mobile apps were non-existent in 2002. Today, over 2.2 million apps are available to consumers.

This bill recognizes how far technology has come. It codifies the position of the Federal CIO and elevates the office to report directly to the head of the Office of Management and Budget.

This bill establishes the role of the Federal CISO, the Chief Information Security Officer, who reports to the CIO and leads OMB's cybersecurity efforts.

Empowering CIOs at the Federal agencies is consistent with the principles of the Federal IT Acquisition Reform Act and the Federal CIO should not be treated differently.

□ 1800

\$90 billion is spent on purchasing IT goods and services. Eighty percent of that is on old, outdated technology. We need a strong Federal CIO to make sure American taxpayer dollars are being spent wisely.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends, my colleagues—MARK MEADOWS from North Carolina; GERRY CONNOLLY from Virginia; my partner in crime on the Information Technology Subcommittee, my good friend, ROBIN KELLY from Illinois; and also BRENDA LAWRENCE from Michigan—for showing the American people that bipartisanship actually happens up here in Washington, D.C., in order to make sure we are keeping Americans safe.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6901, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

TILDEN VETERANS POST OFFICE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1207) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 River Street in Tilden, Texas, as the "Tilden Veterans Post Office", with

the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

On page 2, line 1, strike [SPECIALIST].

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

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLEASANTON VETERANS POST OFFICE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1210) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 122 W. Goodwin Street, Pleasanton, Texas, as the "Pleasanton Veterans Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1210

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

SECTION 1. PLEASANTON VETERANS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 122 W. Goodwin Street, Pleasanton, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Pleasanton Veterans Post Office".

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENCINAL VETERANS POST OFFICE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1211) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 400 N. Main Street, Encinal, Texas, as the "Encinal Veterans Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1211

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

SECTION 1. ENCINAL VETERANS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 400 N. Main Street, Encinal, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Encinal Veterans Post Office".

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPTAIN HUMAYUN KHAN POST OFFICE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3184) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 180 McCormick Road in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the "Captain Humayun Khan Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3184

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

SECTION 1. CAPTAIN HUMAYUN KHAN POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 180 McCormick Road in Charlottesville, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the "Captain Humayun Khan Post Office".

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SGT. JOSH RODGERS POST OFFICE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4326) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1211 Towanda Avenue in Bloomington, Illinois, as the "Sgt. Josh Rodgers Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4326

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

SECTION 1. SGT. JOSH RODGERS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1211 Towanda Avenue in Bloomington, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Sgt. Josh Rodgers Post Office".

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COMER

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, beginning on line 5, strike "1211 Towanda Avenue in Bloomington, Illinois" and insert "200 West North Street in Normal, Illinois".

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

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 West North Street in Normal, Illinois, as the "Sgt. Josh Rodgers Post Office"."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAFF SERGEANT ALEXANDRIA GLEASON-MORROW POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5395) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 Main Street in Dansville, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Alexandria Gleason-Morrow Post Office Building", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5395

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

SECTION 1. STAFF SERGEANT ALEXANDRIA GLEASON-MORROW POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 Main Street in Dansville, New York, shall be

known and designated as the "Staff Sergeant Alexandria Gleason-Morrow Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Staff Sergeant Alexandria Gleason-Morrow Post Office Building".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMY SPECIALIST JOSE L. RUIZ POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5412) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 2nd Avenue in Brentwood, New York, as the "Army Specialist Jose L. Ruiz Post Office Building", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5412

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

SECTION 1. ARMY SPECIALIST JOSE L. RUIZ POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 2nd Avenue in Brentwood, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Army Specialist Jose L. Ruiz Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Army Specialist Jose L. Ruiz Post Office Building".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERGEANT DAVID KINTERKNECHT POST OFFICE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6216) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3025 Woodgate Road in Montrose, Colorado, as the "Sergeant David Kinterknecht Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6216

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

SECTION 1. SERGEANT DAVID KINTERKNECHT POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3025 Woodgate Road in Montrose, Colorado, shall be known and designated as the "Sergeant David Kinterknecht Post Office".

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPUTY SHERIFF DEREK GEER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6217) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 241 N 4th Street in Grand Junction, Colorado, as the "Deputy Sheriff Derek Geer Post Office Building", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6217

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

SECTION 1. DEPUTY SHERIFF DEREK GEER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 241 N 4th Street in Grand Junction, Colorado, shall be known and designated as the "Deputy Sheriff Derek Geer Post Office Building."

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Deputy Sheriff Derek Geer Post Office Building".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LANCE CORPORAL JUANA NAVARRO ARELLANO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6405) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2801 Mitchell Road in Ceres, California, as the "Lance Corporal Juana Navarro Arellano Post Office Building", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6405

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

SECTION 1. LANCE CORPORAL JUANA NAVARRO ARELLANO POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2801 Mitchell Road in Ceres, California, shall be known and designated as the "Lance Corporal Juana Navarro Arellano Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lance Corporal Juana Navarro Arellano Post Office Building".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK LEONE POST OFFICE ACT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6428) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 332 Ramapo Valley Road in Oakland, New Jersey, as the "Frank Leone Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6428

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 "Frank Leone Post Office Act".

SEC. 2. FRANK LEONE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 332 Ramapo Valley Road in Oakland, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "Frank Leone Post Office".

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUDGE JAMES E. HORTON, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6513) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1110 West Market Street in Athens, Alabama, as the "Judge James E. Horton, Jr. Post

Office Building", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6513

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

SECTION 1. JUDGE JAMES E. HORTON, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1110 West Market Street in Athens, Alabama, shall be known and designated as the "Judge James E. Horton, Jr. Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Judge James E. Horton, Jr. Post Office Building".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJOR HOMER L. PEASE POST OFFICE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6621) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 530 East Main Street in Johnson City, Tennessee, as the "Major Homer L. Pease Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6621

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

SECTION 1. MAJOR HOMER L. PEASE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 530 East Main Street in Johnson City, Tennessee, shall be known and designated as the "Major Homer L. Pease Post Office".

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES MARSHALL "JIMI" HENDRIX POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6628) to des-

ignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4301 Northeast 4th Street in Renton, Washington, as the "James Marshall 'Jimi' Hendrix Post Office Building", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6628

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

SECTION 1. JAMES MARSHALL "JIMI" HENDRIX POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4301 Northeast 4th Street in Renton, Washington, shall be known and designated as the "James Marshall 'Jimi' Hendrix Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "James Marshall 'Jimi' Hendrix Post Office Building".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JANET LUCILLE OILAR POST OFFICE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6655) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 44160 State Highway 299 East Suite 1 in McArthur, California, as the "Janet Lucille Oilar Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6655

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

SECTION 1. JANET LUCILLE OILAR POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 44160 State Highway 299 East Suite 1 in McArthur, California, shall be known and designated as the "Janet Lucille Oilar Post Office".

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

PATRICK E. MAHANY, JR., POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6831) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 West Main Street in Frisco, Colorado, as the "Patrick E. Mahany, Jr., Post Office Building", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6831

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

SECTION 1. PATRICK E. MAHANY, JR., POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 West Main Street in Frisco, Colorado, shall be known and designated as the "Patrick E. Mahany, Jr., Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Patrick E. Mahany, Jr., Post Office Building".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

OLLIE M. JAMES POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6838) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 128 East Carlisle Street in Marion, Kentucky, as the "Ollie M. James Post Office Building", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6838

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

SECTION 1. OLLIE M. JAMES POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 128 East Carlisle Street in Marion, Kentucky, shall be known and designated as the "Ollie M. James Post Office Building".

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

□ 1815

**CAPTAIN MATTHEW J. AUGUST
POST OFFICE**

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3414) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Ferry Road in Saunderstown, Rhode Island, as the "Captain Matthew J. August Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3414

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

SECTION 1. CAPTAIN MATTHEW J. AUGUST POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Ferry Road in Saunderstown, Rhode Island, shall be known and designated as the "Captain Matthew J. August Post Office".

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

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARLA W. HARRELL POST OFFICE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3442) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 105 Duff Street in Macon, Missouri, as the "Arla W. Harrell Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3442

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

SECTION 1. ARLA W. HARRELL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 105 Duff Street in Macon, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Arla W. Harrell Post Office".

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

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in following order:

Adoption of House Resolution 1160;

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 7187; and

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

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R.
88, SHILOH NATIONAL MILITARY
PARK BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT
AND PARKER'S CROSSROADS
BATTLEFIELD DESIGNATION ACT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1160) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 88) to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 181, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

YEAS—219

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

Latta	Perry	Smith (MO)
Lesko	Pittenger	Smith (NE)
Lewis (MN)	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
LoBiondo	Poliquin	Smucker
Long	Posey	Stefanik
Loudermilk	Ratcliffe	Stewart
Love	Reed	Stivers
Lucas	Reichert	Tenney
Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Thompson (PA)
MacArthur	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
Marchant	Roby	Tipton
Marino	Roe (TN)	Trott
Marshall	Rogers (AL)	Turner
Massie	Rogers (KY)	Upton
Mast	Rohrabacher	Valadao
McCarthy	Rokita	Wagner
McCauley	Rooney, Francis	Walberg
McClintock	Rooney, Thomas	Walden
McHenry	J.	Walker
McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen	Walorski
McMorris	Roskam	Weber (TX)
Rodgers	Ross	Webster (FL)
McSally	Rothfus	Westrup
Meadows	Rouzer	Westerman
Mitchell	Royce (CA)	Williams
Moolenaar	Russell	Wilson (SC)
Mooney (WV)	Rutherford	Wittman
Mullin	Sanford	Womack
Norman	Scalise	Woodall
Nunes	Schweikert	Yoder
Olson	Scott, Austin	Yoho
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Palmer	Sessions	Young (IA)
Paulsen	Shimkus	Zeldin
Pearce	Shuster	

NAYS—181

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

NOT VOTING—32

Barletta	Hastings	Polis
Beyer	Jones (NC)	Rice (NY)
Black	Keating	Ruppersberger
Blackburn	Knight	Simpson
Buchanan	Labrador	Smith (TX)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Taylor
DesJarlais	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Ellison	Messer	Walters, Mimi
Grijalva	Newhouse	Walz
Gutiérrez	Noem	Wilson (FL)
Hanabusa	Nolan	

□ 1854

Mr. MORELLE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Messrs. GONZALEZ of Texas, DELANEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. DENHAM and BARTON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM FURTHER EXTENSION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7187) to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until December 7, 2018, 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 Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 350, nays 46, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

