

Sánchez	Slaughter	Vargas	Dingell	Kihuen	Peterson	Walberg	Watson Coleman	Woodall
Sanford	Smith (NJ)	Veasey	Doggett	Kildee	Pingree	Waldeen	Weber (TX)	Yarmuth
Sarbanes	Smith (WA)	Vela	Donovan	Kilmer	Pittenger	Walker	Welch	Yoder
Schakowsky	Soto	Velázquez	Doyle, Michael	Kind	Pocan	Walorski	Wenstrup	Yoho
Schiff	Speier	Visclosky	F.	King (IA)	Poe (TX)	Walters, Mimi	Westerman	Young (AK)
Schneider	Stefanik	Walz	Duffy	King (NY)	Poliquin	Walz	Williams	Young (IA)
Schrader	Suozzi	Wasserman	Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger	Polis	Wasserman	Wilson (SC)	Zeldin
Scott (VA)	Swalwell (CA)	Schultz	Dunn	Knight	Posey	Schultz	Wittman	
Scott, David	Takano	Waters, Maxine	Ellison	Krishnamoorthi	Price (NC)	Waters, Maxine	Womack	
Serrano	Tenney	Watson Coleman	Emmer	Kuster (NH)	Kuster (NH)			
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Welch	Engel	Kustoff (TN)	Raskin			
Shea-Porter	Titus	Yarmuth	Eshoo	Labrador	Ratcliffe			
Sherman	Tonko	Zeldin	Españat	LaHood	Reed			
Sinema	Torres		Estes (KS)	LaMalfa	Reichert			
Sires	Tsongas		Esty (CT)	Lamborn	Renacci			

NOT VOTING—5

Johnson, Sam	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)	

□ 1059

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRAN BALLISTIC MISSILES AND INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS ENFORCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1698) to expand sanctions against Iran with respect to the ballistic missile program of Iran, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 590]

YEAS—423

Abraham	Brat	Comer	Herrera Beutler
Adams	Brooks (AL)	Comstock	Hice, Jody B.
Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Conaway	Higgins (LA)
Aguilar	Brown (MD)	Connolly	Higgins (NY)
Allen	Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Hill
Amash	Buchanan	Cook	Himes
Amodel	Buck	Cooper	Holding
Arrington	Bucshon	Correa	Hollingsworth
Babin	Budd	Costa	Hoyer
Bacon	Burgess	Costello (PA)	Hudson
Banks (IN)	Bustos	Courtney	Huffman
Barletta	Butterfield	Cramer	Huizenga
Barr	Byrne	Crawford	Hultgren
Barragán	Calvert	Crist	Hunter
Barton	Capuano	Crowley	Hurd
Bass	Carbajal	Cuellar	Issa
Beatty	Cárdenas	Culberson	Jackson Lee
Bera	Carson (IN)	Cummings	Jayapal
Bergman	Carter (GA)	Curbelo (FL)	Jeffries
Beyer	Carter (TX)	Davidson	Jenkins (KS)
Biggs	Cartwright	Davis (CA)	Jenkins (WV)
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Johnson (LA)
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	DeFazio	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Cheney	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Black	Chu, Judy	Delaney	Jones
Blackburn	Clark (MA)	DeLauro	Jordan
Blum	Clarke (NY)	DeBene	Joyce (OH)
Blumenauer	Clay	Demings	Kaptur
Blunt Rochester	Cleaver	Denham	Katko
Bonamici	Clyburn	Dent	Keating
Bost	Coffman	DeSantis	Kelly (IL)
Boyle, Brendan	Cohen	DeSaulnier	Kelly (MS)
F.	Cole	DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)
Brady (PA)	Collins (GA)	Deutch	Kennedy
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	Diaz-Balart	Khanna

Peterson	Walberg	Watson Coleman	Woodall
Pingree	Waldeen	Weber (TX)	Yarmuth
Pittenger	Walker	Welch	Yoder
Pocan	Walorski	Wenstrup	Yoho
Poe (TX)	Walters, Mimi	Westerman	Young (AK)
Poliquin	Walz	Williams	Young (IA)
Polis	Wasserman	Wilson (SC)	Zeldin
Posey	Schultz	Wittman	
Price (NC)	Waters, Maxine	Womack	

NAYS—2

Duncan (TN) Massie

NOT VOTING—7

Bridenstine	Smith (NE)	Wilson (FL)
Ciilline	Thompson (CA)	
Johnson, Sam	Webster (FL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1106

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to a family medical emergency, I had to return to my district in the early afternoon on Wednesday October 25. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 589 and "yea" on rollcall No. 590.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 220

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed from H. Res. 220.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests

Act sponsored by Representative BRUCE WESTERMAN.

