

ASSOCIATION OF MATURE  
AMERICAN CITIZENS,  
Washington, DC, March 17, 2017.

Hon. KENNY MARCHANT,  
24th District, Texas,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,  
35th District, Texas,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARCHANT AND CONGRESSMAN DOGGETT: On behalf of the 1.3 million members of AMAC, the Association of Mature American Citizens, I am writing in strong support of H.R. 1512, the Social Security Child Protection Act. This important piece of legislation offers more protection for children under 14 who have been victims of Social Security card theft. This bill is as timely as it is simple in protecting the identities of our nation's children.

The Social Security Child Protection Act is a real-life solution to a real-time problem. As the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) recently reported, identity theft rose by 50% from 2014 to 2015. As millions of identities are compromised each year due to Social Security card theft, children are becoming a more attractive target to identity thieves. H.R. 1512 does more to stem Social Security card theft by making it easier for parents to request new Social Security numbers for their children when their Social Security card has been stolen, in transit, from the Social Security Administration (SSA).

Under current policy, parents of children under 14 are able to request a new Social Security number only when they can demonstrate harm has occurred as a direct result of Social Security card theft. However, demonstrating a level of harm requisite with current policy is difficult for most parents because children do not typically participate in activities where harm from Social Security card theft would be made apparent (getting a driver's license, buying a home, opening a line of credit, etc.). H.R. 1512 would make it easier for parents to get a new Social Security number for their children because they would only need to show their child's Social Security card was stolen in transit from the SSA—not that their child suffered harm.

As an organization committed to representing the interests of mature Americans and seniors, AMAC is dedicated to ensuring senior citizens' interests are protected. We thank Congressman Marchant and Congressman Doggett for their commonsense and practical solution to protect children from identity theft. AMAC is pleased to offer our organization's full support to the Social Security Child Protection Act.

Sincerely,

DAN WEBER,  
President and Founder of AMAC.

AARP,  
Washington, DC, April 11, 2018.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,  
Chairman, House of Representatives,  
Committee on Ways and Means, Washington,  
DC.

Hon. RICHARD E. NEAL,  
Ranking Member, House of Representatives,  
Committee on Ways and Means, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: On behalf of AARP's 38 million members, I am writing in support of H.R. 1512, the Social Security Child Protection Act of 2017. The bill directs the Social Security Administration (SSA) to issue a new Social Security number to a child under the age of 14 if the confidentiality of the child's previous number has been compromised due to the theft of the documentation. AARP is strongly committed to protecting the confidentiality of Social Security numbers for American citizens of all ages.

An individual's Social Security number is critical financial information and integral to everyone's personal identity. Many parents apply for Social Security numbers for their children soon after birth. Social Security numbers for all family members are used for a wide variety of purposes, including employment and taxes. For these reasons, Social Security numbers must be afforded the highest level of privacy protection to guard against financial fraud or identity theft.

AARP has a long-standing public policy position to protect the integrity of Social Security numbers that specifically states that "companies, government agencies, and individuals should not be allowed to post or publicly display Social Security numbers, print them on cards, transmit them over the internet or by facsimile, or send them by mail without safety measures." We appreciate your support to protect personal Social Security information and make this change in the law.

We look forward to continuing to work with you to promote the integrity of the Social Security program, and to protect the identities of American workers and their families. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

JOYCE A. ROGERS,  
Senior Vice President, Government Affairs.

Mr. MARCHANT. Again, I encourage all Members to vote "yes" to make sure that children who have their Social Security cards stolen are protected.

Madam 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. MARCHANT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1512, 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.

#### PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM IDENTITY THEFT ACT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 830, I call up the bill (H.R. 5192) to authorize the Commissioner of Social Security to provide confirmation of fraud protection data to certain permitted entities, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). Pursuant to House Resolution 830, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-68 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5192

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 "Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act".

#### SEC. 2. REDUCING IDENTITY FRAUD.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to reduce the prevalence of synthetic identity fraud, which disproportionately affects vulnerable populations, such as minors and recent immigrants, by facilitating the validation by permitted entities of fraud protection data, pursuant to electronically received consumer consent, through use of a database maintained by the Commissioner.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSIONER.—The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration.