YEAS—350

Abraham	Butterfield	Costello (PA)
Adams	Byrne	Courtney
Aderholt	Calvert	Cramer
Aguilar	Capuano	Crawford
Allen	Carbajal	Crist
Amodei	Cárdenas	Crowley
Arrington	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Babin	Carter (GA)	Culberson
Bacon	Carter (TX)	Cummings
Balderson	Cartwright	Curbelo (FL)
Barr	Castor (FL)	Curtis
Barragán	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Bass	Chabot	Davis, Rodney
Beatty	Cheney	DeFazio
Bera	Chu, Judy	DeGette
Bergman	Cicilline	Delaney
Bilirakis	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Bishop (MI)	Clay	Demings
Bishop (UT)	Cleaver	Denham
Blum	Cloud	DeSaulnier
Blunt Rochester	Clyburn	Deutch
Bonamici	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Bost	Cohen	Dingell
Boyle, Brendan	Cole	Doggett
F.	Collins (GA)	Donovan
Brady (PA)	Collins (NY)	Doyle, Michael
Brady (TX)	Comer	F.
Brooks (IN)	Comstock	Dunn
Brown (MD)	Connolly	Emmer
Brownley (CA)	Cook	Engel
Bucshon	Cooper	Eshoo
Burgess	Correa	Españillat
Bustos	Costa	Estes (KS)

Esty (CT)	Lee
Evans	Levin
Faso	Lewis (GA)
Ferguson	Lewis (MN)
Fitzpatrick	Lieu, Ted
Fleischmann	LoBiondo
Forlenberry	Loebsock
Foster	Lofgren
Frankel (FL)	Long
Frelinghuysen	Loudermilk
Fudge	Love
Gabbard	Lowenthal
Gaetz	Lowe
Gallego	Lucas
Garamendi	Luetkemeyer
Gianforte	Lujan Grisham,
Gibbs	M.
Gomez	Luján, Ben Ray
Gonzalez (TX)	Lynch
Goodlatte	MacArthur
Gottheimer	Maloney,
Granger	Carolyn B.
Graves (GA)	Marchant
Graves (LA)	Marino
Graves (MO)	Marshall
Green, Al	Mast
Green, Gene	Matsui
Griffith	McCarthy
Grothman	McCaul
Guthrie	McCollum
Handel	McEachin
Harper	McGovern
Harris	McHenry
Hartzler	McKinley
Heck	McMorris
Hern	Rodgers
Herrera Beutler	McNerney
Higgins (LA)	McSally
Higgins (NY)	Meadows
Himes	Meeks
Holding	Meng
Hollingsworth	Mitchell
Hoyer	Moolenaar
Huffman	Moore
Huizenga	Morelle
Hultgren	Moulton
Hunter	Mullin
Hurd	Murphy (FL)
Jackson Lee	Nadler
Jayapal	Napolitano
Jeffries	Neal
Jenkins (KS)	Norcross
Johnson (GA)	Nunes
Johnson (LA)	O'Halleran
Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke
Johnson, E. B.	Olson
Jones (MI)	Palazzo
Joyce (OH)	Pallone
Kaptur	Panetta
Katko	Pascrell
Kelly (IL)	Paulsen
Kelly (MS)	Payne
Kelly (PA)	Pelosi
Khanna	Perlmutter
Kihuen	Perry
Kildee	Peters
Kilmer	Peterson
Kind	Pingree
King (IA)	Pittenger
King (NY)	Pocan
Kinzinger	Poe (TX)
Krishnamoorthi	Poliquin
Kuster (NH)	Posey
Kustoff (TN)	Price (NC)
LaHood	Quigley
LaMalfa	Raskin
Lamb	Reed
Lamborn	Reichert
Lance	Renacci
Langevin	Rice (SC)
Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Larson (CT)	Roby
Latta	Roe (TN)
Lawrence	Rogers (AL)
Lawson (FL)	Rogers (KY)

NAYS—46

Amash	Duncan (TN)
Banks (IN)	Flores
Barton	Foxx
Biggs	Gallagher
Brat	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Gohmert
Buck	Gosar
Budd	Hensarling
Conaway	Hice, Jody B.
Davidson	Hill
Duffy	Hudson
Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam

Rohrabacher	Sanford
Rooney, Francis	Sensenbrenner
Rooney, Thomas	Smith (MO)
J.	Stewart
Ros-Lehtinen	
Rosen	
Roskam	
Rothfus	
Rouzer	
Roybal-Allard	
Ruiz	
Rush	
Russell	
Rutherford	
Ryan (OH)	
Sánchez	
Sarbanes	
Scalise	
Scanlon	
Schakowsky	
Schiff	
Schneider	
Schrader	
Schweikert	
Scott (VA)	
Scott, Austin	
Scott, David	
Serrano	
Sessions	
Sewell (AL)	
Shea-Porter	
Sherman	
Shimkus	
Shuster	
Sinema	
Sires	
Smith (NE)	
Smith (NJ)	
Smith (WA)	
Smucker	
Soto	
Speier	
Stefanik	
Stivers	
Suozi	
Swalwell (CA)	
Takano	
Thompson (CA)	
Thompson (MS)	
Thompson (PA)	
Tipton	
Titus	
Tonko	
Torres	
Trott	
Turner	
Upton	
Valadao	
Vargas	
Veasey	
Vela	
Velázquez	
Visclosky	
Wagner	
Walberg	
Walden	
Walorski	
Wasserman	
Schultz	
Waters, Maxine	
Watson Coleman	
Weber (TX)	
Webster (FL)	
Welch	
Westerman	
Wild	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Womack	
Woodall	
Yarmuth	
Yoder	
Young (AK)	
Young (IA)	
Zeldin	

Barletta	Hanabusa	Noem
Beyer	Hastings	Nolan
Black	Issa	Polis
Blackburn	Jones (NC)	Rice (NY)
Blumenauer	Keating	Ruppersberger
Buchanan	Kennedy	Simpson
Davis, Danny	Knight	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Labrador	Taylor
Ellison	Lipinski	Tsongas
Gowdy	Maloney, Sean	Walters, Mimi
Grijalva	Messer	Walz
Gutiérrez	Newhouse	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—36

Barletta	Hanabusa	Noem
Beyer	Hastings	Nolan
Black	Issa	Polis
Blackburn	Jones (NC)	Rice (NY)
Blumenauer	Keating	Ruppersberger
Buchanan	Kennedy	Simpson
Davis, Danny	Knight	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Labrador	Taylor
Ellison	Lipinski	Tsongas
Gowdy	Maloney, Sean	Walters, Mimi
Grijalva	Messer	Walz
Gutiérrez	Newhouse	Wilson (FL)

□ 1904

Ms. FOXX changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill 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.

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

THANKING 16TH AND 17TH DISTRICTS OF FLORIDA, STAFF, FAMILY

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the last time I will have the privilege to address this body.

It has been an honor to serve the people of Florida’s 16th and 17th Districts over the last 10 years. I am eternally grateful for the trust that the people of Florida’s heartland bestowed upon me to be their voice in the United States Congress for the last five terms.

I would not have been able to do this job without the great work of my staff both here in Washington, D.C., and back in Florida. Thank you, Team Rooney.

Thanks always to the love and support of my family: my mom and dad; my brothers and sisters, Pat, Joe, Suzanne, Terry, Chris, Molly, and Brian; and, most importantly, to my wife, Tara; and my sons, Tommy, Jr., Sean Patrick, and Seamus. I will be home soon. I love you guys.

HONORING RAED FARES

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening to honor Raed Fares, a hero who I had the opportunity to meet right here in the Capitol some months ago. He was shot and killed in Idlib, Syria, last week by two gunmen, likely al-Qaida affiliates.

Raed founded "Radio Fresh" to give Syrians a source for unbiased reporting other than that of the extremists and the Assad regime. He trained journalists and organized community services and events with the goal of empowering civil society. His work made him the target of the Assad regime, al-Nusra, and ISIS many times, but he refused to back down.

Raed was killed because of his bravery. His work mattered. His life mattered. Raed's death must remind each of us that the Syrian people are fighting for their lives. In the words of Raed: "Freedom is an idea, and an idea cannot die."

HONORING NEEDVILLE HIGH SCHOOL BLUE JAYS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, 2017 was an amazing year for the Needville High School Blue Jays. The Lady Jays won the Texas State 4A championship.

They lost over one-half of their team in 2018. The naysayers said there was no way the Needville Blue Jays will play for the State title in 2018.

The naysayers never talked to Rockie, Evan, Meghan, Treasure, Samantha, Anna, Baley, Madison, Samia, Maddy, Kaitlyn, Tori, or Coach Amy Schultz.

The Lady Jays knew they would play the State finals in 2018, and they did just that. Last week, their season ended with a record of 41-9 and the Texas 4A State runner-up.

The Lady Jays were a true team. They put their heart and soul on the line for their hometown of Needville. It is a town we all love. Needville is proud of our girls.

We will see the naysayers next year at the 2019 State championships.

CONDEMN RUSSIAN NAVAL AGGRESSION

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Ukrainian Caucus, I rise to strongly condemn Russia's dangerous assault on Ukrainian ships in the Kerch Strait. Russia's blockade of Ukrainian ports should alarm the world.

As Russian dictator Vladimir Putin attempts to tighten his bloody, illegitimate grip on the Crimean peninsula and his ill will on the people of Ukraine, the free world cannot sit back and watch.

Crimea and its surrounding waters belong to the people of Ukraine. No amount of propaganda can cover Russia's egregious human rights record in Crimea, including the illegitimate detainment of Oleg Sentsov.

We stand shoulder to shoulder with the international community and our NATO allies in our unshakeable commitment to Ukraine's sovereignty and freedom. We stand in steadfast solidarity with the Ukrainian people. Russia must understand that its actions have consequences.

We must not hesitate to work with our European allies to increase sanctions on Putin's cronies to punish this continued, flagrant aggression. We demand that Russia withdraw from Crimea and Eastern Ukraine.

RECOGNIZING JOHN SCARANO

(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 to recognize my dear friend, John Scarano, who recently retired as the executive director of the Herkimer County Chamber of Commerce after 12 years at the helm.

John, a native of Little Falls and also a twin, returned to Herkimer County after serving in the U.S. Army for 6 years. Upon his return, John spent 23 years at Mohawk Data Sciences Corporation in East Herkimer before his appointment to the chamber in 2006.

During his tenure, John has played a pivotal role in revitalization projects, which have made significant contributions to Herkimer's budding economy, including the Frankfort 5S South Business Park, a new Tractor Supply Distribution Center in Frankfurt, the new Heidelberg Bakery facility, and the emergence and support of countless new small businesses.