We have all seen the devastating effects of wildfires, especially this year. Unfortunately, the U.S. Forest Service estimates there are still nearly 58 million acres of forest at high or very high risk of wildfire. The bipartisan legislation builds on our recovery efforts by giving the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management the tools necessary to better manage our public lands.

The House will also consider H.R. 849, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, sponsored by Representative PHIL ROE. Supported by both Republicans and Democrats, this bill repeals ObamaCare's Independent Payment Advisory Board—or, as most know it as, IPAB—and gives patients more control over their healthcare and not Washington.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider legislation to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program and other important public health priorities. Now, this was marked up earlier this month by the Energy and Commerce Committee. This package will help low-income children get health coverage, continue funding important health priorities like community health centers, and do so in a fiscally responsible manner.

I look forward to the House passing these commonsense bills next week without delay.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader announced that the CHIP bill will be on the floor next week. CHIP and community health centers have always been, as the majority leader points out, a bipartisan priority.

Unfortunately, this bill did not come out of the committee as a bipartisan bill, and negotiations were essentially not fruitful, and the committee reported out legislation to extend these important programs that included billions of dollars in partisan offsets.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the majority leader, does the gentleman know whether the \$8.2 billion reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, which serves nearly 9 million children from low-income working families, will be offset?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

□ 1115

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

First, let me set the record straight. Yes, it did come out of committee, and, yes, we did hold it up three times because your side of the aisle asked us to. But the reason why we are bringing it up next week is not because next week was the date we wanted. We wanted to get this done long ago. But the reason why we are doing it next week is because Minnesota is about to run out of money. And my dear friend knows because I sat with him, even this week, trying to work something out.

Now, we know of these health centers, and in this bill we doubled the

money for them. Of course, this bill is offset. We do it in a fiscally responsible manner. But this is not something to play political games with because some leadership Member wants to hold it up and go into December. We believe committees should be able to do their work.

Now, we started out, and Committee Chair GREG WALDEN, three times, was asked to delay by the ranking Democrat of the committee, even though we know the timeline is about to hit a number of States that cannot wait for a lack of action here.

So, yes, I am upset by this, but I am more upset about the number of times we sat down to try to work something out. And it was only yesterday I was told, Democrats said, no, they don't want to do anything, so we should just go forward. That is not the way this place should work.

If you look at this bill, I believe, if the committee had the freedom on the other side without the leadership telling them they had to vote "no," it would have come out of the committee with a much different vote.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

First, let me say, as far as I know, the leadership didn't give any direction to the committee. The committee decided on its own that it thought that the cuts that were being proposed by the Republicans are very harmful to some very important programs in healthcare for seniors that the gentleman, in his previous remarks telling us what the schedule was, said were very important.

So the reason that we have concerns is we believe the offsets being proposed, Mr. Speaker, by the Republicans, and why we don't agree with the bill that is being brought forward is because we think it hurts the healthcare of millions of Americans.

Let me ask another question, Mr. Speaker, of the majority leader, and let me preface it with Mr. MCCARTHY said in response to my question about the CHIP program: Of course, it is offset.

Let me ask him a follow-up question.

Does the gentleman know whether the \$7.2 billion for community health centers that provide primary care services to 26 million medically underserved Americans will be offset?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Right before your question, you said you had concerns with the offsets. The gentleman knows that I reached out to him, I don't know how many months ago, before a break, numerous times, right over on the floor on his side of the aisle, and I said: I am very concerned with what I am hearing on the Democratic side in the committee; I would like to get CHIP done early. And I asked for your assistance, and you helped.

There is one higher position on your side of the aisle who called the Speaker

numerous times and pretty much shut down your committee. So three times we were asked to delay, and we did.

That is why, this week, I went back to all of you and said: Let's work out if you have a difference of opinion in pay-fors.

It was not us who walked away from the table. It was the message I was delivered from the other side of the aisle.

So I don't know why we are having this discussion. I don't know why you are asking these questions. It is you and your side of the aisle that have said no. It is us who said: Let's sit down and work this out.