(2) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term "financial institution" has the meaning given the term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).

(3) FRAUD PROTECTION DATA.—The term "fraud protection data" means a combination of the following information with respect to an individual:

(A) The name of the individual (including the first name and any family forename or surname of the individual).

(B) The Social Security account number of the individual.

(C) The date of birth (including the month, day, and year) of the individual.

(4) PERMITTED ENTITY.—The term "permitted entity" means a financial institution or a service provider, subsidiary, affiliate, agent, contractor, or assignee of a financial institution.

(c) EFFICIENCY.—

(1) RELIANCE ON EXISTING METHODS.—The Commissioner shall evaluate the feasibility of making modifications to any database that is in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act or a similar resource such that the database or resource—

(A) is reasonably designed to effectuate the purpose of this section; and

(B) meets the requirements of subsection (d).

(2) EXECUTION.—The Commissioner shall establish a system to carry out subsection (a), in accordance with section 1106 of the Social Security Act. In doing so, the Commissioner shall make the modifications necessary to any database that is in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act or similar resource, or develop a database or similar resource.

(d) PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE CONSUMERS.—The database or similar resource described in subsection (c) shall—

(1) compare fraud protection data provided in an inquiry by a permitted entity against such information maintained by the Commissioner in order to confirm (or not confirm) the validity of the information provided, and in such a manner as to deter fraudulent use of the database or similar resource;

(2) be scalable and accommodate reasonably anticipated volumes of verification requests from permitted entities with commercially reasonable uptime and availability; and

(3) allow permitted entities to submit—

(A) one or more individual requests electronically for real-time machine-to-machine (or similar functionality) accurate responses; and

(B) multiple requests electronically, such as those provided in a batch format, for accurate electronic responses within a reasonable period of time from submission, not to exceed 24 hours.

(e) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Before providing confirmation of fraud protection data to a permitted entity, the Commissioner shall ensure that the Commissioner has a certification from the permitted entity that is dated not more than 2 years before the date on which that confirmation is provided that includes the following declarations:

(1) The entity is a permitted entity.

(2) The entity is in compliance with this section.

(3) The entity is, and will remain, in compliance with its privacy and data security requirements, as described in title V of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.) and as required by the Commissioner, with respect to information the entity receives from the Commissioner pursuant to this section.

(4) The entity will retain sufficient records to demonstrate its compliance with its certification and this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(f) CONSUMER CONSENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) only—

(A) pursuant to the written, including electronic, consent received by a permitted entity from the individual who is the subject of the request; and

(B) in connection with any circumstance described in section 604 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681b).

(2) ELECTRONIC CONSENT REQUIREMENTS.—For a permitted entity to use the consent of an individual received electronically pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the permitted entity must obtain the individual's electronic signature, as defined in section 106 of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. 7006). Permitted entities must develop and use an electronic signature process in accordance with all Federal laws and requirements as designated by the Commissioner.

(3) EFFECTUATING ELECTRONIC CONSENT.—No provision of law or requirement, including section 552a of title 5, United States Code, shall prevent the use of electronic consent for purposes of this subsection or for use in any other consent based verification under the discretion of the Commissioner.

(g) COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) AUDITS AND MONITORING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner—

(i) shall conduct audits and monitoring to—

(I) ensure proper use by permitted entities of the database or similar resource described in subsection (c); and

(II) deter fraud and misuse by permitted entities with respect to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c); and

(ii) may terminate services for any permitted entity that prevents or refuses to allow the Commissioner to carry out the activities described in clause (i) and may terminate or suspend services for any permitted entity as necessary to enforce any violation of this section or of any certification made under this section.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the matter preceding paragraph (1) of section 505(a) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6805(a)), any violation of this section and any certification made under this section shall be enforced in accordance with paragraphs (1) through (7) of such section 505(a) by the agencies described in those paragraphs.