Along with his work at the chamber, John has served on the boards of the Herkimer County Industrial Development Agency, the Herkimer County Historical Society, and the Herkimer County HealthNet.

John is a generous, deeply caring, and honorable person, and I know he will continue to do the best for our community in retirement. John is also one of the most relentlessly fun, enthusiastic, and patriotic people I have ever known.

To my dear friend John Scarano, thank you for your many years of dedicated service to our community and our Nation. We are grateful to you, and we wish you the best in retirement.

□ 1915

NAFTA 2.0

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow President Trump will claim victory as the United States, Canadian, and Mexican officials gather to sign a replacement for the North American Free Trade Agreement. But let us make no mistake, this is far from a finished deal.

Congress has the final say on trade. From where we stand today, what has been called NAFTA 2.0 still requires work to reach standards acceptable to the American people and American workers and companies.

How can any President claim this victory the same week General Motors announces the idling of five North American facilities, and as it cuts 15,000 living-wage jobs, including one in Lordstown, Ohio, not even counting the thousands and thousands more jobs that will be lost in the automotive parts sector in our country. What an affront to every promise President Trump has made American manufacturing towns.

Ohio's trade message to our Nation is as loud and clear as it always has been. The job outsourcing destruction due to the original NAFTA deal, which passed a quarter century ago, over my great objection on this floor, continues to reverberate across our State and Nation.

Now, we just saw at Lordstown, another, at that plant, 1,600 General Motors jobs, and upwards of 5,000 total job losses when the auto suppliers are counted at just that one facility.

Following the original NAFTA's implementation, town after town lost good jobs with good wages and benefits.

How many times must America's towns and workers bear witness to NAFTA's vast U.S. job outsourcing and wage drag? How many more?

Millions have suffered firsthand as dire predictions actualized and the false promises of NAFTA job creation failed to materialize. Instead, they personally experienced the great sucking sound of job outsourcing, just what we said here on this floor back in the early 1990s.

Whether GM's decision was at all influenced by NAFTA 2.0 is irrelevant. American trade deals have far too long allowed corporate America to run rampant over America's workers as they seek out the penny-wage laborers who can't afford to buy what they make.

I have a couple of charts here that I want to bring to the floor to describe what has been happening across this continent now for a quarter century, and what is upsetting the American people.

Millions of U.S. jobs have been obliterated year after year, as replacement workers toil and work in unsafe sweatshops and maquiladoras south of the border exposed to unimaginable toxins.

The original NAFTA was supposed to create trade surpluses for the United States. It was supposed to create job growth in the United States. And you know what has happened? Exactly the reverse.

These are the numbers just for the year of 2016. You can see how big the trade deficit is with Mexico, nearly \$70 billion and with Canada, \$8 billion. Now, that is up fourfold since back in the early nineties, before NAFTA was passed, when we already had a small trade deficit with those countries, but it has just exploded.

The original NAFTA fueled massive migration on the Mexican side from their countryside to our Nation as millions upon millions of small farmers' livelihoods were extinguished in Mexico. Mexico's white corn industry was decimated.

Why do you think people fled to the United States? If you were hungry, and you had nothing, and you lived in desperation, well, you might do the same. What a humanitarian tragedy has been occurring for over a quarter century. And yet, policymakers in the United States and Mexico close their eyes to the human tragedy.

Trade with our closest neighbors is never simply a zero-sum game. There have been lots of losers. In fact, our country's been a loser.

Yeah, there are some pockets of transportation jobs down at the border. Anybody would expect that. But overall, a net loser.

And guess what? Under the Trump administration, the red ink is growing.

In the nearly 3 decades since NAFTA's original passage, we have not even had 1 year of balanced trade accounts, which is the true measure of whether a trade agreement is successful or not.

So we look at the Trump trade figures here, going across the months, and you look at the red line. Every month the trade deficit grows, including with Mexico and Canada; not even 1 year of balanced trade accounts, and the numbers are getting worse.

NAFTA provided vivid evidence of a severely-flawed trade agreement that failed America's workers and communities as plant after plant shuts down. And you know, the sad tragedy is, at Lordstown, the third shift was gone a couple of years ago. But as the second shift left this week, they were told by the GM officials in the plant, these jobs are going to Mexico.

Beyond just the NAFTA deficit, all our global trade deficits have ballooned under this administration's erratic trade and tariff agenda. It makes no sense.

General Motors says that one of the reasons they are moving the jobs to Mexico is because of the cost of the Trump tariffs, and that they have had to pay several billion dollars more for steel that goes into making these vehicles.

Well, you know, in this wake, a modern NAFTA agreement to correct all of the injustices associated with continental trade is long overdue. I have eagerly anticipated the release of specific text in this NAFTA 2.0 and strategic agenda from the administration on how President Trump plans to bring jobs

back to America. He actually promised that in all the towns that have just gotten these pink slips. He said it in Youngstown. He told the people in Warren, Michigan, that they never had to worry if they voted for him; that they would never have a plant close down.

Well, guess what? General Motors is closing down the transmission facility in Warren, Michigan.

Thus far, both the trade deficit and the job outsourcing continue to, as the expression goes, go south. These numbers are going to get much worse for the workers and communities in our country.

And the workers in Mexico, since NAFTA's passage, guess what? Their wages are going down. What kind of a system is this?

Anything short of specifics in this redone agreement that will clearly improve job prospects for Americans will fall short of Trump's promises.

Mr. Speaker, this is too important a moment to hang America's economy on faulty assumptions. We, in Congress, not I, but some in Congress, fell for NAFTA in 1994. We can't let it happen again.

The signing of text tomorrow leaves with us a lot of work yet to complete. Let Congress do its job.

Has this administration answered the question of whether the job outsourcing bonanza that has taken hold since NAFTA's passage in 1994 has truly been addressed?

It is hard to believe that will be the case, given the current news about General Motors; and that is not the only company moving jobs out of this country.

Have strong labor standards been included in NAFTA 2.0 subject to swift and certain enforcement? No.

Will corporate interests retain the means to outsource American jobs, to take advantage of rock-bottom Mexican wages? Yeah, they will.

Will we protect the rights of Americans to know what is in the food they are feeding their families, or will trade facilitation hold priority over food safety?

Congress has to ask, will Americans have access to affordable prescription drugs made in Mexico, or will the new NAFTA further rig the system to delay access to more affordable and safe generic drugs and biosimilars?

Globally, will we work to open closed and controlled markets?

Will we equalize the negative impact of the value-added tax in our trade agreement? There is nothing in this on that.

Will tax policy stop favoring outsourcing? No, actually the Trump tax bill favored more outsourcing.

Democrats look forward to holding hearings and oversight of how these questions will truly impact all of America and America's workers and communities. We have called on this administration to work with us to reach necessary and substantive achievements.

There is a new administration taking power in Mexico itself. We need to listen and work with them.

Any new North American trade agreement must raise wages and create a level playing field across the board. The American people are not interested in staged production signing ceremonies. They want a NAFTA deal that is fixed and that will create good-paying jobs in America with benefits you can depend upon and heal the economic injustices suffered for the past 3 decades as people are exploited by institutions more powerful than themselves.

And if America is going to be the leader of the free world, she has to be the leader in free trade agreements that are fair and offer the opportunity of rising living standards for all people, not harming people, but helping people.

Trade is not just about goods, it is about people. We have to put people first. We have to put people at the top of the agenda. We have to put workers at the top of the agenda and treat them for their true worth, and not any longer allow trade deals like NAFTA to hollow them out, to hollow their communities out, and to hollow America out.

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

BIPARTISAN WORK OF THE FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight on behalf of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my great privilege to have the responsibility to chair this committee for the last 6 years. I take no pride on behalf of myself, but I take a lot of pride in the work that has been done on this committee.

A lot of that work, Mr. Speaker, has been bipartisan. And I believe, indeed, that the Financial Services Committee is the hardest-working, most productive committee in the United States House. We have produced more bills; we have had more bills passed on the floor; we have had more bills signed into law than any other committee.

I am especially proud of the work that we have done to create more pro-growth economic policy throughout banking and finance, and the passage of S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief and Consumer Protection Act, has meant so much to helping create more capital to help save our credit unions and community banks, and to really play a part in the unparalleled economic growth that we see in our Nation today. I take great pride in that work on behalf of all our members.

□ 1930

I also take great pride on behalf of our Members for a piece of legislation

that modernized the foreign investment in the U.S. The bill is technically known by its acronym, FIRRMMA, and it modernizes a regime that had not been modernized in quite some time.

Mr. Speaker, so many of us know we have challenges in America today with foreign interests that come in and essentially take our intellectual property, that take our technology, and regrettably China is one of the prime perpetrators of this. I have had the occasion to go to China and meet with their leadership. And I want China to rise, I want them to have economic growth, but not at the expense of the United States of America and not by violating either the letter or the spirit of the WTO, of the World Trade Organization, which we helped them enter a couple of decades ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work, especially, done by the gentleman from North Carolina, who is the vice chairman of our Terrorism and Illicit Finance Subcommittee. He was the House leader on this legislation and worked with the senior senator from Texas, JOHN CORNYN, my friend, to bring this onto the President's desk that ultimately got signed into law.

This was really a revolutionary law dealing with both export controls, foreign investment in the U.S., and the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, was an early leader. He saw the threat before others saw it.

I have had a number of great privileges serving as chairman, but one of the greatest privileges is serving with men and women who have vision, who have commitment, who have principle, and that certainly describes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Regrettably, he and I are both departing after this Congress, and that is a bittersweet feeling. I think we both look forward to the next opportunity that we have.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield him some time, because it is important for us to hear from him about the significance of this legislation and how important it is. I was happy to be in the White House not too long ago to have the President extoll the virtues of this law as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will miss his company, I will miss his leadership, and there is no one that I know of who is a greater authority on terrorist finance who is serving in the U.S. Congress today than ROBERT PITTENGER of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), my friend.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his kind remarks. I remember the first time we met. It was across the street, and I approached him about wanting to serve on his committee. Little did I know that I was headed back to graduate school. He gave me a binder about 6 inches thick and said: Go study it. I had to look up all the acronyms, about 100 of them, and memorize those to get started.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman HENSARLING's leadership and the quality of person he is, he got out in front. He enabled us to become leaders, he enabled us to learn, to give focus, direction on important issues relative to the security of this country, relative to the economic freedoms of this country, and for that, I have the deepest sense of gratitude and respect that he empowered us as he led us.

