automate that process and, as a result, save an estimated $4 million annually that is used by CBP to process and file the paper forms. This is a commonsense reform that will save the federal government money and improve the customer experience at Guam International Airport and ports of entry in the CNMI.

Admittedly, CBP has the authority to create an ESTA system for the Guam-CNMI Visa Waiver Program. However, they do not have the authority to direct revenues collected from this automated process towards staffing at ports of entry in Guam and CNMI. As such, it is the consensus of tourism industry leaders and other stakeholders that there is an ultimate need for this legislation. I am informed that staffing has not increased in Guam since after the 9/11 attacks. The CBP staffing pattern was sufficient, but as the number of tourists grows on Guam the lines have also grown and the staffing has not kept up with demand. Making the visitor entry process into ports of entry in Guam and CNMI electronic is part of the solution, but additional staffing is still required especially since nearly 50 percent of our visitors are first-time visitors and cannot avail themselves of Automated Passport Control (APC) systems.

I am proud of the innovative programming that brings people from all over the world to Guam. For example last year, Guam hosted the Festival of the Pacific Arts (FestPac) a quadrennial cultural event for island nations in the Pacific, which is the largest gathering for Pacific peoples to unite and strengthen our cultural ties. Over 12,000 visitors, cultural performers, and native artists came to Guam to participate in FestPac, and I appreciated the commitment of former Commissioner R. Gil Kerlikowske to ensure there was adequate staffing at Guam International Airport. But that additional staffing was accomplished by approving extra overtime for employees which is a costly endeavor. Events like FestPac show the maturation and growth of Guam's tourism industry. Improving the processes and capabilities of our ports of entry to ensure a pleasant experience for our visitors is a top priority, and the solutions must be long-standing and sustainable. We cannot simply rely on overtime of employees to meet the current and emerging demands at our main international port of entry.

An ESTA for the Guam-CNMI Visa Waiver Program is an innovative, sustainable, common-sense, and cost-saving technological solution that would save the federal government millions, improve the visitor experience for our tourists, and increase resources to improve CBP capabilities by freeing up important personnel capacity to effectively monitor real threats to our national security. An electronic system for travel authorization would ultimately modernize and improve a Visa Waiver Program that continues to benefit the people of Guam and CNMI. My bill would help ensure that federal policy enhances economic opportunities and development in our region instead of being an impediment.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2017

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the American Health Care Act—TrumpCare—and to express my relief that it was removed from consideration before a vote. This proposal would have been a disaster for Oregonians and Americans. People would pay more and get less, and if they couldn't afford to pay more, they'd be out of luck.

Many would face a future without health insurance, or with inadequate coverage. The bill was especially bad for seniors, whose rates would have increased significantly.

Without coverage, working families are a cancer diagnosis or a heart attack away from economic ruin. When I worked at Legal Aid, many clients were struggling to repay medical debt after getting sick with no insurance or insurance that didn't cover their needs. We can't go back to the days when medical debt forced people into bankruptcy.

At my recent town hall meeting in McMinnville, Oregon a woman told me that her father-in-law suffered a massive stroke. Without coverage under the ACA, their family wouldn't have been able to afford the helicopter transport to Portland or his care at a rehabilitation facility.

Astoundingly, the TrumpCare bill also eliminated essential health benefits; several important consumer protections the Affordable Care Act added to insurance. By removing these benefits, TrumpCare would not cover many critical services, like mental health care, emergency room services, and maternity care. This change in the bill, added late at night in a desperate but unsuccessful attempt to gain more support from conservatives, would mean that people would once again buy insurance policies that would not cover their needs.

Additionally, TrumpCare made meaningless the ACA guarantee that people with pre-existing conditions cannot be discriminated against or denied coverage. With TrumpCare, people with pre-existing conditions would face insurmountable bills if unexpected illness or injuries occur.

Finally, women would stand to lose significantly under TrumpCare. Women who get life-saving cancer screenings and care at Planned Parenthood would have to find a new provider. Without insurance plans covering maternity care, women would struggle to get prenatal care—or simply go without. New mothers without insurance could face $50,000 in bills after a cesarean section.

I was strongly opposed to TrumpCare because it was terrible policy for Oregonians and Americans. I will continue to do everything in my power to protect Oregonians from the pay more, get less policies that are currently under consideration by the leadership of the House of Representatives.