(B) RELEVANT INFORMATION.—Upon discovery by the Commissioner of any violation of this section or any certification made under this section, the Commissioner shall forward any relevant information pertaining to that violation to the appropriate agency described in subparagraph (A) for evaluation by the agency for purposes of enforcing this section.

(h) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts obligated to carry out this section shall be fully recovered from the users of the database or verification system by way of advances, reimbursements, user fees, or other recoveries as determined by the Commissioner. The funds recovered under this paragraph shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to the account providing appropriations for the Social Security Administration, to be used for the administration of this section without fiscal year limitation.

(B) PRICES FIXED BY COMMISSIONER.—The Commissioner shall establish the amount to be paid by the users under this paragraph, including the costs of any services or work performed, such as any appropriate upgrades, maintenance, and associated direct and indirect administrative costs, in support of carrying out the purposes described in this section, by reimbursement or in advance as determined by the Commissioner. The amount of such prices shall be periodically adjusted by the Commissioner to ensure that amounts collected are sufficient to fully offset the cost of the administration of this section.

(2) INITIAL DEVELOPMENT.—The Commissioner shall not begin development of a verification system to carry out this section until the Commissioner determines that amounts equal to at least 50 percent of program start-up costs have been collected under paragraph (1).

(3) EXISTING RESOURCES.—The Commissioner of Social Security may use funds designated for information technology modernization to carry out this section, but in all cases shall be fully reimbursed under paragraph (1)(A).

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Commissioner of Social Security shall annually submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the amount of indirect costs to the Social Security Administration arising as a result of the implementation of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5192, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5192, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act, and I am grateful that it is being brought before the House today.

This bill aims to combat synthetic identity fraud by directing the Social Security Administration to accept electronic signatures when financial institutions want to verify their customers' information.

Synthetic identity fraud accounts for 80 percent of all credit card fraud losses today. It has been reported that a record \$355 million in outstanding credit card balances was owed by people who it suspects didn't exist in 2017, up more than eightfold from 2012.

The Government Accountability Office describes this type of fraud as involving the creation of a fictitious

identity using a combination of real data, like a Social Security number or date of birth, from multiple individuals, along with fabricated information.

H.R. 5192 is an important step in reducing fraud, while also ensuring that the Social Security Administration is able to continue providing important services and benefits.

The SSA Commissioner is not allowed to begin development of the new verification system until the Commissioner determines that at least 50 percent of the program's startup costs have been covered by users. After initial development, users of the verification system are obligated to pay for the ongoing costs associated with this new workload by way of advances, reimbursements, user fees, or other recoveries, as determined by the Commissioner.

My south Florida district is far too familiar with fraudulent activity affecting the community, and sadly, children and immigrants are particularly vulnerable to these schemes. Over 1 million children have their identity stolen annually, and they are 50 times more likely than adults to be victims of identity theft.

I am proud to partner with Representatives SINEMA, HULTGREEN, and MARCHANT on this important effort. I would also like to thank Chairman BRADY and subcommittee Chairman JOHNSON for their leadership and hard work, as well as the staff of the Social Security Subcommittee and the rest of the House Committee on Ways and Means staff who have worked on this legislation.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5192, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act, to help modernize identity protections for our children.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 5192, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act, which was introduced by Representatives CARLOS CURBELO of Florida and KYRSTEN SINEMA of Arizona.

Our Nation is facing a growing epidemic of so-called synthetic identity theft. This is a sophisticated form of fraud where the fraudster manufactures a fake identity using a legitimate Social Security number but combining it with a made-up name. Numbers that belong to children are especially valuable for these fraudsters. This is because children typically do not yet have a credit record. If they did, the credit record would reveal that the name and number do not match, making the number useless to the synthetic identity fraudster.

Under this bill, banks and other certified users could verify the customer's name, Social Security number, and date of birth with Social Security's

own records. This would allow the bank to detect attempted synthetic identity theft. As under current law, banks would be required to get the consent of their customer in order to have the SSA verify information.