That is a great testament and a legacy I think that he will carry throughout this United States Congress, and the model that he has been for each of us as we have watched, not just his work ethic, but his character and who he is and how that translated into the public policy for the good of the American people.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me say in my deepest heart my appreciation and my love for him and his sweet wife and his wonderful kids. What a tribute it was to be there with him yesterday when they unveiled the painting that will go in the Financial Services room, to the accolades of the Vice President and Senator Phil Gramm and so many others who were there to pay tribute to a great leader for our country. So I thank the chairman.

And as Chairman HENSARLING spoke to the issues relative to FIRRMMA, yes, we have great challenges from nation states who seek to exploit our laws, who have sought to secure proprietary technology for their own interests and objectives, and particularly, as Chairman HENSARLING mentioned, China.

China, since 2015, has acquired 50 technology companies, semiconductor companies, many of them a part of our Department of Defense. These are critical companies for our own national security. They have been able to circumvent our laws through joint ventures, through minority partnerships to be able to obtain this technology.

In fact, on one occasion, Chairman HENSARLING and I were coming back from Asia, and we stopped in Anchorage and we visited our base there, and they showed us the Stealth F-22. And as the general was showing the incredible aspects of this remarkable plane, the greatest aircraft we have, he said: By the way, the technology of this plane, the engine was sold to China by GE.

Companies have been forced, extorted in a sense, to gain access to Chinese markets. This is wrong. It is morally wrong. It is ethically wrong. It is wrong for our national security.

The FIRRMMA bill, which Chairman HENSARLING recognized and helped pass, it wouldn't have happened without his total commitment and leadership. So this country is more secure today because of what passed regarding the FIRRMMA bill.

The rules will be written over the next year or so. We trust that all that was done will come out and close off these loopholes that have allowed foreign entities to exploit our Nation's national security.

So this bill and our interests are even more secure as a result of the jobs bill that the chairman has advanced for us today. It does continue to ensure the security against predatory Chinese investments by modernizing our securities laws to reclaim the U.S. IPO market, all of this as China lays out its blueprint for dominance in the tech industry.

This package would also cut down on the regulations that burden our small business community. This is key to continuing the innovation and economic growth we are seeking today.

This tax relief and jobs package would continue the innovation and economic growth and would allow investors to have legal certainty by allowing them to interact with entrepreneurs without fear of securities violation.

Furthermore, the cost of initial compliance for an IPO filing now exceeds over \$2 million. This hinders small businesses that are ready to go public but can't afford these regulatory costs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend this bill. JOBS 3.0 would lengthen "on-ramp" exceptions for IPO compliance, helping small business owners navigate one of the most expensive aspects of securities law.

It also allows companies to test the waters before going public to help give them time for their IPO to have a better chance of success.

These provisions are vital to encourage business growth and to reassure the small business community. I strongly encourage the Senate, therefore, to pass this bill.

So, yes, Mr. Speaker, what Chairman HENSARLING has done through this legislation has helped give greater financial empowerment and liberty and freedom to the American people, that is what it is all about today, is freedom. So my gratitude to him for the leadership that he has given us.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say a word of thanks to some other folks who I have probably this last moment to address in this Chamber. As Jesse Helms used to say, a wonderful man from North Carolina: That turtle didn't get up on the fence post by himself. And that is true, I think, for each of us in this Chamber, but I know it is true for this Member of Congress.

What I have been able to do, by the grace of God and through the enablement and empowerment of my chairman and others, will hopefully last, but it happened because of people along the way who stood with me, who supported my efforts.

Of course, I start with my family. I have the most wonderful family in the world. I have ten grandkids I get to go home to, 10 years and younger. I am Pitto to them, and that is all the world to me, and we have a fun time chasing around.

But my team, my staff, enabled me to serve the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina, those people that I love, those eight counties out

there that I am endeared to, but the people who really helped them were the folks back home in my district, in my office. I speak specifically of Linda Ferster, Chris Sullivan, Jamie Bowers, Graham Long, Robert Becker. They were with me from day one. They stood with me the whole 6 years. Nobody flinched, nobody went anywhere. That team was so incredible.

Robert Becker is one of the greatest leaders we have in North Carolina for our veterans. He gets calls from all over the State and he says: What do I do to help this veteran?

Linda Ferster has been working these issues in the bureaucracy for 18 years.

These are great, faithful people who have stood up for my constituents in my district, and all the good that happened in that district was because of them. And I just gave them a door to say: Go through it and you go serve. And they served like they were missionaries. They love those people. Every day they wake up thinking, who can I help today? You know, whose life can I change in a positive way today? And that is the nature of the service that my team provided, the same type of leadership that I had up here in Washington.

My role in FIRRMA just didn't happen by myself. There are many people on my team up here that supported that effort. Clark Fonda was a great leader for me in that. There are other people outside Congress. Heath Tarbert, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, a remarkable individual who served this country so well over such a key part of what we did in this national security bill on FIRRMA.

So my heart is just filled with gratitude for the privilege of serving the good folks in the Ninth District of North Carolina; my gratitude for the body in this Chamber; my gratitude for being able to serve on the Financial Services Committee under the leadership of Chairman HENSARLING. It couldn't be greater. I couldn't be more fulfilled in the 6 years that I had here. I will always treasure and remember this time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank you, I thank Chairman HENSARLING. He is an absolute important friend for me, and I hope we can continue to work together for many years to come. God bless you.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman for his comments tonight.

I hope that there are a fair amount of Americans who are watching this this evening, because they need to know that they owe this gentleman, Mr. PITTENGER of North Carolina, a great debt of gratitude. And indeed America is going to be a safer, more secure Nation because of his leadership.

In his three terms, Mr. Speaker, Mr. PITTENGER achieved more in three terms than many Members achieve in ten terms.

Many people, unfortunately, come to the People's House to be somebody. Mr. PITTENGER of North Carolina came to do something.

And, indeed, don't just take my word for it, but the President of the United States thinks this is one of the most significant pieces of legislation when it comes to dealing with the threats of those who would take our intellectual property, who would take our technology by hook or crook, or however they might do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. PITTENGER for his leadership.

I must admit, this was kind of faint on my radar screen, this issue, but among Mr. PITTENGER's other endearing qualities, he is persistent. He is a very persistent individual. And I am glad he was persistent, because it became a major piece of legislation.

Part of my job as chairman and one of my great privileges is I get to take credit for a lot of other people's good work. I shouldn't, I shouldn't be accorded this. And so I get many thanks, but this was a team effort and it was led by Mr. PITTENGER.

□ 1945

Other countries are now put on notice. We are watching. These rules, as Mr. PITTENGER, the gentleman from North Carolina, has said, will be unveiled in the weeks and months to come. But a new day has dawned for those who think that they are going to take, by hook or crook, our technology.

We want our global neighbors to succeed, but, again, not to succeed at our expense. Those applications of technology and intellectual property that have any type of national defense implications, that is going to stop, and it is going to stop because of the leadership of ROBERT PITTENGER, the gentleman from North Carolina.

It has been a great, great source of pride and joy to be associated with him. I will count him as a friend for life. I appreciate the fact that he would come and spend time here.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that his leadership is not done. His leadership may be done in this body, but his leadership in fighting global terrorism from illicit finance and global terrorist finance, that leadership is not done. In many respects, it is just starting. I look forward to continuing to follow his career and his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we are also joined tonight by another real authority on global terrorist finance, a gentleman who has been incredibly active on the Terrorism and Illicit Finance Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee. I have come to really appreciate his intellect, his knowledge, and his work ethic. He is clearly one of the hardest working members of the Financial Services Committee.

As, regrettably, the gentleman from North Carolina departs, and I am saddened by that, we are both heartened to know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) will remain, and he will be one of the key leaders in the entire United States House of Representatives in combating terrorist finance. He has

been such a workhorse in helping some of our economic growth measures that have helped save community banking and credit unions.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the hard work and great success of the House Financial Services Committee these the past 2 years in the 115th Congress.

Under the leadership of Chairman JEB HENSARLING, the Financial Services Committee became the most productive committee in Congress. Over 44 bills signed into law originated from our committee, including S. 2155. It began as the Financial CHOICE Act, Creating Hope and Opportunity for Investors, Consumers, and Entrepreneurs.

Unfortunately, the whole bill hasn't made it into law, but the core of that bill was dealing with the unintended consequences and, frankly, whether they were intended or not, the harmful consequences of Dodd-Frank.

Under Dodd-Frank, we found that the biggest banks got bigger and the smallest banks became fewer. We found that banks were not too-big-to-fail, but some of them became too-small-to-succeed under the burden of Dodd-Frank's regulatory framework. So much so that even Barney Frank, whose name is part of the Dodd-Frank Act, came to support the reforms for community banking.

I am very proud to have participated in regulatory relief that helped thousands of community financial institutions help lend to their communities. It is making a difference today as we watch the impact in our economy. Indeed, it is, in some measure, fitting that the title began with "Creating Hope and Opportunity for Investors, Consumers, and Entrepreneurs," because that is what is happening in this amazing economy.

There is more good news that is happening in our economy than is probably going to get covered anywhere. Some of it is out there for the C-SPAN viewer to find.

You might not see in the news that we have the strongest sanctions that have been imposed on Russia since it has been Russia. Post-Soviet Union, we have never had a stronger posture toward Russia than we do today.

The Financial Services Committee helps implement those because the Department of the Treasury has an Office of Foreign Asset Control. As part of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee and as part of the Terrorism and Illicit Finance Subcommittee, we look at how to choke off these sources of funds, whether it is Russian oligarchs, Iranian bad actors, North Koreans, or others.

Frankly, I believe we only have tapped the surface on the potential that sanctions have. Indeed, we may be able to apply sanctions to our trade policy and, very targeted, deal with

bad actors, like those who are dumping steel, rather than just putting a uniform tariff out there. We can be precise. Instead of maximizing collateral damage, we can minimize it.

But that shows that there is plenty of work left to do. What we are here to say is that there are plenty of great things that did, in fact, happen.

With respect to trade, one of the things the Financial Services Committee got to do was take a bipartisan delegation trip to China. We talked with folks in Japan, in Hong Kong, in China, and in South Korea about the importance of trade, not just in a way that draws in our Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act, but with all of our trade policy.

The reality is that we were able to send a message to the people in China, to the leadership of China—their Vice President down to their leadership in the trade negotiations—that with respect to China, there is no separation between Congress and President Trump, and with respect to China, there is no separation between Republicans and Democrats on trade.

Our hope is that we can continue to trade, and we can continue to prosper together. As a former Army Ranger, I never thought I would go to China under friendly terms and conditions. I am quite thankful that we were able to do that. I hope that we can continue that peace and prosperity together.