Americans need the stability of knowing they will have affordable health care coverage. I stand ready to work with all of my colleagues on policies that improve access to affordable health care for everyone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEPHANIE N. MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2017

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on April 3, 2017, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber due to a family medical emergency. Due to these unforeseen circumstances, I was unable to vote on two legislative measures on the floor.

I want to express my strong support for H. Res. 92, a resolution condemning North Korea's development of multiple intercontinental ballistic missiles. I am a cosponsor of this measure. Had I been present and voting on Roll Call No. 209, I would have voted "aye."

Likewise, I support H.R. 479, the North Korea State Sponsor of Terrorism Designation Act of 2017. This bill expresses the sense of Congress that the Government of North Korea likely meets the criteria for designation as a state sponsor of terrorism and, if so, should be so designated. The bill also requires the State Department to provide a report to Congress on actions the Government of North Korea has taken to support terrorism. Had I been present and voting on Roll Call No. 210, I would have voted "aye."

NORTH KOREA STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM DESIGNATION ACT (H.R. 479) AND CONDEMNING NORTH KOREA'S DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL BALLISTIC MISSILES (H. RES. 92)

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, North Korea is an existential threat to its neighbors and a global menace that requires constant vigilance and close cooperation between the U.S. and its regional allies. Ignoring North Korea's dangerous actions has been a bipartisan problem of the last three Administrations—and it is one that continues to need bipartisan solutions from the Congress.

Secretary Tillerson announced recently that the U.S. will no longer be guided by the policy of "strategic patience." The U.S. cannot sit on the sidelines while Kim Jong-un proliferates nuclear and missile technology, sponsors terrorism and human trafficking efforts, and continues to abuse the North Korean people.

We trust that the threat posed by North Korea will be high on the agenda of President Trump and President Xi meeting this week. As we all know, the Chinese government's actions have not always been helpful.

Though the U.N. Commission of Inquiry on North Korea recommended the U.N. impose targeted sanctions on the North Korean leaders responsible for massive crimes against humanity, China blocked effective U.N. actions.

China's February announcement that it would cut off coal exports to North Korea is a needed and important step. But senior Chinese officials, such as Foreign Minister Wang Yi, continue to describe the China-North Korea relationship as being one of "like lips to teeth." In other words, there is little daylight between Beijing and Pyongyang.

Such statements are not helpful when North Korea's nuclear proliferation and its development of multiple intercontinental ballistic missiles threaten to destabilize the world. The U.S. Intelligence Community's 2016 Worldwide Threat Assessment concluded that North Korea is ''committed to developing a long-range, nuclear-armed missile that is capable of posing a direct threat to the United States.

Despite China's objections, there is need for deployment of the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system and to conduct joint military exercises to strengthen coordination and cooperation posed by the threat of the North Korean military.

The threat to the U.S. and its allies is not only in East Asia, but in the Middle East as well. We are certain that Iran, to whom the past Administration released billions of dollars, is one of North Korean's nuclear partners. As witnesses testified at a joint hearing last July held jointly by three Foreign Affairs subcommittees, there is ample evidence that Iran has a longstanding nuclear collaboration with North Korea.

We should be very concerned that the Iranians will at some point acquire fissile material beyond what they are allowed to produce for themselves and threaten U.S. regional allies, including Israel.

We must continue to uncover both Pyongyang's enablers and those it enables. We should target with sanctions those individuals responsible for gross human rights violations inside the so-called ''hermit kingdom'' and stop money and materials from reaching terrorists and nuclear proliferators globally.

There is growing evidence that sanctions are having some effect. We know that high-level diplomats, military leaders, and the families of high-ranking officials are defecting—they are recognizing that they will be held accountable if they continue to support Kim Jong-Un's barbaric regime.

I urge support for the legislation offered today and commend my colleagues for bringing this important legislation before the House.

WHAT DO WE HAVE TO LOSE: THE SUPREME COURT

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week, the United States Senate will consider the nomination of Judge Neil M. Gorsuch to the U.S. Supreme Court. Since President Trump first nominated Judge Gorsuch in January of this year, there has been fierce debate regarding his credentials, political leanings, and the circumstances surrounding his nomination.

The circumstances surrounding Judge Gorsuch's nomination are alarming. It is only due to Republican obstructionism during President Obama's Administration that Congress is even considering Judge Gorsuch's nomination. After the passing of Justice Antonin Scalia in February 2016, Republicans in the Senate made an unprecedented move to stall the nomination of Judge Merrick Garland—President Obama's nominee—for a record 293 days. It was the source of tremendous tension during President Obama's final year in the White House, and undermined the integrity of the highest court in our lands and our delicate system of checks and balances. Under Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL's leadership, Senate Republicans refused to hold a single hearing, vote, or take a single action to advance Judge Garland's nomination.