Social Security would not provide any identity information back to the bank other than, yes, this is a match or, no, this does not match. This matching could occur more quickly than it does under current law, to reflect the way commerce is conducted today.

I am pleased that we were able to work in a bipartisan way to develop this legislation and to strengthen it as it moved through the committee process. We did so in several ways.

First, we made sure that users of the system paid the full cost of developing it and conducting the verifications. We did not want to detract from the main mission of Social Security, which is to make sure Americans receive their earned Social Security benefits on time and in full.

Second, we strengthened the security of the system to make it not subject to misuse. Americans' personal information must be kept secure, and Social Security must only conduct the matching when the individual has given consent.

I am pleased to say that Social Security's track record on this is strong, and I expect they will carry on with their protectiveness of Americans' private data as they design a new system. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation to protect children and fight identity theft.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), the distinguished chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CURBELO for yielding and for introducing this commonsense and much-needed bill.

Mr. Speaker, synthetic identity fraud is a real problem with real costs to the victims. One million children have their identity stolen each year, and they deserve to be protected. This legislation will also help stop criminals from stealing \$1 billion a year by ensuring that we can verify a person is who he or she claims to be when applying for a credit card.

Synthetic identity fraud is a growing problem. Social Security must quickly take steps to get this important fraud-fighting tool up and running. As chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, I intend to make sure Social Security doesn't hold this up in any way.

While Social Security will provide this service, the users pay the full cost so Social Security's budget won't be impacted.

Social Security has an important job: to make sure those who are eligible get the benefits they deserve. I am com-

mitted to doing everything I can to protect all Americans from identity theft.

H.R. 5192, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act, is the best way to stop synthetic identity fraud, and I urge you all to support it. The American people deserve nothing less.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the lead Democratic cosponsor of this legislation.

□ 1645

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5192, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act.

Mr. Speaker, most of us assume our children are safe from identity theft. Most children don't have credit cards, and many don't have bank accounts, so why would they be targeted? Unfortunately, there is a new type of crime on the rise known as synthetic identity theft. This crime targets children and accounts for billions of dollars in credit card fraud.

Synthetic identity theft is happening right now, and it is hurting real people. In Arizona, a 17-year-old girl discovered she had accumulated over \$275,000 in debt because her Social Security number was linked to eight scammers and 42 accounts, including mortgages, auto loans, and credit cards.

To pull off this fraud, criminals obtain a Social Security number with no prior credit history, and they use it to apply for a credit card under a fake name. While the first fraudulent credit card application is usually denied, the failed attempt creates a "synthetic identity" with credit bureaus. This allows thieves to apply for credit cards, other lines of credit, cell phones, and other activities that require a credit check. Over time, thieves are able to rack up mountains of debt and ruin kids' credit before they have a chance to build their futures.

Every day, Arizona families shouldn't have to worry about their kids being targets of financial fraud and identity theft. Because financial criminals constantly use new tricks to steal children's identities, we must modernize and strengthen ID verification for everyday financial activities.

Our bill, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act, fights back and gives Arizonans peace of mind. By directing the Social Security Administration to modernize its ID verification system to allow for more transactions to be screened and verified, we are taking a commonsense step to ensure people are who they say they are. Our commonsense bill closes a key security gap, helping to stop synthetic identity theft in its tracks.

Thank you to Chairman BRADY and special thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), my friend, for working together to protect our children and crack down on fraudsters. Arizonans value their privacy, and they want us to work together to protect it.

I am happy to work across the aisle to bring financial criminals to justice and help hardworking Arizona families get ahead.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank my colleague, Ms. SINEMA. It is a pleasure to work with her and to team up, in a bipartisan manner, to fight fraud and to help the most vulnerable, in this case, the children. I am very grateful to her, for all her work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act.

I would also like to begin by thanking Leader MCCARTHY and my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, especially CARLOS CURBELO, for his support in bringing this legislation to the House floor.