But the days of the American people being taken advantage of, whether it is by China or any other Nation, I hope has long passed. Clearly, today, that is the trend. Not only has the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act, FIRRMA, passed, and that gives us this review, but we have an administration that is aggressively implementing a policy that puts that into effect.

There are plenty of things that did pass our House that haven't yet made it into law. A staggering number is 115. While 44 bills were signed into law, 115 passed our committee and haven't yet been taken up across the building in the Senate. Unfortunately, and often despite overwhelmingly bipartisan support in the House, many of these bills have yet to receive the same attention in the Senate.

One example of this is a bill I introduced, the Market Data Protection Act. This passed the House of Representatives unanimously, and it is yet to receive a vote in the Senate. This deals with the protection of government-controlled data by the Securities and Exchange Commission. In fact, our EDGAR database was hacked. We are simply asking that the SEC do the same thing and certify to Congress in the same way they would expect a publicly traded company to certify to them, that they have dealt with the risk and they now have a secure network.

Just earlier tonight, we passed yet another extension of the Flood Act. This bill has been passed by our com-

mittee for a year and a half. It has been over a year since it passed the House with very modest reforms.

One of the sticking points seems to be that the Senate can't live with rebuilding someone's home three times after it has flooding. We will rebuild it not once, not twice, but a third time, and then after that, we are saying, you know, maybe you should move.

But that is too much to ask, apparently, for the Senate. We can't even get a vote on it. It is time for the Senate to act.

Another is JOBS 3.0. This is a bill that provides new 21st century framework for capital formation. You think capital formation, that sounds like Wall Street, that sounds like a big, Republican, stereotypical talking point bill. It passed with more than 400 votes in this body, incredibly bipartisan, very modest reforms, commonsense, for early stage capital formation, and it hasn't yet been voted on in the Senate. There is still time in this Congress, and I sure hope they can deliver on it.

There are a lot of things that we haven't been able to get to. In spite of being the most productive committee in Congress, there are still things that have been left undone. My hope is that we can continue to collaborate in a very bipartisan way as we experience a transition.

As sad as I am to be headed to the minority as a member of the majority party today, I am very sad that Chairman HENSARLING is leaving Congress. This week, we were able to see his retirement ceremony where a portrait was unveiled. But the most important thing that happened there is, frankly, I think everyone in that room was inspired.

I think one of the most unfortunate things about Congress is the way it is perceived by the American people. There are more truly good men and women who serve in this body, in both parties, than I would have ever believed before I got here, and one of the very best is JEB HENSARLING. I am thankful to count him as my chairman, as a mentor, and as a friend. I look forward to seeing how God continues to bless this great man and how God continues to bless this body and our great Nation. It is now time for deeds, not words.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, well, after hearing those kind comments, I would be happy to yield the gentleman even more time. I say that tongue-in-cheek.

Mr. Speaker, I have learned that if you want kind things said about you, announce your retirement. So, I must admit, I am humbled by this experience, and I thank the kind words of the gentleman.

I must admit that it is a real mixed blessing that I get ready to leave Congress, but I take a lot of solace knowing that there is a new generation of conservative leaders who are coming to this body, who know how important faith is in the life of a great Nation, be-

cause you cannot have a free Nation that is not a virtuous Nation and a godly Nation.

I know that there is a new generation of conservative leaders who are coming up who know how important our families are, our families who care for our elderly and nurture our youth and perpetuate our values. They know how important free enterprise is, not just because it allows people to sleep at night knowing the bills are paid, but how empowering it is to finally leave the assembly line and to start your own business; how empowering it is to send that first kid to college; but, ultimately, how important it is to pursue happiness, to use your God-given talents in any way that can help you and your family prosper.

I know I take great solace to know there is a new generation of conservative leaders who know that, ultimately, liberty is an inalienable right given to us by our creator, the Almighty, and how precious it is and how few people on the face of the planet really enjoy the full fruits of liberty.

I count Mr. DAVIDSON among those people, and I will always count him as my friend. But it makes it much easier, after 16 years, to leave this body knowing that there is a WARREN DAVIDSON in Congress and knowing that there is a TED BUDD from North Carolina who will remain in Congress as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD). He also has become a fast friend of mine. More importantly, I count his wife as a friend of my wife, and me as well. Not unlike Mr. DAVIDSON, he is one of the hardest working members of our committee, and he never, never gives up.

Again, a significant portion of the economic growth packages that we have passed out of the House Financial Services Committee, two or three of them I know contain Mr. BUDD's name. That is unusual for somebody who has been a freshman member of our committee, to have so many bills passed. It is a testament to the great citizens of his congressional district that they would return him to office. I hope, next time, maybe a few more will join in and make it a little less interesting. But I am also proud to call him colleague; I am proud to call him friend; and I, again, take great solace to know that this body will see his conservative leadership for quite some time.

□ 2000

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING, and after those kind words, maybe we all should just yield back. But I am going to hang on for a few minutes and talk about some of the great things that we have done on Chairman HENSARLING's committee that I have been honored to be a part of for these last 2 years and look forward to continuing on. One of the things to mention in the 115th Congress is to highlight the need to bring JOBS 3.0 across the finish line.

But before I do that, I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think there

has been a harder working committee in Washington, D.C., over the past 2 years, from our leadership all the way down to the committee's staff level, and it shows in our accomplishments. I am proud to have played a small role in some of these victories.

One simply cannot start a speech like this without talking about the tremendous work that went into the Financial CHOICE Act, which ultimately became known as S. 2155.

As we all know, Dodd-Frank was enacted in 2010 in an effort to end the so-called too-big-to-fail financial institutions. However, Dodd-Frank and Congress inadvertently created too-small-to-succeed financial institutions, which punished our regional and community banks and credit unions. It was unfortunate, but in the end, community financial institutions were shut down, while the consumer and small business owner were starved of the access to credit at a time when they needed it the most.

However, with the passage and ultimate enactment of S. 2155, the status quo that I just highlighted has changed, instead, for good. Dodd-Frank reform was a win for North Carolina's community financial institutions, small businesses, innovators, and the economy as a whole. Under this bill, the consumer and small business will get access to the credit they need, whether it be used to buy a home or finally start and expand their businesses.

I think this bill, Mr. Speaker, is, arguably, the most important legislative win this Congress has seen in a long time. It will benefit all sectors of the economy, and I am so excited that we got this done.

On a more personal note, outside of Dodd-Frank reform, I have really enjoyed the work that has gone on at the Terrorism and Illicit Finance Subcommittee. Under the leadership of our chairman, STEVE PEARCE, my bipartisan bill, H.R. 3321, the National Strategy for Combating Terrorist, Underground, and Other Illicit Financing Act, is just one example of this work. I was able to get this bipartisan bill signed by the President and passed into law as part of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act.

My bill directs the Department of the Treasury to develop a national strategy to combat the financing of terrorism and related forms of illicit finance involving all levels of government. H.R. 3321 will get us closer to a coordinated strategy on disrupting these illicit financial networks in the hopes that we are able to starve terrorist groups like ISIS of the resources they need to carry out their radical agendas.

I also want to highlight and think that we should be proud of the balance we have been trying to strike with regard to fintech. I have my own legislation on this front, for example, H.R. 6849, the Bank Secrecy Innovation Act,

which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to encourage the use of technological innovations that improve financial institutions' anti-money laundering programs.

Financial institutions currently have little incentive to invest in innovative technology solutions to BSA compliance because of the regulatory inflexibility. The Bank Secrecy Innovation Act will provide financial institutions with greater incentive and certainty when experimenting with technology to aid in BSA compliance by providing a safe harbor against having the use of such technology be the basis for regulatory penalty.

The application of innovative technology by financial institutions in their BSA compliance programs will likely improve the detection of illicit activity, leading to more efficient and higher quality reporting of suspicious activity by financial institutions. Better, more targeted reports likely will aid law enforcement in focusing their limited resources on real criminal activities, while also reducing the time that law enforcement must spend weeding out reports that are just irrelevant.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, there is still one more package of bills that passed out of our committee and this body with strong bipartisan backing that still needs to be pushed across the finish line. I am talking, of course, about JOBS 3.0 and the capital formation package that would further improve our economy and make it easier for companies to go public.

This package included bills like mine, H.R. 3903, the Encouraging Public Offerings Act, that I introduced with my friend on the other side of the aisle from New York, GREGORY MEEKS. It passed the House, if you can imagine, 417-0.

It allows issuers to submit to the SEC for confidential review, before publicly filing, draft registrations for IPOS. H.R. 3903 will reduce the risk to companies that are just thinking about going public, in order to make listing on exchanges even more attractive, which, in the end, will only strengthen our financial markets.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation found under JOBS will make it easier for startups and small businesses in North Carolina to attract the investments they need to go public, grow, and create more jobs.

I also want to highlight, briefly, title 14 of JOBS, which protects the American insurance standards. This strong, bipartisan language found under title 14 will give U.S. negotiators the strong legislative backing they need when they negotiate with international bodies like the IAIS.

Now, as we try to bring JOBS over the finish line, I am hopeful that we can keep this strong, bipartisan language in the bill. We must keep it in whatever version of JOBS that we pass. The American insurance consumer needs it and also deserves it. So let's get JOBS done.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, like my colleagues have said before, I want to thank our chairman, JEB HENSARLING, for his principled leadership of this committee and for seeing us through some great wins in the 115th Congress. He has been a friend, a mentor, and somebody I respect in the way he leads, and leads his family greatly, and I know that he will be missed.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words, and far more importantly, I thank him for his leadership. He is truly one of the workhorses for economic growth in the United States Congress.

Again, I take great solace, as I will soon leave this august body, in knowing that somebody like Mr. BUDD will be here. He has such principle, character, is a hard worker, and has success in actually getting bills done that make a difference in the lives of working people. Mr. Speaker, it is such a pleasure to serve with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. Speaker, several of our Members have spoken tonight about what we call the JOBS 3.0 Act, Jumpstart Our Business Startups. Thanks to the leadership of President Trump, thanks to the leadership of Speaker RYAN, and thanks to the leadership of Chairman KEVIN BRADY, we have a great economy. We have, perhaps, the greatest economy in most Americans' lifetimes. Unemployment is at about a 50-year low. For the first time in a decade, we are seeing paychecks rise. We are seeing that take-home pay increase.

Small business optimism, consumer optimism, is off the charts. It is amazing what can happen with some tax reform and regulatory reform. And, yes, I take pride—not on my behalf, but on behalf of the Financial Services Committee—in what we have done to help take some of the shackles off of our community banks and our credit unions. But there is so much more work to be done.