But let me walk through a few of the pay-fors so you understand them and so the American public can understand them, because I don't think they are controversial.

We require health insurance companies to pay claims when they cover Medicaid enrollees while keeping Medicaid as the payor of last resort. Now, that saves \$4 billion.

We say that individuals can't skip on their premium for 90 days and get free coverage. That saves \$5 billion.

We say if somebody wins a high-dollar lottery, those winners should not be eligible for Medicaid.

Now, your side of the aisle voted against that in committee. So the argument that you are making that it is not bipartisan is true. Your side of the aisle believes that if someone wins millions of dollars in the lottery, they should still be eligible for Medicaid.

That will save \$600 million that will actually go to the disabled, those who need this.

And what is more important, these States should not have to wait. These States should not be put in this position. Colorado has just announced that it will freeze enrollment. It will freeze enrollment because you guys walked away from the table. It will freeze enrollment because you say high-dollar millionaire lottery winners should still stay on Medicaid.

I don't think that is where the American public believes this debate should go. I believe that is common sense. I believe that is an area that we can get to. Let's care for the individuals, and let's stop playing politics with this. I am personally stunned you are even asking about this because you know what has gone on.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am chagrined that I have stunned my friend, the majority leader.

Yes, we don't agree with some of those pay-fors. I happen to, by the way, agree. There is no reason why a lottery winner of millions of dollars ought to be on Medicaid.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Nobody did on your side of the aisle in the committee. They all voted against that.

Mr. HOYER. I didn't yield yet.

I simply say to my friend, had I instructed or the leader instructed, that outcome may have been different. However, there are some really substantive issues that we had, we had for a long

time, we negotiated for a long time, and we didn't reach agreement.

My question to you was: Are they offset? I think your answer was, yes, they were offset, and then you proceeded to tell me what the offsets were.

Now, let me ask you a follow-up question to that.

Does the gentleman know whether the repeal of IPAB is offset? That is a \$17 billion deficit creation item. Is it offset?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. If the gentleman's question is if IPAB is offset, it doesn't need to be.

Mr. HOYER. Offset.

Mr. MCCARTHY. No, and it doesn't need to be.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that answer. Perhaps now he knows why I asked the first two questions.

Apparently, it is not the debt that is of concern, because if the debt were of concern, the \$17 billion would be of concern.

That was put in the bill, as the gentleman knows, to try to pay for, as we paid for every nickel of the Affordable Care Act, and that was one of the larger pay-fors.

Now, many Members on your side of the aisle don't like that pay-for, and many Members on my side of the aisle don't like that pay-for. That pay-for said that we are going to decide, if we are exceeding expenditure caps, what needs to be cut.

As the gentleman knows, that board has never been appointed. But if it had been appointed, we would have had 30 days—30 legislative days or calendar days—30 calendar days in which to say, no, we don't agree with that. So the representatives of the people would have had that.

But my point is we are selective in what we want to pay for, and I think that is a concern certainly to me, and I am sure it is to others.

And the gentleman said: Of course, it is offset. The gentleman, here, says this is not offset.

Can I ask the gentleman, why is this not offset? Why is this \$17 billion apparently not a worry for the debt and the other dollars for children are necessary to be offset?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I appreciate the roundabout way of trying to get around why you are not involved in the CHIP program, but let me explain very easily.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is correct. The gentleman has come to me. We tried to work on getting it bipartisan. We didn't reach that conclusion, and I regret that we didn't reach that conclusion.

The majority leader did, in fact, come to me in, I think, absolute good faith, and I wanted to try to get to a resolution. We didn't get there, and I regret that. We are where we are. But I want to tell my friend that I am going to continue to try to work towards that objective.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I look forward to that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

CHIP is in effect; IPAB is not. It hasn't even created a board yet. So what you are saying to me is let's offset something that hasn't even been created.

What I am saying is the last time we had this bill on the floor, it was bipartisan votes. Democrats voted for it as well; 43 cosponsors on your side of the aisle.

So I don't think this question is just to me; it is probably for the whole body. But I think the reason the majority of the body wants to get rid of it is it hasn't even been created, and the majority of the people think it is a bad idea. So let's get rid of it now.

And do you know what? CHIP is already in effect. What is even worse on this process is it is in effect, but now people are freezing enrollments.