H.R. 5192 will bring the Social Security Administration into the 21st century to assist the private sector in combating identity fraud. Identity theft affects thousands, if not millions, of children and families a year. A report by Carnegie Mellon CyLab examined more than 40,000 cases of identity theft and found that 10 percent of children in the study had someone else using their Social Security number. Among other things, children's identities were used to purchase homes and open credit card accounts.

According to the information recently published by the Algonquin Patch, Illinois ranks number seven in the United States for identity theft. The median loss for fraud is nearly \$500. Credit card fraud is the most common type of fraud.

For example, in Wilmette, Illinois, the Social Security number of a 13-year-old was used by a fraudster to open a credit card with a plan to use it to pay for plastic surgery. Imagine when these children go to get their first legitimate extension of credit, maybe a car loan or a student loan, only to find out that criminals have stolen their identities and wrecked their financial standing.

The Protecting Children from Identity Theft will strengthen the relationship between the public and private sectors in order to combat identity theft. Specifically, it will bring the Social Security Administration into the 21st century by allowing companies who meet strict regulatory standards to electronically confirm whether a name, date of birth, and Social Security number match.

This will make it much easier for companies, such as credit card issuers, to ensure that they are only providing credit to legitimate applicants. This will prevent millions of dollars in fraud costs, not to mention preventing all of the headaches for my constituents whose identities will be at risk unless this bill is signed into law.

Again, I want to encourage all of my colleagues to vote in support of the

Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have no further requests for time, so I am going to move ahead and close.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have seen much agreement on the floor today, pleasantly so. I really don't know when I have seen as much agreement on a group of bills and legislation as I have seen on this day. And I guess it really means that all of us agree that we need to do everything that we can to protect ourselves from identity theft, that we need to look after the interest of children and protect them.

I want to thank all of the staff from both sides of the aisle, even those who worked for subcommittees, as well as for the primary staff, for the tremendous amount of work that they have done.

Again, it is a pleasure working with Mr. CURBELO, and I guess if we don't agree on everything, we do agree that all of us have a responsibility to file and pay income taxes in order to keep our government moving.

It has been a pleasant day, not just for us, but I think all of our constituents, who have watched the proceedings, probably are saying to themselves that they would love to see more days like this, and I would, too. So I urge passage of this bill and the others that we have had before us.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague, Mr. DAVIS, and I agree with him. This is certainly something to celebrate. The American people oftentimes see us arguing. It is less often that they see us collaborating, working together to advance policies that will improve quality of life in our country.

That is why I want to again urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5192, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act. We need to do everything we can to safeguard our communities from these fraud schemes. This problem has worsened significantly over the past few years and is leaving families with debt they did not accrue and a weaker credit history.

H.R. 5192 will help root out synthetic identity fraud through modernized verification of customer information, and I hope my colleagues will join me in voting to help protect individuals across the country from this illegal activity.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, my appreciation to Chairman BRADY, to Ranking Member NEAL, to Mr. DAVIS, to Mr. HULTGREN, to Ms. SINEMA, and to everyone who has been a part of making this happen, so that, after we pass this legislation, children in our country won't have to worry about having their identities stolen at such a young age.

This kind of fraud can really ruin people's lives, and today, we are working together, as one united House, Republicans and Democrats, to fight fraud and to protect children, some of the most vulnerable people in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 830, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—420