Freshly uncovered ties between President Trump and his close allies and advisors to the Kremlin have also raised numerous concerns about his nominees and the individuals who President Trump is selecting to fill the most trusted positions within our government. With the resignation of retired Gen. Michael Flynn, former National Security Advisor, former Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort, and foreign policy advisor Carter Page, there is a clear pattern emerging in President Trump's Administration. Members of Congress and others have begun asking questions, and the American people deserve answers before we allow President Trump's nominations to move forward.

Judge Gorsuch's record on the issues also deserves additional scrutiny. While Judge Gorsuch's conservative views are not an outright cause for concern, his record on issues impacting minority groups, women, and workers, and his positions favoring police immunity and corporate interests are cause for concern.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress needs to come together to carefully evaluate Judge Gorsuch's nomination to the Supreme Court. Given President Trump's alleged ties to the Russian Government, I believe it is wise to suspend any of President Trump's nominations until Congress can satisfy any concerns surrounding these ties. It is also hypocritical for Republicans in Congress to cry foul of Democrats for trying to delay Judge Gorsuch's nomination when just a few months prior, Republicans had unjustly delayed President Obama's nominee for a record-setting 293 days. We must act in the best interests of our own country, and I believe that entails delaying the nomination of Judge Neil Gorsuch.

OPPOSING NOMINATION OF JUDGE NEIL M. GORSUCH TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and member of the Congressional Voting Rights Caucus, I rise today to express my views regarding the nomination of Judge Neil Gorsuch to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court is the highest court in the land and the final arbiter of our Constitution and laws, and its rulings can impact the lives and rights of all Americans as shown in the cases of Brown v. Board of Education, Roe v. Wade; Miranda v. Arizona; Gideon v. Wainwright; New York Times v. Sullivan; Obergefell v. Hodges; and Shelby County v. Holder, to name but a few.

Judge Gorsuch is a judge with an agenda, as demonstrated by his record on the federal bench, as well as his writings, speeches, and activities throughout his career.

Judge Gorsuch's frequent dissents and concurrences show he is out of the mainstream of legal thought and unwilling to accept the constructs of binding precedent and stare decisis when they dictate results he disfavors.

Judge Gorsuch's appointment to the Court would tip the balance in a direction that would undermine many of the core rights and legal protections Americans cherish.

For the reasons I will discuss in detail, the Senate should reject his nomination and not consent to his confirmation as the next Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

On Election Night the President-Elect pledged to the nation that he would be a president to all Americans.

That pledge will ring hollow to tens of millions of Americans in light of his nomination of Judge Neil M. Gorsuch to be an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Perhaps nothing would do more to reassure the American people that the President is committed to unifying the nation than the nomination and appointment of a person to be Associate Justice who has a record of championing and protecting, rather than opposing and undermining, the precious right to vote; the constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, criminal justice reform, and support for reform of the nation's immigration system so that it is fair and humane.

That is not to be found in the record or character of Judge Gorsuch.

It should not be forgotten that the vacancy at issue was created in February 2016 by the death of Justice Antonin Scalia and should have been filled by the confirmation of the eminently qualified Judge Merrick Garland, Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

In fact, the only reason Judge Garland is not now on the Court is because Republican Senators disregarded a century of precedent and their constitutional oaths and refused to consider the nomination because it was made by President Obama.

Judge Gorsuch's conservative ideology and professed judicial philosophy of ''original intent,'' which more accurately should be called the doctrine of predetermined result, has been at the core of his prior legal decisions.

He is not an unbiased judge; at best, he is a younger, more charming version of Judge Robert Bork, who was rejected 58–42 by the Senate in 1987.

Unlike his predecessors, Presidents Obama, Clinton, Reagan, Eisenhower among them, the current President did not consult in advance with the bipartisan leadership of the Senate and its Judiciary Committee.

Instead, the President selected Judge Gorsuch from the list of names provided him by the right-wing legal group, the Federalists Society.

Judge Gorsuch's adherence to originalism is alarming and should raise concerns for all Americans because on a narrowly divided Court, his could be the deciding vote to dismantle many of the constitutional safeguards and protections upheld by the Court that have moved the country forward and made it better.

Judge Gorsuch has a history of ruling against people who have used the legal system to hold government officials accountable.

He has also used the bench to rule in favor of large corporations routinely and against the rights of workers.