Mr. Speaker, as you probably know, the whole idea of capital formation for our entrepreneurs, for our small businesses, traditionally, that has been a bipartisan effort. And, in fact, the very first, what we call JOBS 1.0, was signed into law by President Barack Obama. I don't quite have the quote at my fingertips, but at the time, he said something along the lines that we have to, from time to time, remove the regulatory burdens to capital formation that are preventing our entrepreneurs from accessing capital.

So the first point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is the economy of today is in great shape. But can we count on it for the economy of tomorrow? Particularly, Mr. Speaker, when I look at public companies, what I see is that our public companies are fewer, they are older, and they are bigger. Today, in America, we still have far too many old cars and not enough startups in our garages.

I sometimes think—and I am the father of a 16-year-old daughter, a 15-

year-old son—the companies that will drive the economy when they are in their peak earning years, they probably haven't even been founded yet. Where are the next Amazons coming from? Where are the next Googles coming from? Where are the next Apples coming from?

But what we see as recently as 2016, just a couple of years ago, is that new startups' entrepreneurial capitalism was at a 40-year low. Now, fortunately, under this administration, it is taking a turn upwards, but we have got a lot of ground to make up.

Our public companies have been cut in half, a 20-year low, as recently as 2016. Half of the number of companies are going public. And so not only is that bad for America's economy, but it is bad for the family economy because they lose out on investment opportunities.

Had you invested early in Apple, you would have made a gazillion percentage rate of return. It would have been an incredible investment opportunity. At the time, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts wouldn't even allow Apple to sell their securities because they were fearful it was too speculative.

We want to make sure that every American family has the opportunity to invest in the next Apple. But, unfortunately, what we see is a regulatory burden that is absolutely strangling a lot of these startup companies.

Over the past 2½ decades, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. share of global venture investment has steadily declined. And when we see it decline, what we also see is that regulatory restrictions on securities and investment have increased 54 percent in 10 years—in just 10 years, a 54 percent increase in regulatory restrictions on securities, and an 80 percent increase over 20 years.

We are wondering why there is so little entrepreneurial activity, and we are wondering why so few companies have gone public.

Part of what we have to do is simply modernize antiquated statutes. And so with the exceptions of Sarbanes-Oxley, and with the exception of, frankly, the first version of the JOBS Act and the second version of the JOBS Act, almost all of our other significant Federal securities laws date back to the 1930s.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of these, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Securities Act, they are foundational. But so many of these other laws that we still labor under, I mean, there was a time that the telephone was the cutting-edge technology. That is when the SEC was created, in 1934, and the telephone was the cutting-edge technology of the time.

So many of the security laws we have date back to that particular era. At that time, stock offerings were part of the daily newspaper. Well, we don't see that anymore. Pneumatic tubes and ticker tape transmitted the news of a stock sale.

If we are going to be able to fuel the economy of tomorrow, we are going to

have to modernize these securities laws. And, again, traditionally, this has been a bipartisan effort.

□ 2015

The United States House of Representatives has passed JOBS 3.0 by a vote of 406–4. Months later, the United States Senate has done nothing on this piece of legislation. This cannot hold. This cannot be. There is no excuse for the United States Senate back there behind my shoulder to do nothing while, for example, we see more companies go public in China.

We had a discussion a little earlier, Mr. Speaker, how China, unfortunately, too often has taken our technology—our intellectual property—by hook and crook. But a lot of it is companies are choosing to confine their capital in China because they find it easier, and now we are looking at over one-third of public companies are going public in China, and we are down to 11 percent. They have an ascending curve; we have a descending curve.

In order to successfully compete with China in a global economy, we have to make it easier throughout the ecosystem of our small entrepreneurial ventures to make it easier, and so that is what the whole thrust of the JOBS 3.0 Act is all about.

Again, it is a very, very strong bipartisan measure. So often the lead Democrat in this institution, known as ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) and I don't see eye to eye on much. We see eye to eye on very little. But we are joined at the hip in wanting to see the JOBS 3.0 Act. She has been stalwart, and she has been a good negotiating partner to get this done.

So you have one of the most liberal Members of Congress and one of the most conservative Members of Congress come together to advocate for our small businesses, for our entrepreneurs, to help us compete with China in the JOBS 3.0 Act, but somehow they are still not hearing this in the United States Senate.

Please, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), gives every liberal permission to vote for the JOBS 3.0 Act. As chairman of the House Financial Services Committee and one who used to chair the conservative caucus in the House, I give every conservative permission in the United States Senate to vote for JOBS 3.0.

Please, we need a message for all Americans who care about small businesses. We want to make it easier. We want to make it easier for these businesses to get funding.

The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, you cannot have capitalism without capital, and we want to make it easier to access this capital.

So I was very heartened by the fact that, although maybe our Senators—and I have many friends who are United States Senators. I still cannot understand why they haven't taken up a piece of legislation that came out of

the House 406–4, a piece of legislation strongly supported by the administration, and a piece of legislation, again, that is going to help our small businesses and entrepreneurs. Why haven't they taken it up?

Perhaps the single most influential newspaper in America is The Wall Street Journal. It is certainly the most influential economic publication in America, and probably the world. Fortunately, their lead editorial today was to encourage the Senate to take up JOBS 3.0. In fact—I am kind of paraphrasing here because I don't have the newspaper at my fingertips—they said that Congress has done yeoman's work shepherding a compendium of bipartisan bills to access capital. They were referring to JOBS 3.0.

Again, go online. It is their lead editorial.

They said that the Senate shouldn't scuttle what could be one of Congress' better achievements. I agree. This will be one of Congress' better achievements to be able to capitalize our small businesses to make sure, again, they can access capital, they can go public, and that they are not treated like a Fortune 500 company on day one.

Mr. Speaker, many of our biotech companies that provide lifesaving pharmaceuticals, some of them don't even cash flow positive for a decade. They can't be treated with the same regulatory burden on their capital as a Fortune 500 company. If you do, again, they are going to go to China. They are not going to stay in the USA. They are going to go to China. As we continue to compete with them, we cannot allow this to happen.

So we have had such great support. I alluded to the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS). She said that this bill is "a carefully crafted bipartisan compromise." Those are her words. She said that it is "an example of Members on both sides of the aisle working together to support our Nation's small businesses and investors."

Again, she is one of the most liberal Members of the United States House of Representatives and most likely the next chairman of the House Financial Services Committee. She said that this bill will help entrepreneurs, small businesses, investors, and our economy to thrive.

In the 6 years I have been chairman, it has kind of been rare for us to agree on the time of day, but we definitely agree that the JOBS 3.0 Act is important. It is important to America's economy not only today, but more importantly, it is important for the economy of tomorrow.

If there is one aspect of America's economy that is somewhat unique in the world, it is how we have ensured that entrepreneurial capitalism can't just survive in America, but thrive. So those seeds have to be planted today. There is so much competition worldwide, and that is why it is important that we get this done.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce weighed in, and they said that the House amendment to S. 488—I am talking about the JOBS 3.0 bill—would remove barriers for raising capital for America's businesses. Approximately three-fourths of financing for businesses in the United States comes from capital markets, but regulations have failed to keep up with the demands of the 21st century.

The Angel Capital Association has written: "Thank you again for your leadership in promoting American startups, capital formation, and job creation. The JOBS and Investor Confidence Act will help foster innovation and job growth."

The Biotechnology Industry Organization, known as BIO, said: "The JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018, or JOBS Act 3.0, will significantly improve the ability of emerging biotech companies to access capital and invest in their potentially lifesaving research rather than unnecessary compliance costs that do not add value to investors."

There is widespread support. I am almost baffled, Mr. Speaker, why the United States Senate won't take this up. Again, this is a strongly bipartisan package. It doesn't get much stronger than 406-4.

Again, our business startups have neared a 40-year low in 2016. Our IPOs, our initial public offerings that allow our working families to invest in the American economy, are half of what they were 20 years ago.

Why? The average regulatory compliance for initial public offerings has now doubled. It has doubled in the last 25 years. It costs \$2.5 million to go public, with average compliance costs clocking in at \$1.5 million.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, we have to take a look at regulations that date back to the 1930s and start to ask the question: How is that going to impact the economy of the 2030s? The answer is not too well, particularly in a global economy competing with China.

So I just want to conclude by saying that I have so many friends in the United States Senate. I respect the United States Senate. I used to be a staffer of the United States Senate. But there is no excuse why they can't do what the House did and follow our leadership and work on a strong, bipartisan basis to make sure that America just doesn't have the strongest economy of today but has the strongest economy of tomorrow.

It started with men and women, Democrats and Republicans on the House Financial Services Committee, to ensure that the economy of tomorrow, once again, will be strong for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and my friends in the United States Senate to follow our lead, to listen to the administration, and to pass the JOBS 3.0 Act immediately.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7187. An act to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until December 7, 2018.

GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the efforts of my friend from the district that adjoins mine in Texas. He has done a yeoman's work, much of which he hasn't gotten adequate credit for. Hopefully not only the Senate, but the House will respect the work that has been done—including on flood insurance—and stop putting off what Financial Services has done to reform flood insurance.

We have extension after extension when the people whose homes are protected are begging for reforms so they can take their insurance money and build somewhere else instead of being forced to build where their house was destroyed.

Or how about people who have \$50,000 homes having to pay enough in insurance so they insure the multimillion-dollar castles that have been built? They want to make the poor folks pay for the rich folks, and it seems like today most rich folks are Democrats when you look at contributions in recent years. Regardless of what party they are a part of, it is not fair. There are just so many reforms.

Or how about if the Federal Government insurance program pays for the same house three times after it is destroyed, then they get their own insurance, not government?

There are so many brilliant, yet seem pretty basic, reforms that Chairman HENSARLING and his committee have pushed forward. None of them was my idea, but you can read them and go: Oh, that is a really good idea. It is a basic idea.

For some reason, we don't have the gumption to just go ahead and do the necessary reforms that saved a country whose spending is in trouble. Spending is putting the Nation at risk.

There is a very important purpose for government in the United States. It is not supposed to be a government that subdues its people or has the Orwellian job of monitoring them, as we hear China expects to have total monitoring of its citizens by 2020. That is not the job of the government in a free country.

The Revolution was about freedom. And I know Jefferson has taken a lot of flack for having slaves. He and Washington had hoped to free their slaves, but as I understand it, there were provisions that didn't allow what they

wanted to do. But if you look at the original draft of the Declaration of Independence, the original draft that Jefferson did, probably the biggest paragraph that listed one of the many grievances that in Jefferson's mind justified a war for independence and a Declaration of Independence was that King George III allowed slavery to ever get started in America.