Abraham	Castro (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Adams	Chabot	Dunn
Aderholt	Cheney	Ellison
Aguiar	Chu, Judy	Emmer
Allen	Cicilline	Engel
Amash	Clark (MA)	Eshoo
Amodei	Clarke (NY)	Espallat
Arrington	Clay	Estes (KS)
Babin	Cleaver	Esty (CT)
Bacon	Clyburn	Evans
Banks (IN)	Coffman	Faso
Barletta	Cohen	Ferguson
Barr	Cole	Fitzpatrick
Barragán	Collins (GA)	Fleischmann
Barton	Collins (NY)	Flores
Bass	Comer	Fortenberry
Beatty	Comstock	Foster
Bera	Conaway	Fox
Bergman	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Beyer	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Biggs	Cooper	Fudge
Bilirakis	Correa	Gabbard
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Gaetz
Bishop (MI)	Costello (PA)	Gallagher
Bishop (UT)	Courtney	Galleo
Blackburn	Cramer	Garamendi
Blum	Crawford	Garrett
Blumenauer	Crist	Gianforte
Blunt Rochester	Crowley	Gibbs
Bonamici	Cuellar	Gohmert
Bost	Culberson	Gomez
Boyle, Brendan	Cummings	Gonzalez (TX)
F.	Curbelo (FL)	Goodlatte
Brady (PA)	Curtis	Gosar
Brady (TX)	Davidson	Gottheimer
Brat	Davis (CA)	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Danny	Granger
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Brown (MD)	DeFazio	Graves (LA)
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Delaney	Green, Al
Buck	DeBene	Green, Gene
Bucshon	Demings	Griffith
Budd	Denham	Grijalva
Burgess	Dent	Grothman
Bustos	DeSantis	Guthrie
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Gutiérrez
Byrne	DesJarlais	Hanabusa
Calvert	Deutch	Handel
Capuano	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Carbajal	Dingell	Harris
Cárdenas	Doggett	Hartzler
Carson (IN)	Donovan	Hastings
Carter (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Heck
Carter (TX)	F.	Hensarling
Cartwright	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Castor (FL)	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.

Higgins (LA)	McCarthy	Russell
Higgins (NY)	McCaul	Rutherford
Hill	McClintock	Ryan (OH)
Himes	McColum	Sánchez
Holding	McEachin	Sanford
Hollingsworth	McGovern	Sarbanes
Hoyer	McHenry	Schakowsky
Hudson	McKinley	Schiff
Huffman	McMorris	Schneider
Huizenga	Rodgers	Schrader
Hultgren	McNerney	Schweikert
Hunter	McSally	Scott (VA)
Hurd	Meadows	Scott, Austin
Issa	Meehan	Scott, David
Jackson Lee	Meeks	Sensenbrenner
Jayapal	Meng	Serrano
Jeffries	Messer	Sessions
Jenkins (KS)	Mitchell	Sewell (AL)
Johnson (GA)	Moolenaar	Shea-Porter
Johnson (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Sherman
Johnson (OH)	Moore	Shimkus
Johnson, E. B.	Moulton	Shuster
Johnson, Sam	Mullin	Simpson
Jones	Murphy (FL)	Sinema
Jordan	Nadler	Sires
Joyce (OH)	Napolitano	Smith (MO)
Kaptur	Neal	Smith (NE)
Katko	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)
Keating	Noem	Smith (TX)
Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Smucker
Kelly (MS)	Norcross	Soto
Kelly (PA)	Norman	Speier
Kennedy	Nunes	Stefanik
Khanna	O'Halleran	Stewart
Kihuen	O'Rourke	Stivers
Kildee	Olson	Suozzi
Kilmer	Palazzo	Swalwell (CA)
Kind	Pallone	Takano
King (IA)	Palmer	Taylor
King (NY)	Panetta	Tenney
Kinzinger	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
Knight	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Krishnamoorthi	Payne	Thornberry
Kuster (NH)	Pearce	Tipton
Kustoff (TN)	Pelosi	Titus
Labrador	Perlmutter	Tonko
LaHood	Perry	Torres
LaMalfa	Peters	Trott
Lamb	Peterson	Tsongas
Lamborn	Pingree	Turner
Lance	Pittenger	Upton
Langevin	Pocan	Valadao
Larsen (WA)	Poe (TX)	Vargas
Larson (CT)	Poliquin	Veasey
Latta	Polis	Vela
Lawrence	Posey	Velázquez
Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Lee	Quigley	Wagner
Levin	Raskin	Walberg
Lewis (GA)	Ratcliffe	Walden
Lewis (MN)	Reed	Walker
Lieu, Ted	Reichert	Walorski
Lipinski	Renacci	Walters, Mimi
LoBiondo	Rice (NY)	Walz
Loebach	Rice (SC)	Wasserman
Lofgren	Richmond	Schultz
Long	Roby	Waters, Maxine
Loudermilk	Roe (TN)	Watson Coleman
Love	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
Lowenthal	Rogers (KY)	Welch
Lowe	Rohrabacher	Wenstrup
Lucas	Rokita	Westerman
Luetkemeyer	Rooney, Francis	Williams
Lujan Grisham,	Rooney, Thomas	Wilson (FL)
M.	J.	Wilson (SC)
Luján, Ben Ray	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Lynch	Rosen	Womack
MacArthur	Roskam	Woodall
Maloney,	Ross	Yarmuth
Carolyn B.	Rothfus	Yoder
Maloney, Sean	Rouzer	Yoho
Marchant	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)
Marino	Royce (CA)	Young (IA)
Marshall	Ruiz	Zeldin
Mast	Ruppersberger	
Matsui	Rush	