So, if your argument why Democrats can't help us on CHIP and why they want to defend millionaire lottery winners is somewhere that something not created has to be offset, I don't think that is really a fair argument.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his response. I was going to respond later, but let me respond now.

This bill was not marked up in committee prior to its expiring, prior to the authorization ending. So when the gentleman talks to me about time, with all due respect, had it been an item of importance—which it is a bipartisan bill. We both want to see this get done. The gentleman is correct, this program exists. The gentleman is also correct that, until we fix this, there will be States that will be running out of money. That is a great concern to us. It will adversely affect millions of children.

We ought to get this done. We ought to get it done in a bipartisan fashion, and I am sorry that we didn't. I am sorry the committee didn't get it done so it didn't have to come to the majority leader or come to my attention or the leader's attention.

But having said that, that does not answer the question of the gentleman says IPAB doesn't exist. It certainly exists in scoring. As the gentleman surely knows, this is a \$17 billion item that will have to be paid for at some point in time, and it will add to the debt if we don't pay for it. It may not exist right now. It may not exist for reasons that the gentleman probably points out, correctly, that a large number on his side and a large number on my side are not for it.

I want to tell the gentleman that I am for it. I voted that way. But a large number of the majority of my party, I think, are not for it. I agree with that.

But the fact of the matter is repealing this is not paid for, and, as a result, the costs will have to come from somewhere; but on CHIP we had to pay for

it, and on community health centers we had to pay for it.

I agree with that, by the way, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Did I hear correctly that you voted to repeal IPAB?

Mr. HOYER. I believe I did. No? I am checking on it.

But I am saying here, publicly, I voted for the ACA. I think the ACA was good for the country, and one of the pay-fors we said we would pay for, and we did, one of the pay-fors was IPAB.

If we want to substitute some other way to pay for the healthcare that we are giving, fine. That will not increase the debt. But if we don't pay for repeal of this IPAB, it is going to increase the debt.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. My question to the gentleman is: We have brought to the floor, twice, the repeal of IPAB. Am I understanding correctly that you voted to repeal that?

Mr. HOYER. I thought I said, and let me reiterate, I voted against repealing IPAB. I am for IPAB. I will say it again. I know it is politically very controversial. It is a tough thing to do, but it helps pay for what we buy. And the problem in this House and the problem that we just did on the tax bill is we are not paying for what we buy. It is not spend-spend or tax-tax. We do not pay for what we buy. It is easy to buy and it is hard to pay. Here we are with another example.

I yield to my friend.

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

Let me repeat what happened on this floor in history.

Twice, this bill has come to the floor. Neither time—the repealing of IPAB—has it been offset. And do you know what? Forty-three Members on your side of the aisle joined with us. So it was the will of this House, a majority.

But if your argument is why we cannot fund children's health, why we cannot say that millionaires winning a lottery have to stay on Medicaid, if that is the defense from the other side of the aisle why they walk away from the table, I am ashamed. We are better than that, and this House is better than that.

I told you each time—and I tell the gentleman, I know it is not you, but there are other people on your side of the aisle who won't even release their Members from committee.

□ 1130

I know your members on the Energy and Commerce Committee did not want to vote "no" on that amendment. They don't want to defend those millionaires for being on Medicaid and taking away from the disabled and children. I know, in your heart, you don't want to sit back and make CHIP have problems for States, that maybe

Minnesota and Colorado can't increase enrollment, that they have to freeze it today.

We are better than this. If twice it has come to the floor without an offset, and it is the majority of the House that voted on it and it is 43 of your members doing it, I think we should move on now. Let's get back to the table. Let's solve this problem.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and I appreciate the premise for which he stood. I look forward to having the Dream Act brought to the floor, which a majority of Members are for on this floor and will vote for. I believe my friend knows that to be the case, and I hope we would bring it to the floor.

Let me go to this, if I can. The majority leader did not mention whether Alexander-Murray was going to be on the floor next week. Obviously, as the gentleman knows, there is an extraordinary disruption of the marketplace in the healthcare insurance field.

Alexander-Murray, at the request of President Trump, was an effort by Senator ALEXANDER, a Republican from Tennessee, a former Secretary of Education, and a former Governor of Tennessee, to respond to the President's request and, as the gentleman has just noted, working in a bipartisan fashion to come to an agreement to stabilize markets to ensure that people are going to have healthcare and particularly to ensure that the poorest among us can afford their healthcare. Alexander-Murray is bipartisan and has over 60 Senators supporting it.