That came from Jefferson's heart. He saw the problems that were creating the inequities, and he blamed King George for ever allowing it to get started. That ended up being struck from the final draft, but that was part of Jefferson's original heart.

The job of government does not include spying on its law-abiding people who have committed no crimes. It is not supposed to include telling its people where they have to live and what they have to do for a living or not do. It is supposed to be about freedom.

In fact, Dennis Miller made an amusing comment that, if the Founders were willing to go to war and risk or sacrifice their lives in a war over a little tax on their breakfast drink, then think how upset they would be today.

Yet we see the problems and we discuss the problems here, but when the going gets tough, apparently the tough get going by heading home.

□ 2030

We have until January 3, apparently, when the new Congress is sworn in, to get things done with a Republican majority in the House and a Republican majority in the Senate. We passed a tax bill. There have been other good bills passed, as Chairman HENSARLING was talking about. But when it comes to bills that have to do with whether or not this little experiment in self-government continues, we ought to be taking those up.

It has been interesting. There have been many times since I have been here when we saw Republicans and some Democrats who were defeated in a November election and some of them threw up their hands and said: Why should I even come back? I am going to have to have a new job, come January. I have sacrificed so much time being away from my family. What is the use of my coming back in November and December?

But I was greatly gratified at our Conference yesterday to hear people, some who are coming back because they were reelected and some, surprisingly, based on past history, who have been defeated and have said, as DANA ROHRABACHER said: Look, I am not going to be back in January, but I would like to have Christmas Day with my family. But other than Christmas Day, I am willing to come back every day if we can help America protect their future.

There are some very noble people here who understand that the burden of Congress, the House and Senate, is not to impose our will on the American people. It is to protect them. We are

not supposed to be the referee, the coach, the player. The American people should really be the participants. The government is supposed to be the referee. And, yes, we have got to have criminal justice so that when the referee makes a call, it can be enforced.

As a former judge who sent no telling how many people to prison over a 10-year period, I agonized over every one of those cases when I was going to look somebody in the eye and pronounce their sentence. Sometimes juries did it, but there were far more that didn't request a jury trial. Maybe they pled guilty and sought sentencing. Sometimes there were plea agreements. It was up to the judge whether you go along with the plea agreement. Sometimes I didn't.

One of the bills that is being talked about, which is criminal justice reform, which we badly need, desperately need, is actually going to be a slap in the face of every Federal judge who has ever agonized over what is an appropriate sentence.

I think it is fine to tell judges what the rules are when they go into a sentencing so they know what kind of sentence this is really going to be, in terms of real years. But to come back after judges have already agonized, they have had the hearings, considered every possible thing, and say: You know what? We are going to change the rules. We haven't read about the cases you judges agonized over and came to a conclusion on, but we are going to change them anyway.

They don't consider the fact that in so many prosecutions, in the very few Federal cases that are simple possession, it normally has to be a pretty big deal, and that is based on my own experience. I have been a prosecutor. I have been appointed to defend criminal cases in Federal court, State court. I actually was appointed to appeal a capital murder conviction, which was successfully overturned at the highest court in Texas. So I have seen it from all angles: prosecutor, judge, and chief justice reviewing on appeal.

You don't change the rules after they are made. That is why there is a provision in the Constitution that says Congress is not supposed to enact any ex post facto laws. And, yes, that is not specifically pertaining to going back and changing sentences after the fact, but when I read that, under the bill being considered, sex offenders will be released early—or can be—there are many people that will likely be released early, including those—and it is not even considered that some really bad guys, evil people who cut a deal to rat out on people that were even more evil, if they got a deal cut under the Federal system, you can't just agree to a term of years and recommend to the judge like you can in State courts like Texas, but they agree on charges. Okay. We won't pursue the fact that you had a gun at the time and you were trying to use it. We will waive that if you help us with that. And that will

make you look like a much more innocent guy. Or, we will let you plead to simple possession and we won't even bring up all this myriad of other charges. We will just let you plead to this one and let all these others go.

Those things go into the consideration of the court and of the prosecutors when they make recommendations. They will come back after the fact and say: We are going to reform criminal justice, but not the way you, Louie, have been wanting to, you in the ACLU and The Heritage Foundation, and others have agreed on in the past, where we would require a mens rea, an intent, a guilty-mind process for most crimes.

Or, perhaps another one that is a pet peeve of mine, supposedly we have, maybe, 5,000 criminal laws in the Federal system and so many of them say it's punishable by X number of years in prison, such and such fine for any violation hereunder or any regulation hereunder, which allows bureaucrats who have never been elected; who are not necessarily carrying out the will of any American public, just their own personal feelings; that have not been ever voted on, and they pass regulations.

You have regulations, like you have the poor guy that checked the box ground only as the way he was mailing it, and he didn't know some bureaucrat had passed a regulation, put one through that says, you have got to put a stamp on it that has an airplane with a red line through the airplane. So he was hauled off to another State and had never violated the law at all.

There are so many injustices in our Federal system, so many things that need fixing. Some have pointed out the inequity in years, like, back in the eighties when laws were passed that actually made it tougher on sentencing for having crack cocaine than having real powder cocaine—I was a member on the Judiciary Committee when this debate came up—and how it was really a racist law that made it a tougher penalty for having crack cocaine, which more African Americans had, than the powdered cocaine, which was worse, which was more often possessed by Anglo Americans.

Dan corrected the record and I went back and did some digging and found out, wow, he is right. That there were people, like Charlie Rangel and others, who were members of the Congressional Black Caucus who had said anybody that didn't vote for a tougher penalty on crack cocaine than on powder cocaine was a racist, because crack cocaine was destroying African American communities and we needed tougher laws.

But over a 30-year period, or so, people forgot why the punishment for powder cocaine was not as tough a punishment as for crack cocaine. It was passed, as Dan pointed out. People didn't want to be called racists and they were told by some in the Congressional Black Caucus that you would be

a racist if you don't make it a tougher penalty on crack cocaine. They didn't want to be called racist, so they voted and agreed to make it tougher penalties for having crack cocaine.

There is a lot of criminal justice that needs reform and there really shouldn't have been a difference between crack cocaine and powder cocaine. These are things we can debate, we can work out well, and not have a reform shoved through that is going to release people prematurely that should not be released. There is time to work that out.

Some of us were surprised to see the ACLU, the Heritage Foundation, BOBBY SCOTT, and LOUIE GOHMERT working together to try to work on reform. There are things we can work together, even when Republicans lose the majority in January.

So that is not as critical to get that done right now. When we do criminal justice reform, let's make sure we get it right and don't get people killed because we rushed through something that sounded good, but when you got down to the finer points, it created problems.

I was pleased to hear that Jared Kushner was interested in talking to people and talked to some friends of mine about problems they had with that bill. Well, we need to work those out. We don't need to spend time here rushing a bill like that through.

But the President won his election in 2016, and the most memorable promise that he made, he knew he was going to need the help of Congress, and he has been begging for the help of Congress, and he has been told over and over for the last, nearly, 2 years: Okay. We will get to that. We will get to that. We can't get it in this bill, but we will get to that.

As I have told our Conference more than once, the voters are going to come out in 2020, those who voted for Donald Trump, and probably mostly all of them will vote for him again, because he really has been trying to do what he said.

We said we were going to help, and we haven't helped him. The number one most memorable thing voters recall is the promise for a wall. As President Trump has said, we don't need 2,000 miles of wall, but there are places where we desperately need it. We are told: Well, it's just too hard to get the votes in the Senate. You would have to have 60 votes.

Well, I have had some good ideas over the years. Sometimes I have asked colleagues to be the lead sponsor on legislation I have come up with that was part of the committee of jurisdiction so they have a better chance of getting it through. Regardless, I know a good bill when I see it. And BRAD BYRNE has a good bill, H.R. 7073—and I love its title—the 50 Votes for the Wall Act. It eliminates the need for the 60 votes in the Senate. I know we have some House leadership that think it is just going to be too hard to get those votes in the Senate, so why even waste the House's time.

□ 2045

Well, it is because we have a chance to fix something that is terribly broken that exposes Americans to loss of life, loss of property, all kinds of losses, including the loss of a free United States of America. It is that desperate of a situation.

And the Border Patrol, most of the ones I know and have talked to, say: If you allow some of this big—whether you call it a caravan or call it what it really is, an attempted invasion, there are going to be bigger and bigger caravans and invasions. Some of them will end up being so big, you will not be able to stop them, not with troops. It would require all-out war.

The time to stop it is now.

We have seen the photographs of some walled fences where people want to thumb their noses at United States sovereignty. We take an oath. We are supposed to protect the Constitution.

Our number one obligation is to protect the American people. Going back to, metaphorically, the referee-coach-player situation, we are supposed to make sure that the players have a venue where they can safely pursue the free enjoyment of their activity.

And we know—we have heard it from the Mexican officials—there are hundreds of known criminals. Just in the invasive caravan they have seen so far, we know there is MS-13. We know there are people who are going to do terrible damage, cause loss of life, limb, and property.

If we are going to carry out our obligation to the American people, we need to protect them. We need to make sure people come in orderly.

People can slam the American people and raise issues about: Oh, gosh, you guys are such xenophobes and, oh, you have so much hate.

No. We have a love for the American people.

If a parent sees somebody trying to break into their home who is suffering from an illness that will likely be caught by others who are lawfully in the home, that parent would have an obligation, morally, legally. You are supposed to protect your children. Some go to jail for not protecting their children.

In that scenario, which we know there are people with illnesses trying to barge into America, and obviously there are people who have come into America with illnesses we thought we had gotten rid of in the United States, they are bringing them back in.

That is why there was an Ellis Island. That is why democratic presidents and Congresses had gone to such extremes to make sure people were properly vetted, so that the people to whom they answered could live more safely, freely, without fear of an invasion.

We have that obligation to make sure the American people are protected.

BRAD BYRNE's bill gets around the 60-vote requirement in the Senate. We have one of the smartest Speakers we have ever had in PAUL RYAN. He has

been former chair of the Budget Committee. He knows exactly how to go about getting a reconciliation effort accomplished.

Under the process known as reconciliation, all that they would need to do is bring up a 2019 budget resolution that would alter reconciliation instructions. Under BRAD's bill, it would provide \$25 billion for a border wall that would be placed in mandatory spending, and that would be as instructed by the Homeland Security Committee.

It is a majority vote to make that budget change. It is a budget resolution. That is what it would take. Once that is done, then the money could be placed into this trust account that is being set up under the Byrne bill.

I know, back a year and a half ago, we heard all kinds of threats: Oh, we can't really repeal ObamaCare because of the Byrd rule. Can't do it under reconciliation. Oh, the Byrd rule. Oh, we can't.