NAYS—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—8

Black	Jenkins (WV)	Thompson (MS)
Bridenstine	Scalise	Weber (TX)
DeLauro	Smith (WA)	

□ 1720

Ms. McCOLLUM and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 142.

#### ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 833

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Ms. Velázquez.

(2) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Lamb (to rank immediately after Ms. Rosen).

(3) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS.—Mr. Lamb (to rank immediately after Mr. Correa).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 141

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 141, a bill originally introduced by Representative Conyers of Michigan, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE NA- TIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMO- RIAL SERVICE AND THE NA- TIONAL HONOR GUARD AND PIPE BAND EXHIBITION

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 115, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 115

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMO- RIAL SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 37th Annual National Peace Officers Memorial Service (in this resolution referred to as the “Memorial Service”), on the Capitol Grounds, in order to honor the law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2017.

(b) DATE OF MEMORIAL SERVICE.—The Memorial Service shall be held on May 15, 2018, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate, with preparation for the event to begin on May 11, 2018, and takedown completed on May 16, 2018.

#### SEC. 2. USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NA- TIONAL HONOR GUARD AND PIPE BAND EXHIBITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition (in this resolution referred to as the “Exhibition”), on the Capitol Grounds, in order to allow law enforcement representatives to exhibit their ability to demonstrate Honor Guard programs and provide for a bagpipe exhibition.

(b) DATE OF EXHIBITION.—The Exhibition shall be held on May 14, 2018, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

#### SEC. 3. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsors of the Memorial Service and Exhibition shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the events.

#### SEC. 4. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsors referred to in section 3(b) are authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the Memorial Service and Exhibition.

#### SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the events.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 2018, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY EMMANUEL MACRON, PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, April 25, 2018, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Emmanuel Macron, President of the French Republic.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### MAKE THE BAN ON DRILLING PERMANENT

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

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the eighth anniversary of the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the central Gulf of Mexico.

Accordingly, I rise today to, once again, vigorously oppose any effort to allow energy exploration in the eastern gulf. The ban on drilling east of the Military Mission Line, 86 degrees, 41 minutes west, was put in place in 2006 and is going to expire in 2022. We need to make it permanent.

Our tourism industry in Florida and our residential development need protection from offshore drilling. We need protection from the oil companies.

Another spill like Deepwater Horizon would be an existential threat to Florida. The clockwise loop current, which runs all down the west coast, would carry any chemicals that get into the water all down the west coast to Key West.

We don’t need the eastern Gulf to become self-sufficient in energy, either. Technology and the shale revolution have taken care of that.

The Western Hemisphere is already independent and the U.S. itself will be before long. It is estimated that the U.S. will supply 30 percent of Mexico’s gas by 2030. In the Permian Basin alone, one of the three producing sands is estimated to hold over 20 billion barrels of oil equivalence.

As the CEO of Shell said recently: We will see peak demand for gasoline and oil within the decade.

Shell’s latest offshore platform, the Vito, has been scaled back 80 percent from 40,000 tons to 8,900 tons because it is just not productive.

Shell is investing in alternative energies.

Mr. Speaker, please protect Florida and make the ban permanent.