Do you believe that that will be brought to the floor at any time in the near future?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for the question, but, as the gentleman knows, for a bill to come to the floor here, it first has to get out of the Senate. The Senate has not voted on that bill.

I know the gentleman quotes a certain number, but I would wait to see how many votes there are for the bill to see where it goes.

As the gentleman knows, this House has passed a bill that repealed ObamaCare, reformed it, got us a new bill, but made those payments as it went forward. So there is a bill sitting in the Senate that they can take up and solve this problem at the same time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, my friend, the majority leader, with whom I work in a constructive way on many, many items mentioned earlier about how children may lose their health insurance or some of our less well-off citizens who rely on Community Health Centers will lose access, and that, therefore, we need to get this bill done soon.

Millions, I suggest to the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, will be adversely affected if we don't pass a bill stabilizing it.

Yes, I understand you introduced a bill to repeal. You control the House,

the Senate, and the Presidency. We are now 10 months into the year. That bill hasn't passed.

So what we implore, Mr. Speaker, the administration and the majority party to do is not to do indirectly, that is, destroy access to affordable, quality healthcare for millions of Americans, that which they cannot do directly, and they haven't done it directly.

So I would hope that we could bring at least a bipartisan bill, in light of the failure to pass a partisan bill, which has, I am told, 60 Senators who have indicated they support it, maybe more.

I would hope when it comes from the Senate, if Senator MCCONNELL will put it on the floor, that we will consider it forthwith, because the instability that grips the system now is hurting millions, costing them millions, perhaps billions. So I hope that would be a priority item for us, along with the bill that we call the Dream Act.

We need to redeem the dream, Mr. Speaker, and continue a policy which the Speaker has indicated he thought was erroneously repealed by the President of the United States, which I think many Republicans with whom I have talked to think is a policy that ought to be pursued. I hope we can bring that to the floor as soon as possible, and certainly before Thanksgiving.

Mr. Speaker, unless the majority leader has anything further to say, I yield back the balance of my time.

HR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2017, TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, October 31, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDIAN ROCK DAM

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the 75th anniversary of Indian Rock Dam in York County, Pennsylvania.

Indian Rock Dam was completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1942 as part of an unprecedented boom of water resource infrastructure construction across America that stemmed from the Flood Control Act of 1936.

It is an earth and rock structure measuring 1,000 feet long, rising 83 feet

above the streambed that dams up to 9.1 billion gallons of water that otherwise would inundate downstream communities.

While impossible to prevent all floods, we can limit the damage and risk. Since Indian Rock Dam was completed in 1942, it has prevented more than \$55 million in potential flood damage to our community of York, Pennsylvania.

Managed by the Corps' Baltimore District, Indian Rock Dam is one of the 13 Corps dam projects in the Susquehanna River watershed.

For 75 years, Indian Rock Dam has been a silent protector for our citizens. For that and its continued benefit of reducing risks to Americans downstream, I am proud to recognize the 75th anniversary of Indian Rock Dam.

HONORING SERGEANT BRYAN BLACK

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

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, Bryan Black was the kid in Puyallup, Washington, with boundless potential, always striving to do more. He excelled in the classroom and, get this, both on the wrestling mat and at State chess tournaments. Go figure.

When he grew up, he took his potential to the United States Army, where Staff Sergeant Bryan Black conquered Ranger School and Special Forces Selection.

Sergeant Black was not just a warrior and a protector, he was a healer. As a Green Beret in the elite 3rd Group, he served as a medic, always encouraging and caring for those around him.

On October 4, Sergeant Black was killed in Niger.

Our hearts ache for his wife, Michelle; for his sons, Ezekiel and Isaac; and for his parents, Hank and Karen. Their son, husband, father, friend, and patriot will be remembered.

Precious few among us dedicate our God-given ability to protection of our country, but as Sergeant Black's father, Hank, so eloquently said: Some people could, would, should. Others do. Bryan did.

HONORING TROOPS ON DAY OF THE DEPLOYED

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the Day of the Deployed to honor the men and women of our Armed Forces who are serving overseas.

Today we salute them for their service on behalf of the United States of America. We also acknowledge the sacrifice of their families, who are separated from their loved ones during deployment.