We had Republican leaders in the House and Senate telling us: Well, no, the Byrd rule won't let that happen. Sorry. It won't let it happen.

Nobody bothered to go check with the Parliamentarian. The Parliamentarian is not even the last word. Parliamentarians—I am very sorry to say this, but it is true—sometimes are wrong.

I don't know of a time when our current Parliamentarian was wrong, but I certainly know of a prior occasion when a predecessor, since I have been here, was totally wrong.

The Parliamentarian doesn't make decisions. The Parliamentarian gives advice. The decision comes from the Chair.

So, MIKE LEE, Senator LEE, went and asked the Parliamentarian: Do you think this will violate the Byrd rule?

Well, I can't give a preliminary opinion, but I don't see anything there that would violate the Byrd rule. No, I don't think it would be a problem.

Wow.

We had been told for a month that we couldn't do that, that we couldn't repeal ObamaCare, because the Byrd rule wouldn't let it happen under reconciliation. Turned out, nobody checked, and they were wrong. It could have been done. It should have been done.

The first bill, thank God we didn't pass that, but we passed the second one. As I was talking with some colleagues today, if the Senate had joined us, it would have materially helped the American people.

I know there are those who say: Look, the Senate doesn't have the votes.

Well, they could get 50 votes, because we could pass it with 50 votes. I know MIKE PENCE, our Vice President, would help support President Trump and break a tie.

We could get this done. But the Senate will have no pressure until this body passes a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions. And the Senate will need to do that, but they

are not going to feel any pressure until we do it here.

There are House Members, Republican House Members, some returning, some not returning next year, and they are willing to do the work to try to save American lives in this little experiment in self-government.

We have had so many people that have been miseducated to think that: You know, gee, socialism is a good way to go. It would be great for America.

We are seeing the polls reflect that more and more often. Well, let me make clear, anybody that will study history knows socialism, number one, always fails. Number two, you can't have socialism or communism or progressivism, whichever one you want to call it, unless you have a very powerful, totalitarian type government that takes from people who don't want to give it up and gives it to people who do want to give it up.

You don't have a middle class. That was one thing Karl Marx did not foresee, the strong middle class that would grow in America that set us apart from most anywhere else. That is why we did not become communist back when there were communists trying to push us there, because we had a strong middle class.

But in socialism, communism, progressivism, you will have a ruling class, and that is why there are so many billionaires now pushing to try to get us to socialism. They know, or at least they believe, people are too stupid to know how to live, so us ultra-rich billionaires, we will fund socialist-type candidates, because we know, if we get to socialism, you have a ruling class and you have a ruled class, and there is no middle class. You give up so much of your freedom.

It has to stop, and it is going to be stopped only if we will go ahead and push through a reconciliation bill that allows us to give the money to President Trump so we can get a wall built where we need it and secure the American people.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of family medical emergency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1074. An act to repeal the Act entitled "An Act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation".

H.R. 2422. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral

health care for low-income and other underserved individuals by breaking down barriers to care, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5317. An act to repeal section 2141 of the Revised Statutes to remove the prohibition on certain alcohol manufacturing on Indian lands.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 440. An act to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota.

S. 1768. An act to reauthorize and amend the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2074. An act to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 3389. An act to redesignate a facility of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 30, 2018, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 115th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

BRENDA JONES, 13th District of Michigan.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7009. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0044; SC18-906-1 FR] received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7010. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter providing a status report on the account balance in the Defense Cooperation Account, as of September 30, 2018, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608(e); Public Law 101-403, Sec. 202(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 112-81, Sec. 1064(7)); (125 Stat. 1587); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7011. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; North Carolina: Charlotte, City of, Mecklenburg County, et al., [Docket ID: FEMA-2018-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8555] received November 26, 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.

7012. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7013. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tin Oxide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0614; FRL-9982-73] received November 14, 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.

7014. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2018-0567; FRL-9986-15] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received November 14, 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.

7015. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Major interim final rule — Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program: Extension of Eligibility to Certain TRICARE-Eligible Individuals; Effective Date of Enrollment (RIN: 3206-AN58) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7016. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's correcting amendment — Personnel Management in Agencies received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7017. A letter from the Honors Attorney, Regulatory Affairs, Office of Chief Counsel, Pipeline Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Plastic Pipe Rule [Docket No.: PHMSA-2014-0098; Amdt. No. 192-124] (RIN: 2137-AE93) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7018. A letter from the Honors Attorney, Regulatory Affairs, Office of Chief Counsel, Pipeline Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Response to Petitions From Industry To Modify, Clarify, or Eliminate Regulations [Docket No.: PHMSA-2015-0102 (HM-219A)] (RIN: 2137-AF09) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7019. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace, and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Juneau, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0125; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AAL-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7020. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31220; Amdt. No.: 3823] received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7021. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31221; Amdt. No.: 3824] received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7022. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference Amendments [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0770; Amendment No.: 71-50] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7023. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0408; Product Identifier 2017-NM-146-AD; Amendment 39-19495; AD 2018-23-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7024. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0297; Product Identifier 2017-NM-181-AD; Amendment 39-19497; AD 2018-23-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7025. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0637; Product Identifier 2018-NM-091-AD; Amendment 39-19496; AD 2018-23-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7026. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0758; Product Identifier 2018-NM-093-AD; Amendment 39-19493; AD 2018-23-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7027. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines (IAE) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0404; Product Identifier 2018-NE-15-AD; Amendment 39-19468; AD 2018-21-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7028. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0908; Product Identifier 2018-NM-136-AD; Amendment 39-19486; AD 2018-22-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7029. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0551; Product Identifier 2018-NM-023-AD; Amendment 39-19485; AD 2018-22-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7030. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0431; Product Identifier 2018-NE-16-AD; Amendment 39-19475; AD 2018-22-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7031. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0216; Product Identifier 1988-ANE-18-AD; Amendment 39-19474; AD 2018-22-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7032. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0585; Product Identifier 2018-

NM-070-AD; Amendment 39-1948; AD 2018-22-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7033. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0510; Product Identifier 2017-NM-115-AD; Amendment 39-19483; AD 2018-22-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7034. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0589; Product Identifier 2018-NM-021-AD; Amendment 39-19489; AD 2018-23-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7035. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0934; Product Identifier 2018-NE-35-AD; Amendment 39-19478; AD 2018-22-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7036. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0958; Product Identifier 2018-NM-139-AD; Amendment 39-19491; AD 2018-23-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7037. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0027; Product Identifier 2017-NM-118-AD; Amendment 39-19482; AD 2018-22-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7038. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SOCAT Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0326; Product Identifier 2018-CE-006-AD; Amendment 39-19464; AD 2018-21-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5759. A bill to im-

prove executive agency digital services, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-1055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN. Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 6140. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish and carry out a program to support the availability of HA-LEU for domestic commercial use, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-1056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 7187. A bill to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until December 7, 2018; to the Committee on Financial Services. Considered and passed. Considered and passed.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 7188. A bill to extend by two years the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 7189. A bill to modernize the National Air Toxics Assessment, the Integrated Risk Information System, and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 7190. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, to address reorganization of small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 7191. A bill to implement reforms to the budget and appropriations process in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 7192. A bill to enhance the early warning reporting requirements for motor vehicle manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 7193. A bill to amend the VA MISSION Act of 2018 to expand the veterans healing veterans medical access and scholarship program to include more students and schools; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 7194. A bill to repeal the Waters of the United States rule and amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 7195. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make various reforms to Social Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 7196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide investment and production tax credits for emerging energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 7197. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to make grants to local educational agencies for purposes of supporting renewable energy-based heating and cooling systems in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 7198. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating Long Island's aviation history, including a determination of the suitability and feasibility of designating parts of the study area as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 7199. A bill to support entrepreneurs serving in the National Guard and Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 7200. A bill to extend indemnity for wildfires and hurricanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 7201. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to include the exclusive economic zone as part of the United States for patent infringement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 7202. A bill to require a study to determine the best available estimate of the total amount of nonhighway recreational fuel taxes received by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 142. A joint resolution directing the President to terminate the use of the United States Armed Forces with respect to the military intervention led by Saudi Arabia in the Republic of Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. GABBARD, and Ms. LEE):

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CAPU-ANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KEATING):

H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution honoring the 75th anniversary of the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League (AAGPBL); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H. Res. 1161. A resolution directing the Speaker to administer the oath of office to the representative-elect from the 13th Congressional District of Michigan; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. ROYCE of California):

H. Res. 1162. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BASS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. COLE):

H. Res. 1163. A resolution recognizing National Native American Heritage Month and celebrating the heritages and cultures of Native Americans and the contributions of Native Americans to the United States; 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. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 7187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce)

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 7188.

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 Officer thereof.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 7189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 7190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the establishment of a uniform law on bankruptcies throughout the United States; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws

which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;" and Article III, Section 1, Clause 1, Sentence 1, and Section 2, Clause 1 of the Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects judicial powers and cases that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 7191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7, which provides that, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be publish from time to time."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 7192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 7193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution

"All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

Congress shall have the power . . . "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 7194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 7195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 7196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 7197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 7198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 7199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 7200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 7201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 7202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the Constitution (authorizing Congress to “make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces”). Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution authorizes Congress to “declare War.” Congress did not declare war or authorize the use of the Armed Forces in the conflict in Yemen, and this resolution takes corrective action.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 92: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 1318: Ms. JAYAPAL.
 H.R. 1759: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 1847: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 1898: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CLOUD, and Mrs. LOVE.
 H.R. 2417: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2542: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2856: Mr. MITCHELL.
 H.R. 3272: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 3467: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 3598: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 4022: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H.R. 4107: Mr. HURD, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 4256: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 4339: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 4454: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4485: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 4732: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SABLAN, and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 4745: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JONES of Michigan, Ms. BASS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. VELA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. POE of

Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4828: Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 5248: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5678: Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 5911: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 6016: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 6051: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 6165: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 6225: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 6269: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 6272: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 6274: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 6543: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 6816: Mr. MESSER.
 H.R. 6854: Mr. PITTENGER.
 H.R. 6983: Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 6987: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 6988: Mr. COLE, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 7028: Mr. VARGAS.
 H.R. 7035: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 7059: Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 7061: Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 7082: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 7084: Mr. WESTERMAN.
 H.R. 7097: Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 7123: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 7160: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 7173: Mr. TROTT.
 H. Res. 751: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H. Res. 910: Mr. PITTENGER and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H. Res. 1145: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. KIHUEN.
 H. Res. 1150: Mr. CORREA and Mr. PETERS.